

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 1-308

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1983-1984 Session

Report of Proceedings
from 16 to 20 January 1984

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Sitting of Monday, 16 January 1984	1
Resumption of the session, p. 1 — Tribute, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 2 — Market in rice, p. 5 — Welcome, p. 8 — Fruit and vegetables, p. 8 — Farm retirement scheme, p. 16 — Annex, p. 21.	
Sitting of Tuesday, 17 January 1984	23
Approval of the minutes, p. 24 — Decision on urgency, p. 24 — Situation of women in Europe, p. 25 — Topical and urgent debate (announcement), p. 60 — Question Time, p. 60 — Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament, p. 72 — Situation of women in Europe (continuation), p. 75 — Votes, p. 88 — Annexes, p. 91.	
Sitting of Wednesday, 18 January 1984	106
Approval of the minutes, p. 107 — Farm prices (Statement by the Commission), p. 108 — Radioactive waste, p. 117 — Combustible solids, p. 125 — Energy research, p. 133 — French presidency (Statement by the Council), p. 140 — Question Time (continuation), p. 171 — Annex, p. 183.	
Sitting of Thursday, 19 January 1984	207
Topical and urgent debate, p. 208 — ACP-EEC, p. 227 — International Development Association, p. 233 — Community financing of research and industry, p. 236 — European Charter on the Rights of Patients, p. 241 — Combating of acid rain, p. 246 — Votes, p. 252 — Combating of acid rain (continuation), p. 253 — Radia-	

(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)

tion protection, p. 256 — Safety and health at work, p. 258 — Protection of workers, p. 261 — Pollution of the North Sea, p. 271 — Safety of holidaymakers, p. 278 — Annex, p. 281.

Sitting of Friday, 20 January 1984 289

Welcome, p. 289 — Votes, p. 290 — Classification of goods, p. 291 — Discrimination in the matter of passing on nationality, p. 293 — Crisis in the tanning industry, p. 295 — IPDC, p. 299 — Deadline for tabling amendments, p. 301 — Adjournment of the session, p. 301 — Annex, p. 302.

Resolutions adopted at sittings of 16 to 20 January 1984 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 46, 20. 2. 1984.

SITTING OF MONDAY, 16 JANUARY 1984

Contents

1. Resumption of the session	1	5. Welcome	8
2. Tribute	1	6. Fruit and vegetables — Report by Mr Barbagli (Doc. 1-1114/83)	
3. Order of business		Mr Barbagli; Mr Gautier; Mr Bournias; Mr Hord; Mrs Poirier; Mr Delatte; Mr Psmazoglou; Mr Vgenopoulos; Mr Adamou; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Dalsager (Commission)	8
Mr Balfe; Mr Pearce; Mr Enright; Sir Henry Plumb; Mr Ligios; Sir Fred Cather- wood; Mr Sutra; Mr Hopper; Mrs Ewing; Mr Ligios; Mr Hord; Mr Bangemann; Mr Curry; Mrs Walz; Mr Glinne; Mr Bange- mann; Mr Bombard; Ms Quin	2	7. Farm retirement scheme — Report by Mr Ghergo (Doc. 1-1004/83)	
4. Market in rice — Draft regulation (Doc. 1-521/82)		Mr Ghergo; Mr Sutra; Mr McCartin; Mr Flanagan; Mr Psmazoglou; Mr Adamou; Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Hord . . .	16
Mr Kaspereit; Mr Provan; Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Sutra; Mr Vergès; Mr G. Fuchs; Mr Dalsager; Mr Provan; Mr Dalsager; Mr Sutra; Mr Bangemann; Mr Sutra; Mr Bangemann; Mr Curry; Mr G. Fuchs; Mr Provan; Mr Dalsager	5	Annex	
		Mr Patterson; Mr Alexiadis; Mr Kyrkos . . .	21

IN THE CHAIR : MR PFLIMLIN .

2. Tribute

Vice-President

(The sitting opened at 5 p.m.)

1. Resumption of the session

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament which was adjourned on 16 December 1983.¹

¹ For items relating to Approval of Minutes, Membership of Parliament, Petitions, Transfer of Appropriations, Deliberations of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions on petitions, Documents received, Texts of Treaties forwarded by the Council, and Delegation of the power of decision to a committee (Rule 33), see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, once more our Assembly has had to suffer the loss of a Member. The very first day of this year, 1 January 1984, was darkened by the death of our colleague Mario Sassano.

Mario Sassano was born on 1 October 1923 at San Martino in Pensilis. As a qualified engineer, he had played a very active part in the reconstruction and reorganization of power-stations in his country after the war, and had become an internationally recognized expert.

Elected to the European Parliament in 1979 on a Christian-Democratic list, he became particularly active as a member of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, and of the delegation for relations with the Gulf States. His group had recently nominated him to the special committee on European Economic Recovery.

President

His humanity won him the esteem and affection of all his colleagues. He devoted himself to his work conscientiously and with enthusiasm, without ever striving for vain effect.

I am sure I can speak for all the Members of this Assembly in expressing our sincerest condolences to his family and also to the Group of the European People's Party, to which he belonged. Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to observe one minute's silence in homage to our departed colleague.

(The House rose to its feet and observed a minute's silence)

3. Order of business

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

Mr Balfe (S). — Mr President, I refer to the procedure followed by the President at the end of the last part-session when the budget of this Parliament was adopted. Rule 24(3) of our Rules of Procedure lays down that 'the enlarged Bureau shall deliberate on relations with the other institutions and bodies of the Communities'. I have today received a letter from the British Foreign Secretary which reads in part: 'The Council sent a letter to Mr Dankert on 19 December drawing his attention to disagreement between the Council and the Parliament on a number of issues, including the unilateral reclassification of UK and German refunds.' It then goes on to say: 'However, as you know, Mr Dankert chose to take no account of the Council's letter. What I am asking is: Were the Rules of this Parliament, as to the enlarged Bureau being consulted, followed before this unilateral exercise of power, which does seem to be in breach of the Rules?'

President. — Mr Balfe, your query will be forwarded to Mr Dankert, since the matter falls within his personal competence as President of this Parliament.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, I wish to speak on a procedural matter, which I would ask you to take up with the Bureau of Parliament.

I refer to Section C of the report on the situation of women in the Community. In no way am I commenting on the substance of this. But it is, I believe, ridiculous and a preposterous waste of public money to spend 550 pages on this. If there is a case for women in Europe, it is damaged by this.

Do you know, Mr President, it even goes down to such piffling detail as telling us that in the Italian State Television Orchestra 33 % of the first cellos are women. What absolute nonsense! And it doesn't even say how many of the second cellos are women.

Would you please refer this to the Bureau of Parliament?

President. — That has nothing to do with a point of order. Moreover, you will have plenty of opportunity tomorrow to express your views on the matter.

Mr Enright (S). — The gratuitous insults hurled by Mr Pearce are typical of him and his party. However, since it is not a point of order, can he therefore be called upon to withdraw? I am quite sure that he did not say that in consultation with Dame Shelagh Roberts, who has taken a far more sensible line upon these matters.

President. — We do not want to start a debate on this matter.

Sir Henry Plumb (ED). — Mr President, I note that there are 547 amendments tabled to the various reports this week. These are going to need some handling. I equally note that the Nord measures are now in force, but not in respect of reports which have already been dealt with in committee. Can you assure the House therefore, that under these new rules the committees that have reports before us this week will not be subject to a change of procedure? We note that those changes provide that, where there are more than 20 amendments tabled to any one report, the President has the right, if he so wishes, to refer those reports back to committee. If that is the position in respect of any of these reports, obviously we would like to know as a matter of procedure.

President. — Sir Henry, this change in the Rules is not applicable to reports dealt with during this part-session, only to future reports. That is beyond doubt.

At its meeting of 14 December 1983, the enlarged Bureau drew up a draft agenda, which has been distributed. During the meeting this morning, the chairmen of the political groups authorized me to submit to you the following proposed changes.

With regard to Monday's agenda, more than 10 Members have requested, under Rule 56, that the Hopper report, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on consumer taxes (Doc. 1-1121/83), be held over to the March part-session. On the other hand, the chairmen of the political groups are mindful of the Council's wish to have Parliament's opinion not later than the February part-session. Would the authors of this request, therefore, be prepared to limit the deferment they are asking for to one month — that is to say, until the part-session of February?

Mr Ligios (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, I agree — and so do those of my colleagues who signed the proposal — that all the work should be completed by next month, and the subject should therefore be discussed in February. Moreover, I would point out

Ligios

that there is already a report in existence that the Committee on Agriculture is working on, and which will be completed at an early date.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED), *Chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations*. — Mr President, I should just like to point out as a committee chairman that from now on with the log-jam that we have — the reports we have to get through before the elections — for each postponement we shall not be able to discuss some report at the other end. So everything we postpone from now on will knock out some committee's report at the far end, and I really would ask, as a committee chairman, that reports should not be postponed from one part-session to another from now on.

Mr Sutra (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, I shall be extremely brief. I wish to say that our group has decided unanimously to support Mr Ligios's proposal. We entirely agree with it: we believe the Committee on Agriculture should be allowed time to deliver its opinion. That is without prejudice to the attitude which each of us will adopt in the vote when the report arrives, but we cannot interfere with the work of the committee.

Mr Hopper (ED), *rapporteur*. — Mr President, I strongly oppose the proposition that this debate and vote be postponed. I have four reasons for doing so. The first is that the matter is of some urgency, as the Council has itself indicated to you. My own government, that of the United Kingdom, has failed to comply with a ruling of the Court of Justice with regard to the taxation of alcohol. The Italian Government has failed to comply with two rulings of the Court of Justice. It is important that this Parliament should speak with a clear and loud voice on this subject as a matter of urgency.

Secondly, I believe that we should not confuse fiscal questions with agricultural questions. There is very little overlap between the report which I have drafted for my committee and Mr Ligios's report.

Thirdly, as Sir Fred Catherwood has reminded us, the agenda is over-charged for March and the rest of the year. I am told there are something like 370 reports awaiting the attention of this Parliament. If my report is delayed, it will mean that some other report is not considered.

Finally, may I point out that I personally and, I understand, a considerable number of Members in my group intend to support amendments moved by Mr Bocklet and Mr Ligios which will remove many of their objections. I can see little point in postponing until February. The only argument that has been put forward — and I believe a false one — is that we should postpone so that we can consider it along with

the Ligios report. The Ligios report, I understand, will not be ready until March.

For all these reasons I strongly oppose the motion to postpone.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Mr President, there seems to be a little doubt as to what the consideration is now. Are we discussing postponement until February or until March? Mr Ligios did give a hint of doubt in his own remarks when he conceded that it may be available in February, which indicates strongly notwithstanding some pressure that it may not be available in February. So we may be discussing postponement until March, which is quite a different matter from February, and I really think that it is not fair to postpone this until March in view of the backlog. I think this point should be clarified now.

Mr Ligios (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, I thought I had been sufficiently clear when I said that, as far as we were concerned, we undertook to bring the report before the Chamber in February.

I should like to remind honourable Members that the report is already in existence, and that discussion of it has proceeded somewhat slowly solely because we have been waiting for the Court of Justice to give judgment in the action brought against Great Britain.

(Parliament agreed to defer the report until the February part-session)

President. — With regard to Tuesday's agenda, the political group chairmen, having learnt that the President-in-Office of the Council will be speaking during the debate on the report on the situation of women in Europe, and bearing in mind the length of the speakers' list, propose that this debate be continued for one hour in the afternoon after Question Time and the Commission statement on the action taken on the opinions and resolutions of the European Parliament.

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, it seems to me to be totally unrealistic for this House to extend once again the amount of time that it devotes to the report on women, bearing in mind that we are supposedly obliged to deal with so many reports. I think that we, the Members of this House, expect the Bureau and the administration to be able to organize their affairs to the extent that we can have a concise agenda for us to approve without having unnecessarily to involve ourselves in changing times. It seems to me that there is already more than enough time made available for this particular debate on Tuesday, and therefore I am against the proposal to extend it by a further hour.

Mr Bangemann (L). — *(DE)* Mr President, first, I consider that this committee's work has been treated in a somewhat niggardly manner ('stiefmütterlich' if I

Bangemann

may use the expression — I could as well say 'stiefväterlich'). I consider that this committee has done its work very well and that it should be given proper space. One hour more is really not so much. I hope it will not be time wasted, but an hour of good debate which does justice to the committee's work. Furthermore, I would say to the Conservative Group, if it is true as one speaker has just said, that this report is full of ridiculous and piffling detail, then you should welcome the extra hour. Then you can expose even more ridiculous trivialities! I am in favour of endorsing this proposal.

(Parliament agreed to the President's proposal)

President. — With regard to Wednesday's agenda, the Commission will make a statement on agricultural prices at the beginning of the sitting at 9 a.m.

Pursuant to Rule 40(2), this statement will not be followed by a debate, but Members will be given the opportunity of putting brief questions to the Commission for not more than thirty minutes.

Mr Curry (ED), Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. — Mr President, we are of course very pleased to be able to receive a declaration from the Commissioner, but may I point out to you that we have tried this formula of brief questions for half an hour on several previous occasions. It is, in the words of the part of the world I come from, neither nowt nor summat. In other words, you do not get proper questions and you do not get proper replies. It is a token recognition of the Parliament's existence which has no substance of any description, and might I ask the Bureau, when there are urgent matters that affect the livelihood of people in the Community and in which the Community is competent — we spend so much time discussing affairs where the Community is not competent — that provision should be made for the Parliament to be able to assess, judge and react with sufficient time and with sufficient weight, so as to make the whole debate meaningful.

President — Here we are bound by what is laid down in the Rules of Procedure. The House will later have an opportunity of debating this important problem of agricultural policy.

Mrs Walz (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, since you have got as far as Thursday, I should like to know what is happening to the Walz report on nuclear energy and the Rogalla report on coal. Both these items have been removed from Tuesday's agenda. Would you please tell me on which day's agenda they are now? Friday's, no doubt. After all, they are not exactly unimportant.

President. — Yes, Mrs Walz, you are raising an important point there. Your report is still on the agenda for Tuesday. Of course, we cannot exclude the

possibility that it may not be reached on Tuesday because of the change which the House has just adopted: in that case, it will be postponed to Wednesday morning.

With regard to Thursday's agenda,¹ I have received from the Socialist Group a request to withdraw the Bombard report on the use of sewage sludge in agriculture, which is Item No 348 of the draft agenda.

Mr Glinne (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, the reason for our request is simply that the rapporteur cannot be present.

Mr Bangemann (L). — *(DE)* Obviously we must consider the duties of a rapporteur and in exceptional cases rearrange matters accordingly when it is an important report and the rapporteur cannot be present. Then the report must be deferred of course. In the present instance, however, we are talking about a Commission proposal for a directive on the use of sewage sludge in agriculture. I do not feel this report is so important that the rapporteur needs to present it himself. If he cannot attend, someone else can do that for him. Therefore I think we should leave the report on the agenda, with the proviso that it is taken after the report by Mr Sherlock.

For there is something else in this agenda which seems to me illogical and which I don't understand: first comes the report by Mrs Scrivener on an action programme on safety and health at work, then sewage sludge, and then once again a measure concerning the workplace and protection from physical, chemical and biological agents. In my opinion, the Bombard report should remain on the agenda but be called after the report by Mr Sherlock.

Mr Bombard (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, the reason I have to be absent, unfortunately, the day my report was due to be debated — and this report should have been dealt with several part-sessions ago — is truly a matter of *force majeure*.

Furthermore, I have just learnt that there were 31 amendments to this report and that some of them are from the chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and have not been presented in committee.

I think, therefore, that this is a strong argument for allowing me time to see these amendments, which are not available yet, and to hold over the report for at least a month.

(Parliament agreed to the request for withdrawal)

¹ For other changes to the agenda, see the Minutes.

Ms Quin (S). Mr President, I wish to raise a matter concerning the Maij-Weggen report which is due to be taken on Thursday. The English version of the report contains several errors of presentation. In particular, the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture is incorporated in the report without its being made clear that it is the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture. There are also many errors in the way the pages are numbered and presented.

Could this be looked into before the report is discussed on Thursday?

President — We shall make the necessary corrections.

*(Parliament adopted the order of business as amended)*¹

4. Market in rice

President. — The next item is

the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1418/76, on the common organization of the market in rice (COM(82) 345 final — Doc. 1-521/82).

I first give the floor to Mr Kaspereit on a procedural motion.

Mr Kaspereit (DEP). — *(FR)* My request is based on Rule (85) (1) of our Rules of Procedure.

I have heard that the General Council of the overseas department of Réunion, which is affected by the motion for a resolution which we have been considering, has just taken a decision pointing out that it is not desirable for the existing rules to be amended, which means that the General Council wants the system for semi-refined rice to be left like that for other kinds of rice and not amended.

That is why, pursuant to Rule (85) (1) of the Rules of Procedure, I request this matter to be referred to committee.

Mr Provan (ED). Mr President, on a point of order, I would like to hear a statement from the Commission on this matter before Parliament deliberates on this any further.

What faced us last part-session, Mr President, was quite an intolerable situation. We were requested, as a Parliament, to give this report urgent treatment by the Council. I think the Council was absolutely right in asking for it, because this Parliament had been asked last June to appoint a rapporteur, a rapporteur was

appointed and that rapporteur has failed to come forward with a report.

Mr President, every day that this matter is delayed by this Parliament costs the Community 20 000 ECU. The delay of one month has therefore cost the Community 600 000 ECU. That is quite intolerable when the Community is slowly going bankrupt. Why was it necessary for a Commissioner, on his own initiative, last part-session, having been approached by one Member of Parliament, to stand up and suggest to Parliament that it be delayed for one month? That again was quite intolerable, and for one Commissioner to take it upon himself to do this has cost the Community that amount of money.

Therefore, before we go any further, Mr President, I hope to hear a statement from both Council and Commission so that Parliament can come to a proper balanced conclusion.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — *(DA)* Mr President, this matter was referred to Parliament for its opinion 18 months — I repeat, 18 months — ago. I think it really is time now that Parliament discharged its responsibility and delivered an opinion, as both the Council and the Commission have asked it to do. The last time it was down for consideration here in the House, it was postponed for a month to allow for further information and clarification in response to the wishes, as I understand it, of certain Members of Parliament.

I believe they have now got all the clarification and data that are required for Parliament to deliver its opinion. Of course, I do not know whether Parliament will speak for or against it, but we must have a decision so that we can proceed further.

Mr Sutra (S), rapporteur. — *(FR)* Mr President, as Mr Provan said and as the Commissioner has just confirmed, we were first asked to consider this matter some time ago. I was appointed rapporteur, but all the same it is surprising — and I am entitled to feel positively angry — that a rapporteur should still be expected to deal with a text dated 1982 — for it bears the number COM(82) 345 final — when we have been told that an agreement was reached at the Council of Ministers on 20 and 21 June 1983. In view of this I have refused to deliver a report on texts which, I am told, are obsolete, and I ask the Commission to confirm that it is asking me to produce an opinion on an obsolete text of 1982 when an agreement has been reached in the meantime — on 20 and 21 June 1983 — in the Council. The situation being what it is, I have tabled some amendments to which I shall speak if the request for reference to committee is rejected.

Mr Vergès (COM). — *(FR)* I think this is a question of principle on which we can all agree. We have been asked to deliver an opinion on the text of a proposal

¹ For items relating to the time-limit for tabling amendments and speaking-time, see the Minutes.

Vergès

for a Commission regulation and, as has been said, that was over 18 months ago. We are now being asked to debate this text and to vote on it as a matter of urgency just as we hear that in June 1983 — seven months ago — an agreement was reached in the Council which was completely different from that regulation, and on that we have not been consulted. We have said that this shows a serious disregard for the principle of consultation. You will all recall the incident in the debate on the Colleselli report on wine when the Council, without informing Parliament, took a very different decision on the regulation submitted to us and so provoked a protest from the President of Parliament in which he had the Assembly's full backing. We are in exactly the same situation: we are being asked to vote, as a matter of urgency, on a text from November 1982. We are kept in ignorance of a Council decision of June 1983, which supersedes the text on which we are asked to vote and renders it completely obsolete. If they had meant to make a laughing-stock of Parliament they could hardly have done better! We therefore ask to be notified of this Council agreement; a group amendment refers to this report although the text is not available and has not been signed. Parliament cannot allow this; we hope we can all agree first that the text of this Council decision should be made known to Parliament and then, in full possession of the facts, we shall ask for it to be withdrawn or held over, having regard, moreover, to the decision of the General Council of Réunion, which was unanimous in its opposition, for this concerns the price of rice over there and, what is most important, will determine the future survival or otherwise of a large undertaking.

Mr G. Fuchs (S). — *(FR)* In view of what Mr Sutra and Mr Vergès have just said, which exactly tallies with my own information, I should like to ask the Commission to confirm that this text of June 1983 does exist, for it seems to me that if we have confirmation of its existence — and I for my part do not doubt that it does — Parliament will certainly agree to the request for reference to committee which has just been put to the House.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — *(DA)* Mr President, the agreement which was reached in the Council of Ministers was discussed and considered in a Council working-party on rice a year after the Commission's proposal was forwarded to Parliament. There had been no reaction to the proposal from Parliament during that year. The working-party may have altered the proposal a little so that the classification is slightly different from that in the Commission's proposal.

The reason why the subject was discussed was, of course, that we had not got an opinion from your

Parliament and were unable to submit a proposal for final adoption by the Council. Therefore I must urge Parliament to deliver an opinion on the proposal, which has been in your hands since 1982 and which is therefore 18 months old.

Mr Provan (ED). — Would the Commissioner confirm or deny that in June, when this was agreed in Council, the French Government was in fact in favour of this proposal for a regulation from the Commission being put forward?

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — Yes, Mr President.

Mr Sutra (S), rapporteur. — *(FR)* Mr President, as rapporteur I wish to say that I had not meant to ask for a reference to committee, so this is not a delaying tactic. I am not in the habit of trying to obstruct Parliament's work. I believe that, if the Commission were able to let us have the text of the agreement of June 1983, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture could be asked to call a meeting of the committee this week and we could adopt a text within three days. But to do as Mr Dalsager has just done and reproach a rapporteur for not reporting on an obsolete text of 1982 when there is a new one of 1983, which we have not been sent, that is intolerable! We cannot allow Parliament's work to be treated with such contempt.

(Parliament rejected the request for reference to committee)

President. — We accordingly proceed to the debate in the proper sense of the term.

Mr Sutra (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, first may I make a correction: I am no longer the rapporteur on this subject, because it is the procedure without report that has been adopted.

It is very simple. Given that we know that there is a new text, we revert to the procedure which I, personally, had envisaged. I was not insisting on a reference to committee. For me, the important thing was to restore the existing text. So I have tabled an amendment requesting that the 1982 text be replaced by the text of the agreement of 20 and 21 June 1983. I think that that should be unanimously adopted. I am sorry that a majority of Members should have voted to accept texts which are not known to us and which the Council and Commission, in defiance of correct procedure, have failed to forward to us. But, since we are now bound by this vote to proceed to the final decision, although this is the procedure without report — I repeat — and I am no longer the rapporteur on this subject, I ask Parliament to vote for the amendment, which is quite simple. I shall read it again: to replace Article 1 of the document by the text of the agreement reached in the Council on 20 and 21 June 1983.

Sutra

A second amendment calls for the deletion of Article 2, because obviously Article 2 would then fall.

I wish to say again that I regret that our Parliament should have been compelled to work under such conditions. How is one to present a report — for I worked on this report and drew it up, even though I am refusing to present it — how is one to present a report on a document of 1982 which I have just been told is obsolete? So I have refused to present my report and the 1983 document has still not been referred to me, although this is now January 1984. To expect Parliament to work under such conditions is totally unacceptable.

(Interruptions from Mr Bangemann)

You think it perfectly in order for the chairman of a group to see nothing wrong in Parliament not being consulted on texts which are adopted by the Council? Well, if that is what you in your group call strengthening Parliament's powers, I feel sorry for you!

Anyway, speaking for myself, when I say that I want to strengthen Parliament's powers I mean that it should at least be able to exercise fully all the powers that it has, and that seems to me the very least one could expect!

So I shall ask Parliament to adopt — not so much my amendment, for heaven's sake — but to endorse an agreement reached by the Council on 20 and 21 June. That is the least I can ask.

Mr Bangemann (L). — *(DE)* Mr President, I am very sorry to have to raise a procedural issue, but I find the procedure used by Mr Sutra exceedingly misleading and also unfair to us. The amendment he has just spoken for is a personal amendment and not an amendment tabled in his capacity as rapporteur. He *was* the rapporteur, but he obviously isn't the rapporteur any more. In what capacity has he been speaking? His remarks should have made clear what view he wished to put forward on behalf of the competent committee as its rapporteur. But what he has actually been saying is merely a personal view, which is, moreover, totally untrue, since he has failed as rapporteur over the past 18 months to draw up Parliament's opinion on the first proposal.

If we accept his amendment, it will become an institutional issue: we shall have accepted a Council proposal which we have not even seen or discussed yet. This is just not on!

It would not be fair for me to go into the background against which Mr Sutra may have been acting, but what he has just told us is not what a rapporteur is supposed to say to the House.

He has misled the House.

Mr Sutra (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, I object to Mr Bangemann's reproaching me for not presenting my committee's opinion seeing that my committee has never given an opinion, because it agreed with me that we should wait until the text of the Council agreement was sent to us. The committee refuses to work on an obsolete text, and I personally do not feel entitled to ask the Committee on Agriculture to work on a text of 1982 when we know that there is another dating from 1983. But it is I above all who object to my committee's having to work in such scandalous conditions and to the Council keeping texts back from us. Are these texts so shocking that they need to be hidden from us?

President. — Mr Sutra, we do not want to pursue either a personal discussion or, if you please, a procedural debate.

Mr Bangemann (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, to end this debate could we ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, who is present here, to explain what the problem is, because I am not well informed. In any case — I say this to Mr Sutra — I do not possess the information necessary to allow me to decide on this matter as a Member of Parliament, let alone as chairman.

I should therefore like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to tell us his committee's position.

Mr Curry (ED), Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. — Mr President, to the best of my recollection this matter has not been raised in the Committee on Agriculture in any shape or form whatsoever, either as to whether we should proceed or whether we should not proceed. Therefore, as Mr Sutra has said, he is not speaking in this House with the responsibilities of a rapporteur carrying a specific mandate from the committee.

Mr G. Fuchs (S). — *(FR)* With your permission, Mr President, I should like to satisfy Mr Bangemann's curiosity. In two sentences, the position is as follows: we have a Commission proposal from 1982 which had the merit of countering an obvious fraud and the disadvantage of creating social problems in the island of Réunion. Later on, in 1983, the Council agreed on a proposal which we have not been acquainted with formally but which we have good reasons to believe is better. Consequently, it seems utterly absurd — and I am choosing my words carefully — for the Member of the Commission responsible for agriculture to ask us to deliver an opinion on a text which is socially bad for Réunion and, in addition, has been rendered obsolete by a subsequent decision of the Council.

That, in a word, is the position.

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, this situation is getting more and more confused, and I think it is unfortunate that Parliament did not do the deed last part-session when it was asked to by a request from the Council for urgent procedure.

But let me try and set the background. Everybody knows the way the Community operates. The Commission comes forward with a proposal — which it did in this case — but, unfortunately, for some reason or other, the rapporteur did not bring it up in committee; he did not submit a report to committee, and I have to ask the question why he did not produce a report on the original Commission proposal. That should have been the procedure.

The rapporteur is now saying that he is not going to produce a report until he sees the Council's proposals. That has nothing to do with it, Mr President. I submit that the report should originally have been founded on the Commission's proposals and because the report did not come forward from the Parliament, the Council worked out its own decision as to what it should be. That, Mr President, is a slap in the face to the Parliament, and if Parliament goes on behaving like this, not bringing forward reports, we shall get kicked in the teeth every time by the Council. We, as a Parliament, have got to make certain that we do our work properly and on time so that we can help the Council in making up its mind on its decisions.

I come to the matter in front of us for debate today. Non-adoption of this proposal is going to cost 20 000 ECU per day, as I pointed out earlier. The French Government has agreed in Council that this should not continue. Unfortunately, however, there are certain unscrupulous operators within the Community who are mildly changing raw brown rice so as to attract a fairly massive subsidy from the Community. I submit to this Parliament that this sort of almost-fraud cannot continue and that the Commission is quite justified in trying to stop it.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) We are hearing a lot about the Council adopting a decision. The Council has not adopted any decision. The subject was discussed in a working party on rice, in which the technical feasibility of implementing the proposal was discussed. If the President of the Council had been here, he could have confirmed that the Council has not adopted any decision and cannot adopt a decision until Parliament's opinion is available; and we asked for that opinion 18 months ago.

President. — From the procedural point of view, the situation is, I think, clear.

The debate is closed.¹

¹ For the vote, see Annex.

After the vote on all the amendments

President. — Since the vote on the amendments has led to a contradictory result, the vote on the Commission proposal as a whole is postponed and the matter will be referred to the Bureau. The House will, of course, be kept informed.

5. Welcome

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honour and also a pleasure to welcome a delegation from the Assembly of the Federative Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia, who have now taken their seats in the Official Gallery.

(Applause)

We heartily welcome our Yugoslav colleagues. This delegation will be taking part in the fifth interparliamentary meeting with our own delegation, led by Mr Enzo Bettiza. This meeting will be the first to take place since the new cooperation agreement between the European Community and Yugoslavia came into force.

I can assure our visitors that our Parliament has always devoted great attention to Yugoslavia and attached particular importance to the development of those ties of friendship between our two Assemblies that were established seven years ago. We therefore attach great importance to the visit of this delegation, and I trust that this third visit to Strasbourg will serve to strengthen our cooperation in the interests of our countries and for the benefit of our peoples.

(Applause)

6. Fruit and vegetables

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Barbagli, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-1114/83), on the proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-211/83-COM(83) 92 final) for

- I. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 516/77, on the common organization of the market in products processed from fruit and vegetables, and Regulation (EEC) No 950/68, on the common customs tariff;
- II. a regulation fixing guarantee thresholds for certain products processed from fruit and vegetables; and
- III. a regulation adjusting certain rules in the 1979 Act of Accession in respect of products processed from fruit and vegetables

Mr Barbagli (PPE), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the proposals from the Commission for an amendment to the Regulation of 1977 on the common organization of the market in products processed from fruit and vegetables are directed in the main to a revision of the system of existing aids, having regard to the incompleteness and inadequacy of the current procedures. The amendments set out to consolidate the results already obtained, and to improve the competitive position of producers with the Community, especially as regards aid for processing industries. At the same time, it is proposed to revise the 1981 regulation on dried grapes and dried figs, following the entry of Greece into the Community.

It should, however, be observed that the proposals of the Commission for amending the regulations currently in force do not entirely eliminate the gaps that at present exist. In fact, as far as the initial aim of these measures is concerned — which was to provide support for the economy of the Mediterranean regions — only some of the economic aspects of that régime are taken into consideration. In addition, the report of the Commission contains no appraisal of the results of implementing Regulation No 516/77 as far as the efficient management of the market for processed fruit and vegetables is concerned.

The inadequacy of this analysis is reflected in the partial nature of the proposals, which do not meet the most important need, which is for the revision and extension of the present measure so as to remove the snags that have already been encountered and promote significant agricultural, industrial and commercial growth in the sectors of production concerned. Although on the one hand the proposed changes (a different method of calculating aid, a minimum import price, the storage of dried grapes, and guarantee limits) introduce a few limited functional improvements, they are on the other hand essentially aimed at reducing expenditure under the Community budget. Moreover, the guidelines for the reform of the CAP call for more advanced proposals for the revision of Community action where processed agricultural products are concerned.

With regard to the proposals of the Commission as set out in the document in question, there are some comments that need to be made. In the first place, there is the danger that, by means of amendments to the system of aid which are on the surface merely of a technical nature, attempts may be made to reduce its scope and limit the quantities eligible for aid. We are of the opinion, on the other hand, that the current system of aid should not be called into question, since it helps to promote both the development of the Mediterranean regions that traditionally produce and process fruit and vegetables, and the establishment of

regional balance. Our fundamental aims must continue to be the maintenance of Community preference, guaranteed income for farmers, supplies on favourable terms for the foodstuffs-processing industry, and fair, stable prices for consumers.

With regard to the new system for fixing the minimum price to be paid to producers, the linking of the basic price of the fresh product to the minimum price, by applying various coefficients to be fixed by the Council, leaves the Council too much leeway, and makes it doubtful that a fair minimum price will result in the end. We are furthermore concerned at the Commission's intention to freeze minimum prices of Williams pears and tomatoes for three years, and the failure to take into account the increase in cost of production. Precise rules should, on the other hand, be introduced to prevent there being an excessively inflexible link between the basic and withdrawal prices, on the one hand, and the minimum price on the other.

Then, with regard to the list of products that receive aid, there is a risk of competition, in respect of the same product, between those types of processing that receive aid and those that do not, and it is our view therefore that the list should be broadened to include all the processed forms deriving from the same basic product, and be extended to include other products as well.

With regard to the question of aid, there are strong reservations about the new system for calculating aid for processing industries, both as regards the flat-rate element and the subsequent fixings of the amount of aid, for which the proposed criteria are vague. In effect, the amendments must not lead to a reduction in aid, as this would act as a disincentive to the processing industry and lead to a fall in exports and an increase in prices.

With regard to packaging and quality standards, priority should be given to defining, as soon as possible, Community standards designed to harmonize national quality standards, and establishing criteria for the payment of aid, based on the quality standards for the processed products.

We are absolutely opposed to production quotas lower than the total level of Community consumption, especially for products of which there is a shortage in the Community, such as Williams pears and tomato-based products; on the other hand, the system of export refunds should be strengthened and extended to include other processed and semi-processed products.

Finally, where dried grapes and dried figs are concerned, we call for an extension of the current regulation for these products, which expired at the end of the marketing year, and a change in the present system of intervention and storing, as well as the approval of compensatory measures to ensure

Barbagli

markets for the products. We oppose the fixing of a production quota for dried grapes.

Mr Gautier (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like, on behalf of the Social Democrats, to explain that we cannot endorse the report in its present form. Wherever one goes in the Community these days one hears about saving money — whether in the Council, in the Commission or among ordinary citizens, and also in connection with the common agricultural policy. However, I do know of one body which is not in the slightest concerned about economizing, and that is the Committee on Agriculture of the European Parliament. Here we have just one more example of how steps like these to try to improve the administration of policies by the Commission is, in essence, rejected by — in this case — Mr Barbagli's general political report and something else is asked for.

A few illustrations will make clear what we are talking about. When economies are discussed, the Committee on Agriculture asserts that the aid measures must be extended still further and strengthened. Paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution proclaims loud and clear that the burden which the fruit and vegetables sector places on the Community budget is only small. As to that, let me just point out that this expenditure has risen in the last three years from 50 m ECU to almost 600 m ECU. But the Committee on Agriculture pays no regard to that and — as we might expect — it sees, in recital F, a real danger of the quantities eligible for aid being limited as a result of the Commission's amendments. But is it not right that there should be some attempt to limit expenditure here too? To me, at any rate, it seems incomprehensible that the Committee on Agriculture should come out with remarks of that nature. This wonderful report also tells us what the objectives of the agricultural policy must be in this sector as well. However, the objective normally found in Article 39 of the EEC Treaty is overlooked as usual, namely, to establish market balance. This never appears in any of the reports of the Committee on Agriculture, because many members of that committee do not wish it to do so.

Then again, paragraph 19 rejects the fixing of quantitative limits for tomato-based products. If such limits were applied and exceeded, then, it says, they should not lead to punitive measures. Yet we all know that considerable problems arise in this very sector of aids to tomato-processing. Last of all — and this beats the lot — in paragraph 27 the fixing of a production quota of 80 000 tonnes to dried grapes is rejected because there is no surplus production of this product. This very Parliament, however, scarcely half-a-year ago decided that 60 000 tonnes of dried grapes should be distilled — meaning, destroyed.

For all these reasons, we Social Democrats at any rate are unable to endorse the report in its present form. Another reason is that, though it deals with general matters, the report makes no mention whatsoever of the whole problem of supervision which occurs in this sector.

One actually hears of people trying to carry out on-the-spot checks being shot at in broad daylight. But that is not even mentioned. So we think the report is incomplete and just one more example of the shoddy products we are accustomed to getting from the Committee on Agriculture: a lot of money is very nice — the more for agriculture, the better!

Lastly, as one might expect, we find in paragraphs 20-22 the remarkable observation that exports must be increased and imports curbed. This, too, is in line with the committee's usual approach without any thought being given to whether this is actually sensible and reasonable for us from the general economic and political standpoint or which imports we want to curb. Maybe imports from Israel, or Morocco or somewhere else? How are we supposed to reconcile that with our general policy? Therefore, I myself have tabled a number of amendments to elaborate some points and delete others. If these amendments are adopted, I could abstain — otherwise I must vote against the report.

Mr Bournias (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, before I begin my speech, I would like to remind the colleague who spoke on behalf of the Socialist Group that the proposal we are debating was approved by the competent Parliamentary Committee with 22 votes in favour and only 1 against. I think this is an important point.

Mr President, I am one of these who maintain that the system of aid established from 1978-79 onwards for processing fruit and vegetables has been extremely helpful to the economies of Mediterranean countries mainly active in this sector of production.

The Christian-Democratic Group, to which we Greek European Members of the New Democracy belong, was the first to show positive interest on behalf of the Mediterranean region and the endeavour to reduce inequalities *vis-à-vis* the northern countries. Consequently, I approve the Commission's proposal to retain the basic principles of the system and review the method of calculating the minimum price and the amount of aid involved, provided that this review does not diminish the importance of the system for granting aid or the quantities subsidized. This is very rightly stressed by the proposed resolution, which also adds that it would not be right to jeopardize the incomes of many thousands of small producers in less-favoured areas of the Community such as my own country, for reasons pertaining to the budget alone. To be specific, we in Greece prefer the proposed system

Bournias

for calculating the minimum production price, because the decision would be taken indirectly by the Council of Ministers, which determines the increases in the basic price.

As for aid to the processors, we cannot approve of the proposed new method of calculation, which bases itself on the raw material and no longer on the processed product. This is because the new method does nothing to avoid the difficulties of the present system, but adds greater difficulties during the administrative control, increases the administrative effort required, and above all abolishes increased subsidies for small packs, with the result that in such cases the processing activity will have to move away from the Mediterranean to other countries. The Greek position in relation to the imposition of guarantee thresholds or quotas on the quantities qualifying for aid is that we oppose the imposition of production restrictions for products in which the Community is not self-sufficient.

Finally, we agree with the proposed resolution as regards a listing of products that qualify for aid, and that apricots should be added to the list. Indeed, we propose that the system of subsidies should be extended to cover not only apricots but strawberries, crystallized pears and pickles. As for dried grapes and dried figs, the Greek position is 'Yes' to storage, 'No' to thresholds, since the Community's production — i.e., Greece's production — only corresponds to half the consumption of those products.

Mr President, before finishing I think it necessary to add, with special reference to Greece, the following comments. The withdrawal of products in which the EEC is markedly deficient, such as citrus fruit, apricots, etc., creates social, economic and political problems to the disadvantage of the country affected, but also doubts about the EEC's policy which provide substance for the propaganda of its enemies. It is therefore necessary to review this policy and cease destroying Community produce, otherwise there is no point in speaking of integrated Mediterranean programmes and the forthcoming accession of Portugal and Spain to the Community.

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, I think the first thing I should say to this House in rising to join in this debate is that I do not represent any region which has vested interests. The United Kingdom does produce some top fruit, but I think in this connection we are talking largely about Mediterranean produce. What I think I can do is to represent everybody in the Community, namely all the consumers, and a large proportion of the people in the Community — namely, taxpayers.

I must say that I was absolutely shattered to hear Mr Bournias, a Greek representative, say just now that there should be no restriction in the subsidy system.

Hasn't it yet reached Greece that the Community has run out of money, thanks to over-expenditure on the common agricultural policy? And has it not been made known to Mr Bournias that the fruit and vegetable sector in the Community has not been reduced? He was suggesting that we were going to penalize the producers of Mediterranean produce. Is he not aware that expenditure in the Community's fruit and vegetables sector has increased by no less than 600% since 1975? This thing has taken off in no uncertain fashion because of a whole series of irregularities which in their turn have so served to increase substantially the cost of this sector to the Community that the Commission now feels obliged to bring in some changes. I think it is important to realize, since tomato production is a very important aspect of this report, that the cost of production aids amounts to 95% of the total value of tomatoes, so this huge amount of support for the tomato sector is one which has got out of hand. I am sure that most, if not all, taxpayers believe that to be the case.

Little wonder that we see such a strange situation when we realize that where tomatoes are concerned, the present aid supports not just the raw material, but the finished product, including all the packaging. What sort of agricultural policy is it when we have to support and subsidize the packaging industry? I would suggest, therefore, that on the one hand the taxpayer is paying much too much and on the other the consumer has then to foot the bill for the higher cost of the product.

And, of course, whilst the 600% increase is disturbing, all of us are aware that there is a distinct prospect that the Community will enlarge itself by taking in the Iberian peninsula, and we also know that Spain alone produces the equivalent of 40% of the total Community production of tomatoes. So we can look forward to an increase of 40% in our total tomato production if and when Spain joins the Community.

So I would suggest it is vital that the Community should stabilize the cost of its fruit and vegetables sector, because the implications of enlargement are really quite horrendous. It seems to me that we have here an albatross which could well turn into a monster if we do not introduce a degree of control which is quite clearly overdue.

My group welcomes the Commission's proposals, because they will ensure that aid for products like tomatoes will be related to the actual raw material. What is also very disturbing in this same sector is the lack of harmonization of quality standards. A large number of people, particularly the food manufacturers of Europe, are very disturbed that notwithstanding what could be described as an expensive support for such a sector, we are still not getting the quality that we deserve in Europe. I think the time is now overdue

Hord

for a substantial improvement in quality standards. We really ought to have, by this time, a worthwhile harmonization of quality standards. I believe also that we should now contemplate the possibility that Quality 3 for fruit and vegetables should no longer rank for intervention. The very example which we recently had and which Mr Gautier cited — the 60 000 tonnes of Greek dried fruit for which there was no market and for which the Community taxpayer was and is now being called upon to pay extra storage costs — and no doubt the Community taxpayer will be called upon to pay a vast sum of money for the distillation of this dried fruit that nobody wants — is a classic case of producing a substantial quantity of products which are well below the standards which the European consumer should be expected to be paying for. So I suggest that the time for harmonization of quality standards is long overdue.

Mr President, as I say, my group believes that the Commission proposal is a move in the right direction. It is overdue, and my group will support it. However, what we would like to say today is that there is much more to be done both in improving quality standards and also in controlling this sector, because quite clearly there are many instances of fraud. I believe that with the prospect of enlargement this is a sector which badly needs a good deal more attention from the Commission, since not only should we be trying to reduce the cost of this sector but we must recognize the dangers and the challenges from enlargement to include the Iberian peninsula.

Mrs Poirier (COM). — (FR) Mr President, it is the family producers of fruit and vegetables who have been and still are the main losers in the common market. The shortcomings of the Community system, both as regards income guarantees and protection against imports, are very largely to blame for this. After years of struggle, the producers have won a new regulation for fruit and vegetables in which we find many of the proposals put forward in the Maffre-Baugé report adopted by Parliament. That is a positive result, and it should help to redress the situation by correcting the injustices and inequalities from which Mediterranean producers have suffered for too long.

But we cannot allow the implementation of this regulation to be put at risk by enlargement and made dependent on the opening of agricultural negotiations with the applicant countries. Although some improvements have been achieved for fresh fruit and vegetables, nothing has been decided as yet for products processed from fruit and vegetables. The problems in this sector are all the more serious since they affect not only the producers, but also jobs in the processing industries, and I am well qualified to speak about this, because many undertakings, small and medium-sized, and many cooperatives in my region of Aquitaine are in difficulty at present.

When it was first implemented we felt serious reservations about Regulation 516/77, which sought to

replace protection at frontiers, which had indeed become very perfunctory, by aid for processing. This aid constituted a distortion of Community preference and benefitted mainly the processors by helping them concentrate their operations to the detriment of producers, and undermining the potential of the Southeast of France, in particular for tinned fruit, tomato purée, etc. Furthermore, we were afraid that it would encourage fraud — indeed, experience has proved us right. We would have preferred a market organization that respected Community principles more, but we must admit that the system that was set up was, despite everything, better than an artificial system of market protection under GATT. Of course there is no question now of abandoning all this, of starting all over from scratch: the regulation exists, it has been operating for six years with some favourable results and also with many deficiencies and inadequacies which it is now time to correct. The Commission has at last decided to make some proposals, but unfortunately these proposals conform with its general policy of limiting agricultural expenditure at the expense of the producer. In the guise of technical adjustments, they reduce the scope of the present system and make the conditions governing its application tougher by limiting the quantities eligible for aid and the guaranteed prices. I would point out, in particular for Mr Hord's benefit, that these price restrictions have still not been of any benefit to the consumers, who never get anything out of them, even though it is farmers' incomes that are blamed for this as they have been for years.

Price restrictions also jeopardize the incomes of several thousand farms and employment in regions which are, in many cases, among the least favoured in the Community.

The rapporteur of the Committee on Agriculture rightly criticizes this trend; he has put forward proposals for improving the 1977 regulation, and I endorse his general approach. But I suggest that these measures should be reinforced both through Community aid and import control. This is the purpose of the supplementary amendments tabled by our group to make good some of the many deficiencies in the provisions. We think that the way to improve the regulation is by quantitative management of the market and of outlets inside and outside the Community, in order to determine the share to be left to imports.

We think imports should be controlled more effectively by making all processed products, whether eligible for aid or not, subject to import certificates and to the automatic operation of the safeguard clause and, for the most sensitive products, by introducing voluntary restraint agreements or tariff quotas. This is the only way of ensuring that the business of supplying the processing industries goes as far as possible to Community undertakings.

Poirier

Improving the regulation also implies extending the benefit of aid to other processed products. It also means correcting intra-Community imbalances, as a result of which certain countries may be unfairly favoured. We also advocate measures to regularize intra-Community trade.

I cannot conclude my remarks without making a fundamental criticism of the Commission's approach, which we meet again in the wine sector. Its aim is to reduce agricultural expenditure so that enlargement will cost the Community as little as possible. That is a bad approach. Moreover, it is obvious that, if enlargement did come about, it would nullify all the improvements we may suggest today. This is one of the main reasons for our opposition to enlargement.

Mr Delatte (L). — (FR) Mr President, honourable colleagues, what is the subject of the Barbagli report? Viewed in the simplest terms, the Commission's proposals consist in supplementing the existing rules, because an organization of the market in fruit and vegetables already exists. The Commission proposes extending aid for producers to cover processed products. I think it important to continue granting such aid because of the economic difficulties which the majority of fruit and vegetable producers in Europe are encountering at present. But a number of processing undertakings and industries also find themselves in financial difficulty; consequently, I regard such processing aid for fruit and vegetables as absolutely essential.

We are told that economies must be made. That is true and I am totally in favour of it. And if economies must be made, we must go about them in the right way. In the fruit and vegetables sector, the solution is to encourage Community preference. If more attention were paid to that, if one could count on European solidarity in respect of all products and in particular fruit and vegetables, substantial economies would be made. That is the crux of the matter!

I consider the Commission's proposals to limit the guarantee thresholds inadequate, and in that I agree with the Barbagli report. I think it important that we should be able to adopt this report, for it is essential, of course, to stabilize production costs on condition that the producers are given the means of doing so. Let me say, too, that it also seems to me very important to encourage a concern for quality.

In conclusion, I wish to say simply that it is important to improve the organization of the market in fruit and vegetables both for fresh produce and for processed products, when discussions are due to begin on Spain's entry into the Community. The accession of the two applicant countries cannot be allowed unless we have put our own house in order — that is, Europe itself, as it exists today with its organization of the market in fruit and vegetables.

Mr Pesmazoglou (NI). — (GR) Mr President, I was surprised to hear what Mr Gautier said a little while ago, claiming to speak on behalf of the Social Democrats, and indeed what Mr Hord said on behalf of the European Democrats if I understood him correctly. The reason for my surprise is that our two colleagues seem unaware of the following facts.

First, of course we are talking about restricting the CAP expenditure. That is entirely necessary, but by far the greater part of that expenditure relates to other products and other countries, not to fruit and vegetables, dried grapes and dried figs, which are mainly of interest to the Mediterranean countries.

Right now, we are talking about a number of amendments which, as Mr Delatte said a few minutes ago, are designed to make Community preference more effective. Community preference is something that interests us all, particularly the Mediterranean countries, including, of course, Greece, my own country.

My second comment is that our two colleagues have perhaps failed to note, or have forgotten, that a basic aim of the European Community is to secure a balanced development with priority for the development of the Mediterranean south. In a resolution proposed by the Committee on External Economic Relations and approved by Parliament, the entire problem of reducing production costs and CAP expenditure and opening up our agricultural products to international trade is dealt with. Special mention is made, and there is an extensive paragraph proposed by Italian and Greek colleagues, concerning in particular the problems and products of the Mediterranean south.

My third comment is that perhaps our two colleagues are unaware that certain products are decisively and traditionally important for our peoples, and that their objections are thus directly wounding to our peoples.

On the whole, the report by the Committee on Agriculture is along the right lines. However, I think it will need to be amended in certain respects, and the points in question are those mentioned a little while ago by our colleague Mr Bournias. More generally, I would like to say that where fruit and vegetables are concerned it is logical for me to wonder how our colleagues can raise objections to the inclusion of those categories of products which are not covered at present. Many of those categories are of great interest to us, such as all the varieties of pears and apricots, about 40% of which undergo further processing. It is also logical to include all processed products and not just a few of them. These are amendments that have a particular bearing on the mechanism of protection, so that Community preference may be made more effective. As for dried grapes and dried figs, Greece is the only country in the Community that produces those

Pesmazoglou

products, they are traditionally important, and securing effective Community preference would put an end to contraventions by third countries outside the Community, which take place today to the cost of the Community as a whole and Greece in particular.

Mr Vgenopoulos (S). — (*GR*) Mr President, I would first like to make it clear that our colleague Mr Gautier was not speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group. He said that he was speaking for a number of Social Democrats, of whose identity only he is aware. The Socialist Group as such has adopted no position on the Barbagli report; it is neither for nor against, and each national group is free to vote as it sees fit.

I now come to the point. The Commission's proposals for the modification of Regulation (EEC) No 516/77 concerning the common organization of the market in products processed from fruit and vegetables will have the effect of perpetuating the unfair treatment applied to Mediterranean products in relation to products from the north. Whereas fruit and vegetable products represent 11% to 12% of the value of the Community's total agricultural production, they absorb only about 6% of the total expenditure of the EAGGF (Guarantee Section). This fact alone is conclusive proof of the unfair treatment applied to Mediterranean products. In 1982 and 1983, the participation of processed fruit and vegetable products in the expenditure of the EAGGF (Guarantee Section) was only 4.3%. Instead of trying to safeguard the products of southern parts of the Community, especially in view of the enlargement to include Spain and Portugal, the Commission proposes to reduce budgetary expenditure on processed fruit and vegetables; and instead of making specific proposals for the support of Community preference for those products, which are faced by cut-throat competition from third countries because of preferential agreements, the Commission proposes upper limits on the Community output of products in which the Community is deficient, such as dried grapes.

The setting of a production limit of 80 thousand tonnes for sultanas is unacceptable. The Commission's fears of a future imbalance between the production and consumption of sultanas are unfounded, for the following main reasons. The Community's consumption is almost twice as large as its production. The Community's production potential operates within a definite framework and is only subject to climatic conditions. In 1981-82 there were problems with sultanas, not because production was excessive but because the Commission was slow in applying measures to protect the Community's produce. Finally, in its proposals the Commission maintains that under the new system there will be no problems in disposing of the Community's produce. For these reasons, Mr President, I believe there are no grounds for the imposition of production quotas.

As for the abolition of intervention for dried grapes and dried figs, I would like to make the following comments. The Commission maintains that with the measures it proposes there will no longer be any need to hand over these products for storage, because it will be to the advantage of the processors to purchase them from the producers, and this, indeed, at the beginning of the trading period. I would like to ask the Commission: if at the end of the trading period the processors have not bought in the produce from the producers, then where does that leave the producers? How can we safeguard their incomes? We cannot put the producers' incomes at risk by relying on the correct functioning of the system proposed by the Commission to safeguard them. Besides, it is well known that many contraventions and shady deals take place in the importing of fruit and vegetables. That is where the contraventions take place, and not, as one of our colleagues from the opposite side of the House alleged, through artificially low invoicing that results in illegitimate and cut-throat competition for Community products. This is the reason why there has to be, as it were, a safety-valve to prevent stocks remaining on the producers' hands at the end of the trading period. A safety mechanism of this type could be provided by operating a system of storage during the final month of the trading period.

Mr President, I cannot say that the existing system of aid provided by Regulation (EEC) No 516/77 is a cure-all. We should recognize, however, that it has helped the less-favoured regions in southern Europe, and for this reason we should not interfere with its principles and its aims. Unfortunately, while claiming that the proposed new regulation involves only certain technical modifications, the Commission is jeopardizing the incomes of many thousands of the Community's Mediterranean small-scale producers. I agree with the rapporteur, Mr Barbagli, that we must reject the Commission's proposals, not, of course, because we should do nothing to disturb the existing Regulation (EEC) No 516/77 — indeed, all regulations ought to be reviewed in the light of current conditions — but because the Commission's proposals are unrealistic and will rouse the agricultural population in opposition to those measures. Even now, in Greece we have had acute reactions from the producers of dried grapes and figs, who demonstrated their opposition because of the dangers inherent in the new proposals, which threaten to reduce still further their already low incomes.

The Commission will therefore have to come up with new proposals that do not restrict the scale of today's aid system or the quantities that benefit from aid, but aim to protect the Community's products, especially those of the small producers in less-favoured regions of the Community.

For these reasons, Mr President, we are in favour of the Barbagli report and will support it with our vote.

President. — In reply to the remark you made at the beginning of your speech, I wish to inform you that Mr Gautier came up to the Chair to point out that he had been speaking in his own name and not in that of the Socialist Group. This will be indicated in the record.

Mr Adamou (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, we agree with the report, and more particularly the resolution proposed by Mr Barbagli on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture concerning the situation of processed fruit and vegetables, and we shall vote in favour of them. The report's comments and criticisms concerning the Commission's proposals are generally justified. We, too, express our opposition to the Commission's measures, since they would bring about a deterioration in the situation pertaining to processed fruit and vegetables because, within the framework of the CAP review, appropriations in that sector would be reduced by 34.3 million ECU, or 2.5 billion drachmas, each year.

From the standpoint of Greek agriculturists, the present situation should be not only retained but extended to cover other products as well, such as apricots, all the varieties of peaches, etc. We also oppose the three-year freeze on the price of pears and tomatoes. Aid should be calculated on the basis of the difference relating to the final, processed product, and not on that of the price difference relating to the raw material. Otherwise, the Greek processing industry will suffer, the consequences will place extra burdens on producers, the products will become more expensive, and there will be higher unemployment and more disposal by burial.

The Community must take definite measures concerning products imported from third countries, not only by specifying a minimum import price, but by defining quotas and compensatory contributions. It was because of the lack of any such measures that Greek sultanas remained undisposed of last year and had to be distilled for alcohol.

With particular reference to Greece, we ask for aid so that production costs can be reduced and the competitiveness of our agricultural products enhanced. Subsidies should be granted for their processing and not for their burial, and financial assistance given to encourage their penetration into other markets. We call for a correct application of the principle of Community preference, because during the three years since Greece's accession to the EEC, Greek farmers have buried 770 000 tonnes of fruit and vegetables, something without parallel in any other Member State of the Community. We do not agree that the Commission's proposals on dried grapes and figs are positive, nor is it right that the production of sultanas is below 80 000 tonnes. Average production is now 100 000 tonnes per year, and in the next two to three years, with the new growths, will reach 120 000 tonnes.

Moreover, since Greece is the only country in the Community that produces dried grapes and figs, and since the Community is not self-sufficient in these products, Greek farmers believe that no thresholds should be imposed on them. They also call for the present situation regarding collection and storage to be retained, and for processing to be subsidized on the basis of the finished product.

In conclusion, I would like to point out an inaccuracy. The report is mistaken in claiming that the price of Greek dried grapes has increased by 150% since 1978-79. Would that this were so, because then Greek dried-grape producers would be enjoying tolerable incomes and would not be living as miserably as they are now! The increase is in fact very small, and does not cover the cost of production or the rise in the cost of living or inflation.

Mr Kyrkos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, we shall vote in favour of the Barbagli resolution, and we express our satisfaction that both the resolution and the explanatory statement have taken into account, among other things, a number of proposals contained in the resolution which I put forward some time ago and in which appropriate claims were made on behalf of farmers in the Mediterranean countries. In the light of the Community's present difficulties, we must do all we can to avoid solutions that could make things still worse for farmers in the less-favoured regions of the Community.

The Commission's proposals would tend to do that, and the Committee on Agriculture very rightly calls for their decisive modification. The problem of surpluses invoked by the Commission is clearly artificial, granted that the EEC is deficient in almost all processed fruit and vegetable products. The imposition of quotas essentially penalizes Greece and the other southern regions, especially since the principle of Community preference is not applied effectively. Thus, the Committee on Agriculture is quite right in regarding the imposition of quotas for fruit and vegetables as unacceptable. More particularly where dried grapes are concerned, we must stress that abandoning the idea of quotas is also a matter of justice towards our country, which the Community obliged to purchase more expensive meat by enforcing radical changes in the supply situation existing at the time, with economically very damaging results.

In addition to the comments made by my Greek colleagues, with which I agree completely, I should like to say that in the last few days the results of an exhaustive survey of the average agricultural income in our country were published in Greece. It would be very interesting to compare this with the corresponding incomes in other countries of the Community, to highlight the exceptionally weak position in which Greek farmers find themselves. Our Parliament should listen with care to the voice of protest coming

Kyrkos

from the Community's southern regions. The Barbagli resolution, which contains positive notions on supporting incomes and encouraging the processing of fruit and vegetables, provides Parliament with an opportunity to express its concern for Mediterranean agriculture. It also outlines a path which the Commission should follow if the orientations it is currently adopting are not to lead to outbursts of dissatisfaction among farmers in the south, which would place even greater strain on the Community's already difficult situation. Until the time comes when new resources will make it possible to view the CAP in a different light, we shall have to strive for balances that will inevitably have to tread the increasingly fine line between support for northern and for southern products.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, first, on behalf of the Commission, I wish to thank Parliament for the attention it has given to these proposals, which the Commission submitted to the Council in response to information concerning the difficulties involved in getting the system of production aids for certain products processed from fruit and vegetables to operate satisfactorily. The Commission agrees with Parliament that decisions are needed quickly in this sector, especially for dried grapes and dried figs, since the current provisions for these products expire at the end of this production year, but also in regard to quality standards.

However, the Commission cannot agree with certain paragraphs in the resolution. Thus, it is not the Commission's belief that the list of products eligible for aid should be extended; on the contrary, it is important that certain factors in the formula for calculating the aid should be changed so that the aid is based on raw materials. Some speakers have also touched on this problem.

Again, the Commission thinks it necessary to maintain the existing quantity restrictions in the sector and fix a guarantee threshold for dried grapes, as has also been mentioned by various speakers. But we are in an extremely difficult situation where this product is concerned, and we all know very well that the position in regard to storage is creating more and more problems every year. Therefore, in the Commission's view, for the producers' sake as well, we must change the system so that it works better.

President. — The debate is closed.

We should now proceed to the vote. For technical reasons, however, seven amendments tabled last Thursday did not reach the services concerned until this afternoon and consequently have not been translated and distributed in proper time.

Under these circumstances, I propose that the vote on the Barbagli report be postponed until the next voting-time.

(Parliament agreed to this proposal)

7. Farm retirement scheme

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Ghergo, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on the urgent need to draw up a new farm retirement scheme (Doc. 1-1004/83).

Mr Ghergo (PPE), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the motion for a resolution presented by Messrs Davern, Cronin, Flanagan and Lalor does not strictly concern the farm retirement scheme as it applies to employed and independent farm workers in the Community. It does, however, contain specific references to that scheme; in fact, recital C of the preamble refers to the EEC's farm retirement scheme as having been 'a total failure'. Paragraphs 1 and 4 state that people who have accepted the Community farm retirement pension are being 'blatantly discriminated against' as compared with those who draw the old-age pension. Finally, paragraph 5 calls for a review of the Community farm retirement scheme. But the Community has not specifically given its attention to this problem so far, and the Commission has only published national reports and statistics on social security in the farming sector.

It therefore does not seem to me that we should be talking about failure, still less a review of the Community farm retirement scheme, which, in practice, is non-existent. In fact the Irish members of the EPD Group, who presented the motion for a resolution that is the subject of my report, are referring to Council Directive 72/160/EEC regarding 'Measures to encourage the cessation of farming and the reallocation of utilized agricultural areas for the purposes of structural improvement'.

In practice, that directive offers advantages to those who intend to give up farming.

It provides for the payment of a bounty to those who give up farming and sell or lease their land for it to be developed for the purposes of structural improvement. The directive also aims to encourage old people to leave farming; for farm-owners between 55 and 65 years of age there is provision for the payment, over and above the bounty I have just referred to, of an annuity of 900 UC in the case of married couples and 600 UC in the case of bachelors (it is obviously this annuity that the authors of the motion are referring to). This annuity is also extended to include the employees and members of the farm-owner's family who work on the farm, and who benefit from the measures referred to.

Naturally, since it is a directive, its mode of implementation is the responsibility of Member States, and probably in Eire it is the implementation of that directive that has caused the consequences complained of in the motion for a resolution.

Ghergo

Having regard, therefore, to the content of the motion for a resolution, my report ought not to concern the farm retirement scheme for farmers and farm workers in general, but the manner in which Directive 72/160 has been applied in Eire.

The inquiry can naturally be extended to all Member States, with an assessment of all the laws adopted nationally for its implementation.

With that in view, paragraph 6 of the motion for a resolution calls on the Commission to bring forward an initial report on the situation regarding such pensioners — a situation that will probably differ widely in the various Member States, depending on the manner in which the directive has been implemented.

It must also be borne in mind that the measures provided for in Directive 72/160 are no longer in force, since the period allowed for taking action under the directive expired on 31 December 1983.

Having thus set forth the question, it must be pointed out that it should fall within the competence of the Committee on Agriculture. I believe, in fact, that the Committee on Agriculture — and this seems to me to be the only possible reason why it should not have delivered an opinion — is in the process of preparing a report on the agricultural structural directives, which include Directive 72/160.

I should like to make it clear that it is not my intention on this occasion to go into the question of the agricultural structures, only to deal with the social aspect.

The determination of social security systems — and hence retirement pension systems for particular categories of workers — is left by the Treaty of Rome to the legislation of individual Member States. Even so, as I have emphasized in my report, from the standpoint of that Treaty, which has amongst its fundamental principles the improvement of living and working conditions and the progressive harmonization of regulations to that effect, a situation of such obvious inequality at the expense of one particular category of workers in comparison with the remainder, cannot be considered 'normal'.

Now the social security arrangements for farm workers present special features which make them financially difficult to control, especially where farming has not produced incomes comparable to those of other sectors; that fact will often mean that the level of benefits is low, or will require massive State action. That notwithstanding, considerable inequality frequently exists to the detriment of the farm workers, and such a situation cannot be tolerated socially. This disparity to the detriment of the farm workers is all the more serious if we remember that it is additional to the equally unacceptable gap in incomes.

The only solution to put matters right — having regard to the nature of the subject and the constitutional structure of the Treaty of Rome — is a recommendation to Member States. At all events, it is of fundamental importance that one or other of the Community bodies should now undertake to study the problem and put forward the most appropriate solutions, possibly as part of the more wide-ranging investigation now being carried out into the question of retirement age.

I am therefore grateful to the members of the EPD Group who, by drawing attention to the fact that in some Member States and Eire in particular the regulations in force create serious inequality in the pension benefits of farmers and farm workers as compared with those of other industries, have focused attention on such a delicate and important question.

The readiness to tackle and resolve important sectoral problems — such as that which we are now considering — is a measure of the Community's determination to achieve a genuine degree of economic and social development in Europe. With deep conviction I therefore recommend the House to adopt my report.

IN THE CHAIR : MR NIKOLAOU

Vice-President

Mr Sutra (S). — (*DE*) Mr President, as I have taken up enough of the House's time this afternoon, I shall try to be brief.

I shall say simply this, that we endorse and our members in the Committee on Social Affairs endorsed this excellent report by Mr Ghergo. The committee unanimously adopted the report, and I hope the House will do likewise.

I should like to congratulate Mr Ghergo on widening the scope of his remarks. Having been asked to report on a resolution the object of which was to consider the problem among Irish farmers, he had the good sense to go beyond that and I will just add this: even if the Treaty of Rome did not actually state that such harmonization would be up to us and our responsibility, there is nothing to stop us asking for it. We can but congratulate Mr Ghergo on going beyond what he was asked for and giving a Community dimension to his report.

The report is of particular value for farmers in the least-favoured regions. The rapporteur is concerned to reduce disparities. It is inadmissible that some workers in the agricultural sector should be underprivileged in comparison with others. For this reason, we support Mr Ghergo's report.

Mr McCartin (PPE). — Mr President, I want first to thank Mr Ghergo for his excellent report, which was

McCartin

unanimously adopted by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, and to say that, while Mr Ghergo and his committee have examined one side of this problem, I look forward to the opportunity of a further and more comprehensive discussion on all the aspects of this problem when the structural directives come up for consideration by the Committee on Agriculture.

This is a directive which at all events has not achieved its object in one Member State of the Community, Ireland; indeed, it has in common with the other directives in that group, Nos 159, 160 and 161, the fact that none of them has achieved the same results in Ireland as elsewhere in the Community. I might add that they have not achieved the same results in parts of Italy or in other under-developed regions of the Community either. It underlines for us the necessity, when formulating such directives, to bear in mind that while they will read in the same way and seem to apply the same rules to each area of the Community, in fact, when it comes to administering them at the national and regional levels, their effects may be entirely different. The effect of this directive has therefore been entirely different in Ireland from what it has been elsewhere. We did not employ socio-economic advisers who would discuss with farmers and advise them on the possibilities of operating this retirement scheme, because, I suppose, agriculture makes up such a large proportion of our economy and because our economy as a whole is less developed than those of other parts of the Community. We are not in a position to treat industry in the same way, and therefore the directives which were intended to harmonize opportunities throughout the Community have not done that at all but rather have contributed to a widening of the gap, because they were financed differently by the various governments of the Community and were administered more liberally in some Member States than in others. They have contributed to a divergence of opportunities rather than a harmonization.

It is quite obvious that this particular directive has been much more effective in France and Germany than it has in Ireland or Italy. Something like 90 % of all the land that has changed hands under this directive has done so in those two countries. In Ireland, the effect has been totally insignificant in that we had only 400 to 500 farmers retiring under the scheme.

The particular problem in Ireland is that our social welfare legislation provides that if a farmer has an income he is means-tested before he or she can apply for the old-age pension. Therefore, if he or she is in receipt of a farm retirement pension, they are not in a position to avail themselves of an old-age pension. This means that the scheme is not attractive to people engaged in agriculture. Of course, the ownership of a farm will also affect one's entitlement to an old-age

pension, but because farms are small and agricultural incomes are small and difficult to estimate, farmers usually find themselves in a better position if they own the farm than if they are in receipt of a particular amount of hard cash weekly which is estimated, is very obvious and will be deducted from their entitlement to an old-age pension. That is the difficulty.

There are two sides to this, the social problem that Mr Ghergo has mentioned and the economic problem as well, for while 23 % of the farmers of this Community are over 65 years of age — and this is an unacceptable state of affairs — the proportion is as high as 30 % in Italy, in Ireland the percentage is about average at 23 %, while in Germany, where this scheme has been operating effectively, only 9 % of farmers are over 65 years of age. This means that our agriculture is less efficient and requires more aid. If we succeeded, through this retirement scheme, in improving the structure of ownership and getting land to change hands to younger and more dynamic people, people who are trained, younger and prepared to make progress, then we should help to solve the problem of subsidizing agriculture and creating a healthier and more independent industry.

I hope that in the near future the Irish Government will not operate this scheme as they have done in the past. They have changed it recently, and the Irish Government also hopes to introduce a new system of legislation which will facilitate the long-term leasing of land. We do not have legislation covering this in Ireland at the moment. I hope the Irish Government will be able to get from this Community some sort of assistance with the new scheme for the development of long-term leasing in Ireland in order to facilitate the transfer of land from older to younger people and, at the same time, to compensate people retiring so that they can live out their lives in dignity.

I ask the Commission to look favourably on the application that will be made by Ireland in this respect and trust that in the near future we shall have put together a retirement scheme in Ireland which will facilitate the transfer of land from old to young, which will make the agricultural population more independent generally and less dependent on subsidies from Europe or anywhere else and will enable the older people to retire and live out their old age in dignity and comfort.

Mr Flanagan (DEP). — Mr President, I am very pleased that the initiative taken by my three colleagues and myself twelve months ago has led to the Ghergo report, and also to this opportunity for Parliament to discuss the farm retirement scheme situation in the Community.

As I was minister in charge of the department which had the responsibility for operating this scheme when Ireland entered the Community eleven years ago, I know a good deal about the subject. I do not claim to

Flanagan

be an expert on all aspects of retirement schemes, as Mr Ghergo is. However, the objects of the scheme, as drafted, are very well known and I do not have to repeat them here, except to say that the social objective of the scheme was an excellent one indeed: to release land from the ownership of elderly people who wished to retire with a view to distributing it among younger people better able to work it.

In working for that objective, it surely must be a *sine qua non* that the retiring farmer and his wife should not be penalized for carrying out a very useful social duty. It was Mr McCartin's government which nullified the effect of the farm retirement scheme by anti-social measures; and I would like to remind him that that government, like the government in operation in Ireland today, contained alleged Socialists. There is nothing more precious to an elderly farmer than the guarantee, for instance, that he and his wife will have free medical and hospital service. Since there is no insurance scheme of farmers in operation in Ireland, the only old-age pension is a non-contributory one and this, as Mr McCartin rightly pointed out, is subject to a means test.

The stamp duty imposed on the voluntary transfer of land — and this was done by my own party as well as by the present government — is unduly high and the method of assessing the value of land unfair.

So, in a nutshell, I would like to say to you, the Members of the Parliament, to Mr Ghergo, and to the members of the Committee on Agriculture who will later be discussing this subject in connection with the Bocklet report, please tell the Irish Government that if, as the previous speaker claimed, they are to introduce a further farm retirement scheme, they should not wind up nullifying the excellent social objective of the farmers' retirement scheme by sending voracious Ministers for Finance, Revenue Commissioners and anti-social Ministers for Health to deprive the elderly of the guarantee of free medical and hospital services. If they are going to repeat that exercise, there is no point in the Irish Government asking the Commission, or anybody else, to produce a better farm retirement scheme. Theirs is the fault. It is an urgently needed social matter where Ireland is concerned. All I can do is use this occasion to ask the Irish Government to examine their own consciences and to see if there is any way that alleged Socialists, and those who work with them, can try to cooperate with Europe to bring social justice to the elderly, particularly the small-farming elderly community of the country, part of which I represent.

Mr Pesmazoglou (NI). — (GR) Mr President, the analysis of the subject carried out by both the rapporteur and other directly involved Irish colleagues is also of great interest to Greece, where — as is known — the pension for a farmer is now between one-quarter

and one-third of the lowest pensions paid by the national pensions organization. Now, establishing a system that will safeguard a uniform minimum pension for all, including in Greece's case the farmers, but also professional craftsmen and even in some cases the uninsured, is a right and fair aim that should be supported by the European Community, no doubt as a long-term goal.

The second comment I have to make is that a proper solution of this matter would slow down the tendency of our populations to move away from agricultural areas, and would encourage young farmers to remain or to establish themselves. A reversal of this tendency to migrate from the land is particularly important for economically weaker countries such as the Mediterranean ones. It also makes an immediate impact on production, as was stressed a little while ago.

My third comment is that it would be very useful for the Commission to examine the matter with particular reference to the two countries where it arises in the most acute form, meaning of course Ireland and Greece, and to consider the following thought: I propose — and I call upon the Commission to reply specifically to this proposal — that the possibility be examined of planning a stage-by-stage approximation of pensions for farmers, and indeed other major categories among the population, to the minimum pension paid by the state pensions organizations in Ireland and in Greece, and that this gradual closing of the gap be further tackled by examining the possibility of limited participation by the European Social Fund.

Mr President, it is self-evident, as I am fully aware, that all this is very difficult in a time of crisis and high unemployment; but these are measures that could have economic consequences as was stressed a little while ago. I think it is an imaginative plan that could find a very favourable response from large sectors of our peoples.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) Mr President, this matter is of exceptionally vital interest to millions of farmers, especially in poorer countries such as Greece. In Greece, the number of farmers pensioned off was 710 396 in 1983, and of these 91% drew pensions of 4 000 drachmas a month, 8.8% drew 4 750, and 0.2% drew 5 500 drachmas. Since 1 January this year farmers' pensions have been increased by 1 000 drachmas, but these sums are still quite inadequate even for the most rudimentary survival.

The retirement age for both men and women is 65 years. However, bearing in mind the harsh conditions of life common to farmers, thousands of them never even reach retirement. We therefore propose that the age-limit be reduced to 60 years for men and 55 years for women, and straight away to 60 for both. The amount of the pension should be doubled, to enable

Adamou

them to secure the most basic living requirements. We think, though, that this matter will necessitate improvements in the legislation of every individual state, taking into account the conditions of life in each case, and not a complete harmonization of national laws.

With these comments, we shall vote in favour of the Ghergo resolution.

President. — Without wishing to comment on the validity of the figures you have given, I should like to indicate to the House that the level of the pensions you mentioned is equivalent to 400-500 French francs. I say this to give Members a reference in terms of a more familiar currency.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, in regard to this report, too, the Commission appreciates the work done in the committee, for it has highlighted a problem which is, of course, of immediate concern. For the moment, I must say the Commission cannot detect any political will on the part of the Member States to align their social security provisions, and it is not planning at present to submit a proposal for harmonization. Nor does it intend to intervene in the social legislation in order to eliminate the disparities among the different social categories in sectors for which responsibility rests largely with the individual Member States, as Mr Ghergo himself acknowledges in his report. The Commission can, however, decide to utilize the information gleaned from its examination of the Member States' response to the Council's recommendation on flexible retirement, which focuses on a specific aspect — i.e., pensionable age — and not the size of the pension.

At the end of 1982, the Commission submitted a memorandum on social security with a view to stimulating a wide-ranging debate on the subject at both national and Community level. The responsible committee in Parliament has already held its first debate on the subject. The Social Affairs Ministers held an informal meeting in Athens in November 1983, and the Commission intends to base its proposals on the results of the discussions going on at present or planned, when it will decide whether the Member States are ready to find common or differing solutions.

With regard to paragraph 4 of the text, the Commission is able to announce that the report on the implementation of the directives concerning agricultural structural reforms will be made public shortly. That report will, among other things, deal with Council Directive 72/160, which is mentioned here, on aid to farmers who give up farming and aid for the use of the released farmland for structural improvement measures. The aim of this directive is not, of course, to introduce a pension scheme for farmers. On the

contrary, it was made clear in Article 2(3) of the directive that the Member States are expected to take all necessary measures to ensure that those receiving the allowances or premiums do not suffer a reduction in the social security benefits which they would have received if they had not abandoned farming and are not forced to pay unreasonably high social security contributions. This Community measure is merely an arrangement to give farmers the chance to retire from farming early and, under the provisions of the directive, an interim grant is paid for this, although — as some speakers have said — no one could claim that it had been a great success in the Community. One cannot pretend that it has.

President. — The debate is closed.¹

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, on the presumption that you are going to close this sitting very shortly, I rise to make a formal complaint on the ground that the House will have lost one half-hour of its time. We are constantly being reminded of the large number of reports which are outstanding, and it seems to me that the fact that we have this one half-hour left over at this stage indicates a shortcoming in the management of the Parliament's agenda for today: it seems to me that in future the Bureau and the administration ought to be able to ensure that there is sufficient business for every sitting so that we do not run out of business, given that we have a surplus of reports. If there were to be an excess of reports put down for, say, a Monday afternoon, those that were not actually taken within that time could be moved on to the Tuesday. On that basis, I ask the Bureau to recognize the shortcoming of the agenda in practical terms and trust that this situation will not occur again.

President. — Mr Hord, I have noted what you have said. I can only remind you that the Hopper report was due to be taken now but has been deferred to February by a decision of this House. There is therefore nothing else to be done. However that may be, I entirely agree with you in principle.

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, by way of a response, I think you will agree there is perhaps an inherent need, particularly on a Monday when Parliament determines the agenda, to have rather more reports put down for a Monday afternoon than could normally be accepted during the time, because of the risk of one or more of the reports being taken off the agenda.

President. — You are right. I will convey your suggestion to the enlarged Bureau.²

(The sitting closed at 7.35 p.m.)

¹ For the vote, see Annex.

² For the next sitting's agenda, see the Minutes.

ANNEX

Votes

This Annex indicates rapporteurs' opinions on amendments and reproduces the text of explanations of vote. For further details of the voting, the reader is referred to the Minutes.

COMMISSION PROPOSAL ON THE MARKET IN RICE (Doc. 1-521/82):
HELD OVER.

* * *

GHERGO REPORT (Doc. 1-1004/83: FARM RETIREMENT SCHEME):
ADOPTED

Explanations of vote

Mr Patterson (ED). — The reason I am giving an explanation of vote is that my group did not contribute to the debate, and I hope this is not taken as an indication that we do not support Mr Ghergo's excellent report. Without wishing to enter into domestic Irish politics, both the speakers from Fine Gael and Fianna Fáil put their finger on the need for farm retirement schemes. Farmers by and large do not enjoy occupational pensions or retirement schemes on a par with other workers, and the result is an ageing farming population which has a very bad effect on the prospects of younger farmers. I was surprised when I heard the Commission say there was no political will to go into the harmonization of social security, because I had in front of me a document produced by the Commission on precisely that problem. But Commissioner Dalsager did say that he was going to pursue the matter with the Social Security Ministers and others, and I hope that this particular matter of farm retirement schemes will be one of the things which he presses for. My group will support this report.

Mr Alexiadis (NI). — (GR) In connection with pensions for Greek farmers, I fear that a misunderstanding has arisen in the House. Pensions for Greek farmers are not based on the principles of social security — in other words, there are no contributions by the insured or his employer. Pensions for Greek farmers are paid for by the taxpayer in the urban sector, mainly from the great pool of wage-earners. Until recently this cost on behalf of farmers was deducted from the revenue for the following year; now, however, it is incorporated in the principal tax and consequently this deduction does not take place. Thus, the entire burden of providing pensions for the agricultural population, which I admit are essential though inadequate, falls on the urban population and in particular the great mass of wage-earners. I shall vote in favour of the Ghergo report.

Mr Kyrkos (COM), in writing. — (GR) We shall vote in favour of the Ghergo report on the situation pertaining to farmers' pensions. However, we think that the Commission should take the initiative, and in collaboration with the Member States, define a general basis for providing pensions for farmers within the Community. Because it is surely a fault of the Community's prime policy, the CAP, to concern itself even with peas, yet not to trouble about the people at the heart of the agricultural policy, namely the farmers, once they have ceased being economically active. A policy of the kind required should take the following general lines:

- 1) Retirement of farmers from farming at the age of 60 years ;
- 2) Definition of a minimum pension equal to that of the non-specialized industrial worker ; and
- 3) Allowing employment in the agricultural sector to count towards pension entitlement for all those who have been obliged, by the difficult conditions of life in the agricultural sector, to find other employment.

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 17 JANUARY 1984

Contents

1. <i>Approval of the Minutes</i> <i>Mr Beazley</i>	24	<i>Mr Contogeorgis; Mr Gerokostopoulos; Mr Contogeorgis; Mr Nyborg; Mr Conto- georgis</i>	61
2. <i>Decision on urgency</i> <i>Mr Lange; Mr Balfe; Lord Douro</i>	24	— <i>Question No 3 by Mr Vié: Financing for the airport at Pointe Saline:</i> <i>Mr Pisani (Commission); Mr Lomas; Mr Pisani; Mr Simpson; Mr Pisani; Mr Habsburg; Mr Pisani; Mr Seefeld; Mr Pisani; Mr Moreland; Mr Pisani</i>	62
3. <i>Situation of women in Europe — Report (Doc. 1-1229/83) by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and oral questions to the Commission (Doc. 1-1221/83) by Mrs von Alemann and others and (Doc. 1-1222/83) by Mrs Weber and Mr Glinne</i> <i>Mrs Cinciari Rodano; Mrs Gaiotti De Biase; Mrs van den Heuvel; Mrs Pantazi; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul; Mrs Lizin; Mrs von Alemann; Mrs Spaak; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Eisma; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs S. Martin; Mrs Lenz; Mrs Lizin; Miss Hooper; Mrs Le Roux; Dame Shelagh Roberts; Miss De Valera; Mr Estgen; Mrs Macciocchi; Mrs Roudy; Mrs Vayssade; Mrs Phlix; Mr Brok; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul; Mrs Focke; Mrs Pauwelyn; Mr Gauthier; Mrs Hammerich; van Fanti; Mrs Schleicher</i>	25	— <i>Question No 6 by Mr Pintat: Energy objectives:</i> <i>Mr Pisani; Mr Pintat; Mr Pisani; Mrs Ewing; Mr Pisani; Mr Purvis; Mr Pisani; Mr Collins; Mr Pisani</i>	64
4. <i>Topical and urgent debate (announcement)</i> <i>Mr Provan</i>	60	— <i>Question No 7 by Mr Gauthier: Oil consumption:</i> <i>Mr Pisani; Mr Gauthier; Mr Pisani; Mr Seligman; Mr Pisani</i>	66
5. <i>Question Time (Doc. 1-1268/83)</i> — <i>Questions to the Commission</i> — <i>Question No 1 by Mr Bord: Member States and the European Monetary System:</i> <i>Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Bord; Mr Andriessen; Mr Provan; Mr Andri- essen</i>	60	— <i>Question No 8 by Mrs Lizin: Admissi- bility of the actions brought by a number of Luxembourg communes against restructuring decisions:</i> <i>Mr Thorn (Commission); Mrs Lizin; Mr Thorn</i>	67
— <i>Question No 2 by Mr Papaefstratiou: Exorbitant increase in transit charges for goods vehicles in Austria:</i> <i>Mr Contogeorgis (Commission); Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Contogeorgis; Mr Nyborg; Mr Contogeorgis; Mr Seefeld;</i>		— <i>Question No 10 by Mr Marshall: Italian tobacco industry:</i> <i>Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr Marshall; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Hord; Mr Tugendhat</i>	68
		— <i>Question No 11 by Mr Rogalla: Specific measures towards European integra- tion:</i> <i>Mr Thorn; Mr Rogalla; Mr Thorn; Ms Quin; Mr Thorn; Lord O'Hagan; Mr Thorn</i>	69
		— <i>Question No 12 by Mr Kazaxis: Double payment of road tax by Greek officials of the European Communities:</i> <i>Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr Gero- kostopoulos; Mr Tugendhat</i>	71

<p>— <i>Question No 13 by Mrs Ewing: National Consumer Councils: Mr Narjes (Commission); Mrs Ewing; Mr Narjes; Mr Hord</i> 71</p> <p>6. <i>Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament</i> <i>Mr Cousté; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Chambeiron; Mr Andriessen; Mr Eisma; Mr Andriessen; Mr Cousté; Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Van Minnen; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Richard; Mr Van Minnen</i> 72</p> <p>7. <i>Situation of women in Europe (continuation)</i> <i>Mr Pasmazoglou; Mr Purvis; Mr Adamou; Mr Jürgens; Mr Romualdi; Mr Enright; Mr Patterson; Mrs Boserup; Mrs Krouwel-Vlam; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Alexiadis; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mrs Rabbethge; Mrs Baduel-Glorioso; Mrs</i></p>	<p><i>Fuillet; Mr Bournias; Mr O'Mahony; Mrs Weber; Mrs Spaak; Mr Richard (Commission)</i> 75</p> <p>8. <i>Votes</i> <i>Mr Sutra; Mr Gautier; Mr Bangemann; Mrs Cinciari Rodano; Mrs Pantazi; Mr Konstantinos Nikolaou; Mr Bangemann; Mr Barbi; Mr Bangemann; Mr von der Vring; Mr Balfe; Mrs Cinciari Rodano</i> 88</p> <p><i>Annexes</i> <i>Mr Sutra; Mr Gautier; Mr Klepsch; Mr Prag; Mrs Péry; Mr Glinne; Mrs Lenz; Mr Bangemann; Mr Pearce; Ms Clwyd; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul; Mrs Lizin; Mrs Dury; Mr Balfe; Mr Halligan; Mr Irmer; Mr Vankerkhoven; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs von Alemann; Mrs Lenz; Mr Brok; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Di Bartolomei; Mr Kallias; Mr Lomas; Mr Paisley; Mrs Péry; Mr Seal; Mr Tuckman</i> 91</p>
--	--

IN THE CHAIR : MR KLEPSCH

Vice-President

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

1. *Approval of the Minutes*

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

Mr Beazley (ED). — I should like to raise a matter relating to the Minutes in regard to order of business, paragraph 11, page 15 of the English version, regarding the intervention of Sir Henry Plumb for clarification of a point relating to the new Rules of Procedure of this House. May I point out that Rule 54 a, first sentence, second line, in the English version, is translated differently from the French, Italian and German versions, and it states

'In cases where the committee responsible tables a report pursuant to Rule 100, or under the procedure provided for in Rule 32', whereas in other versions, it is 'and under the procedure of Rule 32'.

Secondly I think that further questions will arise about the use of discretion by Presidents of this House and chairmen of committees, so I presume that the best procedure would be for me to put a question to the Bureau under Rule 25 for clarification. Will the President confirm this to be correct?

President. — Mr Beazley, the English text will be put in line with the other texts. Secondly, you have chosen the right way of questioning the Bureau under Rule 25. Should such a case arise before the Bureau has given a ruling, it must be dealt with by the Chair.

*(Parliament approved the Minutes)*¹

2. *Decision on urgency*

Proposals from the Commission to the Council for

- I. a regulation establishing special measures of Community interest in the field of employment;
- II. a regulation establishing special measures of Community interest relating to transport infrastructure;

¹ Topical and urgent debate (announcement of motions for resolutions tabled): see Minutes

III. a regulation establishing special measures of Community interest relating to energy strategy

(Doc. 1-1236/83 — COM(83) 696 final, 697 final and 698 final).

Mr Lange (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (DE) Mr President, the Committee on Budgets discussed the matter yesterday after asking the other committees involved for their opinion. After careful consideration the committee came to the conclusion that the request from the Council for the question to be dealt with in urgent debate should be rejected because Parliament has to examine these proposals particularly carefully and the other committees concerned must also be allowed to reach their opinions carefully. We must be particularly careful here proposal this is a question which has been in dispute between the Council, the Commission and Parliament for many years. For this reason it seems expedient — I repeat — to examine very carefully these three documents and with them the overall questions affecting both Member States and Community policy. These are the reasons for the proposed rejection. But — I must add this — the committee yesterday undertook to put this question for decision in the February meeting and it also informed the other committees concerned of this undertaking.

Mr Balfe (S). — Mr President, I wish to speak in favour of urgency on the grounds that last night we were presented with three documents clearly dated for 1 December which could have been considered by this House before it took its decision to reject the special measures in favour of Germany and the United Kingdom. Those documents have clearly been in the possession of this House for a considerable period of time and they could have been circulated and they could have been dealt with last night. They certainly could have been dealt with by way of a preliminary first discussion. There are many precedents for this happening and there are many precedents for the Committee on Budgets meeting more than twice in one week. This procedure, in my contention, is being used further to put pressure on this Parliament and to put pressure on the Parliament to assert powers that it just does not possess. I was very sorry that the European Democratic Group, better known as the Conservative Party, did not feel able to support the request for urgency because unless we get this matter firmly before this House we will not get the matter resolved.

Finally, Mr President, I would say this. The Conservative Party has got to stop playing politics and has got to start uniting with us in a demand to get the money repaid via the special measures. I appeal to the Conservatives to stop playing politics with Britain's money and to start uniting around the demands which we all know are just and which we all have.

Lord Douro (ED). — Mr President, although the British Labour Party has apparently changed its attitude towards membership of the European Community, it is still getting it wrong. The fact is that it would be totally unreasonable to expect this House to conclude its deliberations on these three regulations during this week. Mr Balfe is quite right in saying that the regulations were apparently published on 1 December, and it is rather surprising that they only came to members of the Committee on Budgets for the first time last night. But given that, it would be totally unreasonable, as I say, to expect this House to consider the matter properly with the benefit of the opinions of the specialist committees and to conclude its deliberations this week. We are as keen as anybody to see the money repaid to Britain, but we equally believe that Parliament must undertake its proper responsibilities in this matter. If we can conclude our deliberations on these draft regulations in February, that will be time enough and that, we think, is the right thing to do.

(Parliament rejected urgency)

3. Situation of women in Europe

President. — The next item on the agenda is the report (Doc. 1-1229/83) by Mrs Cinciari Rodano, drawn up on behalf of the Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe, on the situation of women in Europe.

The following oral questions are included in the debate :

— by Mrs von Alemann and others (Doc. 1-1221/83) to the Commission :

Subject : Participation of women in projects under the European Social Fund

In its resolution of 17 May 1983 on the Commission's proposal to the Council for a regulation to implement the Council decision on the tasks of the European Social Fund, the EP regrets that the resources of the Fund have not hitherto been allocated proportionally between men and women (see point 13 of the resolution) and calls on the Commission,

— to ensure that within 5 years the number of women participating in projects subsidized by the Fund is equal to the number of participating men, so that specific operations on behalf of women can be phased out ;

— to introduce an appropriate prior condition to this effect for applications for Fund assistance (see point 14 of the resolution).

1. Will the Commission ensure that, in drawing up the internal guidelines for the allocation of resources from the new Social Fund, Parliament's wishes are taken into account ?

President

2. Will the responsible Commissioner notify the Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in good time as to how he intends to use the resources of the Social Fund to attain the goal of 5 percent participation by women in the projects subsidized by the ESF?
3. What specific actions has the Commission planned for the coming five years to achieve this?

— by Mrs Weber and Mr Glinne (Doc. 1-1222/83) on behalf of the Socialist Group to the Commission :

Subject: Detrimental effect on women and girls of cuts made under the law on the promotion of vocational training (BAFÖG) in the Federal Republic of Germany

Directive on equal treatment for men and women as regards access to employment, vocational training and promotion, and working conditions (76/207 EEC)

1. How does the Commission view the German law on the promotion of vocational training (BAFÖG) of 6 June 1983 in relation to the Directive on the principle of equal treatment (76/207 EEC)?
2. Are the effects of the BAFÖG cuts on training opportunities, particularly for women and girls in rural areas, not directly contrary to Article 2.1.: 'For the purposes of the following provisions, the principle of equal treatment shall mean that there shall be no discrimination whatsoever on grounds of sex either directly or indirectly ...'?

Article 4: 'Application of the principle of equal treatment with regard to access to all types and to all levels of vocational guidance, vocational training, advanced vocational training and retraining, means that Member States shall take all necessary measures to ensure that :

- (a)
- (b)
- (c) vocational guidance, vocational, training, advanced vocational training and retraining shall be accessible on the basis of the same criteria and at the same levels without any discrimination on grounds of sex.'

Mrs Cinciari Rodano (COM), coordinating rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, the resolution that we have the honour to submit to you was prepared on the basis of the conclusions of the 18 Reports of Inquiry that are attached. Account was also taken of other problems discussed by the Committee — for example, the opinion on employment, or that of Mrs Martin on small and medium sized businesses. Finally, the resolution contains proposals and suggestions that are contained in motions for resolutions proposed by other colleagues and forwarded to the Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry, which she did not decide to make the subject of separate resolutions.

I should like to draw members' attention to the fact that the resolution is not being presented by a rapporteur on behalf of the Committee of Inquiry but by the Committee of Inquiry itself. This is being done in order to emphasize that it is a joint work, to which all members of the Committee have contributed. I should like to thank them all for their work in this connection.

The method that has been followed has its merits, but also its defects. Since it was necessary first of all to examine 18 reports and numerous opinions and then summarize them, little time remained for drawing up the final resolution, which meant that some colleagues who were also members of the Committee have presented amendments of a formal nature, in addition to those concerned with the substance of the resolution, which refer to different opinions.

The Committee of Inquiry had a double mandate : to keep watch on the implementation by the institutions of the Community of the resolution of 11 February 1981, and to keep a close check on the situation of women in Member States. These were two different tasks : one was concerned with checking and stimulating the institutions of the Community, the other was one of investigation.

In the explanatory statement that accompanies the resolution we have indicated what, in our view, has been done by the Commission, the Council, the Court of Justice and this Parliament to implement the resolution of 11 February. I shall limit myself here to a few observations of a general nature on this first point of our mandate, leaving the details to the written report.

The resolution of 11 February constituted the reference point for Community action in respect of women, although we are far from any full implementation of Parliament's vote. This Assembly, as a body, was consistent with that vote and has drawn the logical conclusions from it on a number of occasions. The Commission, thanks mainly to the work of Commissioners Richard and Natali and those who work for them, who deal with problems to do with women, has shown its very considerable commitment, with the preparation of the programme of action, new directives, numerous studies, the setting up of the Committee for Equal Opportunities, and the steps taken to apply existing directives.

We must recognize that this represents a very considerable workload if we take into account the fact that, in the whole of the period from the signing of the Treaty of Rome up to 1979, there has been only one programme of action and three directives dealing with women.

It falls, however, very far short of the needs of the masses of women at such a difficult time that is so full of danger.

Cinciari Rodano

Unfortunately, the verdict as far as the Council is concerned is very unfavourable. We find once again, where women are concerned, the same grounds for complaint that we find throughout the life of the Community — slowness in dealing with things, delays, and the inability to take decisions. To date the Council has not even adopted the Directive on part-time working.

It must be concluded that Parliament has done well to equip itself with specific instruments for working on women's problems — first the *ad hoc* committees, then the Committee of Inquiry — thus showing that the activity of an institutional body is in practice more effective than the initiative of individual members alone. At this point I should like to recall the experience gained both on the 1983 budget and the budget for 1984.

Before moving on to the second point of the Commission's mandate, may I remind members that ours was the first committee of inquiry to be appointed by the European Parliament, that the Rules of Procedure contain no regulations for the functioning of such committees, and that there was no customary practice to refer to. It is to be hoped that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure will look into this question and define things better for the future.

I should like also to emphasize that, whilst we have not encountered any special difficulty in our relations with Member States, even though they did not all provide the information requested — and we should like here to thank those that did so — nevertheless the existence of committees of inquiry of the European Parliament perhaps opens up a problem of an institutional character that deserves examination in the appropriate quarters. The rapporteurs will illustrate the results of their inquiries in regard to the second point in the Commission's mandate.

With regard to the working methods used, details of the questionnaires, hearings, and so forth are contained in the explanatory statements.

I shall only make a few general observations. Very briefly, the situation of women in Europe has deteriorated in the period from 1981 to 1984. The working female population has increased, the level of female employment having risen from 30% in 1979 to 31.2%, and that in a period which saw a fall in the level of male employment.

Female unemployment has however risen by a substantially greater amount than female employment. More and more women — especially young women — are looking for work, but more and more women are finding all doors closed to them. At the same time, the budget crises in the Community and Member States have harmful repercussions. Women are likely to be increasingly called on to fill the gaps left by the

deficiencies in the social services: the burden of domestic work grows heavier; the traditional division between the social roles — with men responsible for production, politics and social life, and women doing the domestic work, looking after the children and the elderly, and so on — threatens to become irreversible.

Europe is faced with the urgent necessity to overcome the technological gap *vis-à-vis* the rest of the world.

It would be suicide for Europe — and, hence, for women — to oppose the technological revolution.

The danger is that the jobs in which women are employed may vanish with the introduction of new techniques, and women are not able to find employment in the advanced sectors of industry. In the same way, there is also a danger that new, more isolating forms of home working will become more widespread.

In no country is equality a full reality, and more flexible instruments are necessary, with wider scope. For this reason we consider the adoption of positive measures, to root out the sources of discrimination at the workplace, to be of great importance. In some countries new discriminatory practices are appearing, especially in the field of job recruitment. There is the danger of a wave of 'restoration' that will reverse the great victories achieved by women in the 1970s. That would be a blow to the entire level of civilization and democracy in Europe.

The resolution contains precise and detailed requests on all the various issues. The rapporteurs will explain these.

One might ask whether our requests are compatible with a situation of crisis, and whether we are asking far too much.

We do not think so. Women, and their movements and associations, are the bearers of a new scale of values; it is women who, for example, are asking whether wellbeing is only something to be bought with money, or whether it is not also a question of greater freedom and the possibility of personal fulfilment through more human interpersonal relationships, a less polluted environment, a new mode of working, a world free from the nightmare of rearmament and war.

In other words it is not a sectoral problem that women are raising when they pose the question of their situation; it is a general one — the question of the quality and aims of all development. It is illusory to think of finding a way out of the crisis without women and against women, seeking only to restore the old status quo, traditional systems of convenience and age-old privileges, at the expense of the female masses.

I should like, finally, to ask Members to reflect on one fact. This resolution is an act of confidence in the Community and its future. It calls for new legal instru-

Cinciari Rodano

ments in the Community. It invites the women of Europe to hope that, through more incisive Community action and greater European integration, they may find help in their battle for emancipation and liberation.

There are, anyway, very few conflicts of interest amongst European women. Progress on the road to equality in one country is a help, a stimulus, in other countries; it is not an object of envy, but rather one for emulation.

I hope that this Assembly will be able to respond to these hopes and expectations: I hope, in other words, that it will crown the very great amount of work already done by adopting this resolution. In this Europe of ours where, after the Athens Summit, everyone is talking of the Community's failure and crisis, Members will instead be able to say that Parliament is continuing its fight. They will thus be able to face the European electorate strengthened by a job well done in support of women. They will be able to say to them: 'Continue to have faith in Europe, continue to have confidence in its Parliament!'

(Applause)

Mrs Gaiotti De Biase (PPE), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as far as the application of the Directives of 1975 and 1976 on equal pay and equal treatment is concerned, an overall appraisal of them, at a time that is now near the end of the first decade of their application, is contained in the attached reports, which are supplemented by a corrigendum for updating purposes.

The overall appraisal of their effectiveness prompts two opposite reactions: on the one hand, this Parliament must indicate in no uncertain manner the positive, symbolic and at the same time concrete value of a set of laws that not only marks the Community as being one of the most legally advanced bodies in the world, but has also stimulated and sustained, in a difficult ten-year period, the negotiating power of women and the development of the mental approach to them, harmonizing 'upwards' the legal structures of the Member States and providing effective control and strict supranational control of the Commission by the Court of Justice, in order to punish and reduce infringements of those laws.

Through this legislation — as the Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry also reminded us — women are coming to be one of the social groups with the greatest interest in the furtherance of the integration of the Community; they have strengthened their solidarity beyond frontiers, basing it on an institution, and using official international instruments.

With regard to the concrete effectiveness of the directives, we must, I believe, acknowledge that the positive

signs outweigh the negative ones. The steps taken to bring national legislation into line with the infringement procedures of the Commission — which has acted promptly — and above all the important contribution of Community case law — and here we must recognize the significant role played by the Court of Justice — and the increase in the number of actions brought, as well as in the initiatives undertaken by women, prove, without a shadow of doubt, that Community legislation has not ended up in a drawer, has not remained a dead letter, but has taken its place as a dynamic factor in a complex many-faceted process, to which it has brought a sign of hope. However, this Parliament cannot remain content with this positive reaction.

The aims that were the object of the 1975 directive on equal pay and that of 1976 on equal treatment are still not guaranteed; not only that, they are still unimplemented, and they are in danger, unless new initiatives are launched, and new action taken.

If the gap between men's and women's pay has perhaps shown a tendency to decrease — more rapidly, however, in the years immediately after the application of the directives — women still remain concentrated in the lower income groups.

The redefinition of many job descriptions, arising partly from the challenge of new technology, is still influenced by the old practices: where the women are in a minority, the job description always identifies with the lowest job, compared with the job where women are in the majority. The transition to the use of objective job classification criteria is slow or non-existent.

The second directive requires more complex strategies to make it totally operative; those strategies, which are outside the scope of the text of the directive, will be dealt with by other rapporteurs, and will deal with training, answers to the new technology, and the creation of an environment that is favourable to the equality of women. From the time of its first application, however, it already contained internal gaps that must and can now be quickly filled. The Community needs to define which professions are by law excluded from application of the principle of equality of treatment — the law by which discrimination on the grounds of sex in the case of certain jobs is legitimate is a case in point. There is still too much divergence from one Member State to another and harmonization of protective legislation is necessary. So also is there need for a common definition of indirect discrimination, just as it is necessary to authorize a reversal of the onus of proof. On all these things the Commission has already produced important reports. The time is therefore ripe: there is no reason to wait any further.

Gaiotti De Biase

The question of furthering the policy of equality must in any event be considered in relation to the strategy for dealing with the economic crisis and female unemployment. I will say straight away that I am not one of those who believe that, with the continuation of expansion, the way to equality would have been smoothed, and its implementation made easier: perhaps women would have been content, anyway, with what security was possible. It remains a fact that today the directives on equality must serve, as an irreplaceable instrument, to prevent the technological revolution from resolving itself in Europe into a new class system, a polarization of the workers with protected high level technicians on the one hand, and replaceable, expendable repetitive labour on the other. Such a polarization would place women — as is the case already, unfortunately — on the weaker side. For this reason it is essential that, faced with the technological revolution, we resist the temptation to take a frightened line, all on the defensive, as is happening with a great many trade unions, tied as they are to defending employed males rather than embracing a strategy of free access, untrained by prejudice and dogma.

I should like to use the time allotted to my group to warn against two forms of dogmatism: the first is the refusal to recognize that the changing image of work, which is bound up with the technological revolution, offers positive new opportunities to women, instead of simply the risk of their being passed by and pushed aside; and that for that reason an over-rigid conception of work, which is what we have inherited from the two centuries of industrial evolution, would have an inhibiting effect on women's action, if all we did was rigidly to defend it instead of opening our minds to all the challenges that the new situation offers. One of the dogmatisms to avoid, in this difficult, problematical strategy for giving women that place in society that has never been theirs, is the one that is still carried along by an old-style feminism, that dogmatism that Betty Friedan denounced in her last book: women are not divided into progressives who want equality, and traditionalists who see the family as their only aim. The great majority of women, today, want equality and want it forcefully for its own sake: but they also deeply feel the solidarity of interests and identification with a family that is still a projection of themselves.

Women are asking at one and the same time for an individual guarantee for themselves, and a collective guarantee for the family they love. Without this double guarantee there can be neither justice nor equality for anyone.

(Applause)

Mrs van den Heuvel (S), *co-rapporteur*. — (NL) In our contacts with the electorate, Mr President, it is noticeable that women in particular realize that the

European Community plays a very important part in their lives. This is not so surprising. The European Community has something to offer women: three directives on 'equal treatment' and a programme for action that has some very promising aspects. The Commission is undoubtedly to be applauded for the fact that the message that the European Community is promoting the equality of women and men appears to have been heard by the electorate. But we cannot, of course, confine ourselves to words of praise today. Creditable policy arouses expectations and calls for commitments to continuation and expansion. In short: *noblesse oblige*.

At this time of crisis, when national governments, obsessed with the idea of cutting expenditure, are again taking action for which women will probably have to foot the bill, and the governments of various Member States — and I am ashamed to say that my own country, the Netherlands, seems to be setting a poor example — are taking measures that increase rather than decrease women's dependence, it is all the more important for the European Community to stimulate greater equality.

Now that governments are showing that they do not in any way appreciate that the emotional dependence of one person on another is not the same as the economic dependence of one person — usually a woman — on another — usually a man — the Commission must be more active than ever, simply because emotional relationships are in no way helped by dependence. On the contrary, it disturbs them.

Noblesse oblige, if I may remind the Commission. The Commission has obligations towards millions of women citizens in Europe. As an elected representative of these citizens, I therefore ask, firstly, for clarification of the term 'indirect discrimination' as used in the directive.

During the discussion we had in the Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe, the representative of the Commission who was present confirmed my view that 'indirect discrimination' exists where reference is made to marital status or family situation — the words used in the directive — when measures are taken allegedly irrespective of sex, but the level of an employee's wages or salary is partly determined by his or her spouse's income.

In a situation where the vast majority of bread-winners are men, such measures do after all constitute discrimination against women. I should like the Commission to confirm this view so that the women of Europe know that the Commission is on their side.

Secondly, social assistance in the Member States — as you can see from my report — is all too often paid to the family. If you consider that many of these allowances replace or supplement benefits designed to cushion the consequences of unemployment, the obvious conclusion to be drawn is that this is in

van den Heuvel

conflict with Article 3 (1) (b) of the directive. The governments of the Member States have so far completely failed to realize this. It is unashamedly reported that this point may not have been discussed at all. I should like the Commission to clarify this too.

I should also like to say a few words about the application of the directives. Answers to the questionnaires sent out by the Committee of Inquiry reveal that various governments are in the process of adjusting their social legislation to the directive. The press has referred to an interim report adopted by the Commission very recently. This report has not yet been forwarded to Parliament or to the members of the Committee of Inquiry.

I would therefore ask the Commission to answer the following questions. Firstly, is the Commission aware of the overall situation? Secondly, is 19 December 1984 the date that is being observed everywhere? Thirdly, is the Commission prepared to take immediate action if it emerges that the commitments entered into are not being honoured? And fourthly, if it is true that supplementary payments would be made to families to bring their incomes up to a social minimum, what is the Commission going to do about Article 7 (2) of the directive, which clearly states that derived rights may only be of a temporary nature?

I should just like to refer to the *reculs* or reductions in incomes. According to what the Commission said during the discussion of the action programme and according to the Council too, no one was to be worse off than he or she was at the time the directive was adopted. I should like to ask the Commission of what cases of *recul* it is aware and how it intends to intervene in such cases without delay. I will leave it at that for the moment.

(Applause)

Mrs Pantazi (S), rapporteur. — (GR) Mr President, dear colleagues, first of all I would like to compliment our chairman, Mrs Cinciari Rodano, and the other members of our committee on the important work they have done.

It emerges from the committee's research that the women's issue has not only not been fully incorporated as an integral part of overall Community policy in the ten Member States, but also that, in many respects, it is slipping back somewhat. Up to a point this is due to the continuing economic recession and unemployment, and to the heightened financial difficulties faced in the national and Community budgets. In the main, however, it is due to the prevailing attitude of mind and to the lack of proper education and vocational training. It is also clear that there is a real danger of further division of the labour market along sexual lines, and of a return to the apportionment of family and social duties according to sex.

The exceptions in Europe today are France and Greece where moves to bring about equality between

the sexes are continuing, a fact which demonstrates two things. Firstly, that political will on the part of each national government to bring in the appropriate legislative measures, while at the same time promoting the change in attitudes which is necessary in order for these measures to have real practical effect, is a precondition for the achievement of social equality. Secondly, that feminism and socialism are inextricably linked concepts. Because for socialists the feminist struggle is something more than a simple striving for equality between men and women. It is the repudiation of every form of dominance of one social group by another. It is the defence of human rights wherever these are violated. The women's struggle is linked with the struggle men are engaged in for a reorganization of work based on an economy serving mankind and not the interests of the monopolies.

Today we can say with pride that Greece is in the forefront as regards institutional and economic measures aimed at improving the working and living conditions of women. Now, with the modification of the anachronistic system of family law, the provision of separate pensions for women in farming families, the employment programme for young women, the setting up of the Equality Council, the law on sex equality in the workplace and the creation of crèches, the things for which the Greek women's movement has been struggling, and its visions, are becoming reality.

And while most European governments are cutting back on social benefits because of the recession, the Greek Government is pressing ahead rapidly with the improvement of living and working conditions through the increase of social benefit provision in the state budget in spite of the limitations imposed by spending on defence and the need to deal with the economic crisis.

At the Community level, in the industrial and energy sectors, and in the farm sector especially, the situation calls for a forthright, bold and fair approach on a global basis which will allow policies for tackling the recession and for getting rid of regional inequalities to be brought in. In the less-favoured regions of the Community, and chiefly in Greece, Ireland and the Mezzogiorno, equality of opportunity for women cannot be made sure of unless the disparities between these regions and the more developed ones are first eradicated. This applies particularly for rural women in the Mediterranean regions where intervention by the Agricultural Fund Guidance Section must be stepped up and credits made available from the Social Fund for the training of women in traditional crafts.

As far as the Community's proposed measure for the reduction and reorganization of working time is concerned, we have two comments to make. Firstly, that part-time employment is a trap for working women because it is a marginal activity with only

Pantazi

partial involvement and without promotion prospects, and in the event of redundancies women are the first to get the axe. Secondly, that the reduction of working hours need not necessarily lead to a corresponding reduction of incomes if it is coupled with a proper reorganization of the work involved.

Finally, Mr President, there cannot be progress in Europe for either women or men unless decisive steps are taken on peace, disarmament and cooperation between peoples. So long as the world's wealth is frittered away on the invention and manufacture of ever more destructive weapons and missiles there will be women, men and children who will go hungry.

I would like to end my speech by repeating from this platform my proposal which the Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe has accepted. The issue of peace must be taken up by all the women of Europe, and through their representatives they must lead the way in a campaign throughout the continent to get a peace dialogue going so that that which is most excellent on this planet, mankind, can be saved.

(Applause)

Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Colleagues, women and young people are the victims of rising unemployment. The Committee of Inquiry found that male unemployment now is twice what it was in 1970, female unemployment is eight times higher. In the meantime women have come to represent 37 % of the workforce in the European Community, but the volume of work has not increased. This is due to the fact that the majority of women are in part-time employment or have been replaced. Future prospects for female employment are even grimmer if the governments continue to follow the principle of doing nothing. There are already 13 million unemployed in the European Community. Unless effective measures are taken in the field of employment, by 1985-86 one out of every nine people of working age in the EEC will be out of work; that would mean 18 million.

But the negative effects of new computer and micro-processor technologies affect precisely those sectors and branches of the economy in which women are typically employed. This is true of industry, which employs a quarter of all women. It applies to office jobs, which likewise account for around a quarter, and in future it will apply to services, which account for around a half of female employment. For this reason the Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe advocates a general reduction in working hours and a reorganization of labour — also in favour of women. We are calling for binding legal action at European Community level with the aim of concerted action by the governments to reduce working hours. The introduction of the 35-hour week in the Federal Republic of Germany alone could create at least 1 million jobs. The intention is that a joint concerted

action programme will be put into effect in individual sectors and wage agreements in the Member States. In this way we are also supporting workers in the Federal Republic and in other Member States who are at present fighting for a reduction in working hours.

To those who say that the reduction of working hours has negative effects on exports: joint concerted action at European level in fact prevents distortions of competition as between Member States. The Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe supports a reduction in daily working hours within the framework of a reduction in weekly working hours with the objective of a 35-hour week. This is the only way to ensure that both partners do in fact have the chance of working. Only in this way can both partners share in the care and upbringing of children and in housework, and we do in fact want a permanent change in the roles of men and women in our society.

I should like to make a personal point: early retirement, which is being discussed in many member countries including the Federal Republic at the moment, presents problems for women in two ways. Firstly, it does not solve the problem of the general change in the relationship between men and women and in their traditional roles, and secondly experience has shown that women's pensions are much lower than men's: in this way, if the pension is reduced accordingly women are forced onto the social services and surely that cannot be the objective from the equal rights aspect.

(Applause)

Anyone who chooses the other strategy — i.e. rejects a general reduction in working hours and concentrates on flexible working hours and part-time work, as the employers' associations and the German Labour Minister do — is providing for rising female unemployment. We of the Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe consider that flexible hours do in fact make it possible for an undertaking's machinery and computers to be utilized more fully, but they make no contribution to the equality of women or to the fight against unemployment. The effect of this kind of strategy would be to push women into less secure conditions of employment without any chance of promotion, in the form of part-time work, isolated work at home, of systems whereby women are available for work for days on end but are paid only for the time when they are called out. This is politely called capacity-oriented variable working hours. The consequence for women: they would once again be stuck on the bottom, badly-paid steps of the career ladder. Their retirement benefits would continue to be lower than those of men. It would be the end of equal rights. That is why I appeal to my colleagues in the conservative and liberal groups, only some of whom are present at the moment. I know

Wieczorek-Zeul

that the male majority in these groups will weaken the passage of our report and I appeal to you: do not allow the work which we have done together in committee and which we believed in to be changed by that majority. Stand by the report which we compiled together! Do not subordinate your woman's interest to your group interest!

(Applause)

Mrs Lizin (S). — (FR) Honourable Members, I wanted to ask for your attention for a few minutes, particularly to give congratulations to Yvette Roudy and to thank her for being here. I wanted to say that she is the only minister for women's affairs in office in the whole of Europe, that she is also the first minister representing the French presidency to be with us today and that this is perhaps the first time that our Parliament has had the pleasure of having a specialist minister at a debate prior to Wednesday's big debate on the French presidency. We in this House all hope this presidency is a success and that progress is made with all the dossiers.

Mrs von Alemann (L), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this summer the European Parliament will come to the end of the first electoral period in which members have been directly elected. When we came here in 1979 we Liberals promised to take an increased interest in the rights of women in Europe. Can we stand up and say that with the completion of the work of the Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe this is the last special debate on women's affairs and that in future women's affairs will be dealt with equally with men's? I think not. In recent years the situation of women in Europe has worsened, not improved. We have to consider the fact — as other speakers before me have already said — that 11.8% of the women who represent 37% of the Community workforce are out of work. That figure is far too high.

Women have the same right to earn their living as men have. For girls it is a matter of course that they receive further training after leaving school. But do they receive the training that will ensure that afterwards they have a relatively well-paid, reasonable job? Here too the figures speak for themselves. An increasingly large number of girls are receiving training in only four or five occupations, which implies that careers guidance is inadequate and that schools and employers must be educated into realizing that they are neglecting potential which must be utilized in the interests of our economic and social development. There must be no more lengthy discussion of whether girls are suitable for technical jobs. It was proved long ago that it is environmental influences rather than genuine differences in ability which keep girls out of the scientific and technical fields.

A word at this point to the education-policy people who are responsible: it is discrimination if a girl has to opt for a specific choice of subjects at a time when she is still not in a position to see the consequences of her choice. Later on this leads to a very one-sided education and a badly-paid job. In my report on vocational training the majority of the Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe called for a programme for the development of vocational training containing measures to ensure equal access to all places on job-training schemes, to remove age barriers to access to training schemes, to provide counselling at an early stage and for practical work to provide work experience and to guarantee the right to vocational and advanced training both during and after periods spent bringing up children.

Guidance and training of counsellors are points which were made as long ago as 1976 but which were never taken up properly by the Commission. There were some very interesting experiments in France to provide guidance and support for women resuming work and these were adopted by other countries. I appeal to all those responsible in the member countries to continue along this path. As regards the pilot programmes for training counsellors and the setting up of support systems during vocational training in jobs, in trades and in technical fields: women need help here, chiefly from other women who are also involved. It will then be easier for them to get through this training with a satisfactory outcome.

We also have to remember that these are not the only things which oppress women today and which are important for society. The problems in our society are not only concerned with the vocational training of girls. They can be seen in the overall trends and in the drop in the birthrate in almost all the countries of the Community, which always leads conservative politicians to the cry that a woman's place is in the home. Is it not rather that women nowadays no longer have the strength and the courage to bring up more than one child because they know that two or more children will automatically result in their losing the chance of returning to work? Do not women have the same right to earn their living as men do? Where does it say that women are incapable of earning their own livings?

Do you really think it is right to look at family policy only from the aspect of State welfare and State finance? Do you not think instead that it is right to place family policy in the wider context of European policy and to say: we must give young parents some prospect which will enable them to become cheerful, happy and active parents instead of depressed ones who are desperate to find a day-nursery for their children. Happy mothers bring up cheerful reliable children. That is what I believe we should be saying in this House!

von Alemann

But we must go beyond the taboos. We must also discuss something which is becoming very important in the Federal Republic of Germany, the introduction of the 35-hour week. Here I take issue with my colleague Heidi Wieczorek-Zeul. I do not in fact believe that the 35-hour week will create many more jobs for women.

(Applause)

If working hours in the Federal Republic of Germany are reduced by about 12 % from 40 hours to 35 it will in fact result in the creation of new jobs among workers whose work is machine-based, i.e. the so-called direct producers. But where do women work? Do they work in these directly productive fields or do they in fact work in the indirectly productive areas, i.e. in the administrative field, in offices? In the latter it will be easy to make up for lost working time by rationalization, reorganization and increased production. I must warn you therefore not to use the 35-hour week as a way of improving the lot of women without talking of other ways!

Women are disproportionately affected by these measures and there is reason to fear that the new technologies which affect office work particularly strongly will lead to a disproportionately high rise in female unemployment if the action taken is too general.

It is the opinion of the Liberals that the efforts being made in research and technology, the great efforts being made in industry and in groups of companies in our countries mean that we shall not get left behind by these technological changes. The Liberals also believe however that in this context we must not neglect the interests of individual workers and members of families. It is our duty as Liberals to defend the freedom of the individual so that he is able to shape his own destiny and make the best use of his opportunities. We therefore advocate greater flexibility of working hours, i.e. in the interests of changing the roles of men and women it must be possible for fathers to take more interest in their children and for mothers to be able to avail themselves of the right to paid employment, which is also theirs. This must be made to happen in such a way that the individual worker has a greater say in the allocation of his working time.

I rate the work of women in the home very high — I have to say this because I have already talked about housewives. I really do think, however, that after a phase of working in the family women really must be given an opportunity to return to working life. There are some good starting points. There are good examples for instance in the Netherlands, namely the day schools in which 100 000 women have finished their schooling and are now able to go on to further study. We have all been asked to collect and pass on information about what is happening in the field of women's affairs in the other member countries and to learn

from it. I believe this to be so important that Parliament should encourage the setting up of women's information centres like those in the United States so that we can at last find out on an objective basis what exactly the limits of female deprivation are, how far women do in fact have to perform two roles, so that we can put figures on the table; in Europe we are still to a large extent working on assumptions.

We also want to ensure that some degree of temporary preference is given to equally qualified women in middle management, in top management and in the civil service so that they get jobs and career opportunities. We consider that this too is necessary.

Policy on women's matters is not just policy for women or their children. Female policy is social policy. This is the year 1984. George Orwell wrote the novel *1984* and disturbed readers throughout Europe, 'Imagine a boot stamping on a human face for ever.' We Liberals are fighting against an inhuman society. We are fighting to prevent oppression of the individual by major groups in that society. We do not believe in subordinating the individual to standardized solutions to problems to a greater extent than the social framework requires. Women's problems will not be solved by standardized solutions. Woman's view of life is different from man's, women have different problems from men. We must try to ensure that these problems are given increased consideration both in vocational training and at the workplace.

I believe that today's debate in the European Parliament can help to increase awareness of this and I hope that you share my view that it is only through a policy of looking forward to the 21st century that we shall be able to solve the problems of this society of women, men and children. I call upon you to work together for this.

(Applause)

Mrs Spaak (NI), rapporteur. — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the repercussions of the new technologies on women's life and work should always be seen within the broader context of the economic crisis. It has become commonplace to say that Europe is going through a structural rather than an economic crisis. Unemployment and the reorganization of working time mean that our social organization has to be recast and the new technologies are an essential aspect of this upheaval.

The challenge that they represent to society is an even greater challenge for women — who are handicapped in a number of ways. It is the so-called women's occupations which have to be altered or done away with and they will not be a source of employment in the future. Any retraining in these sectors is sketchy. Women are not ready to take up the posts that will be created — if the Member States give Europe the relevant means — in the new technologies.

Spaak

In existing sectors, where keyboards and screens are replacing manual skills and putting these jobs out of reach of women, resistance from existing organizations, which protect male workers as a matter of priority, is to be expected. In these organizations, particularly trade unions and firms, women are not in the posts and do not have the sort of duties that would enable them to be involved either in the design of new technologies or in negotiations between employers and employees. They are, furthermore, ideal targets for the development of work in the home. I shall return to this later.

There are risks of seeing the quality of women's employment deteriorate once more. But this period of change can and must be the opportunity to make a better job of defending women and their place in society. In this field, they should be on the offensive and get both themselves and the European institutions mobilized.

The European Community has an essential part to play in defining and devising the strategy to adopt for new technologies. Europe has been a pioneer in the defence of women's rights and it should remain so.

A general assessment of all the Community documents and action to do with the new technologies suggests too much neutrality towards women. Women are considered more as an annex to the issue — whereas they could well be the first victims.

I shall only mention two areas in which the Community's efforts are essential — education and training. It is vital for both girls and boys to be trained and familiarized with the new technologies very early on. These subjects should be compulsory from the first day at school. We have just tabled a draft decree along these lines in the Belgian Parliament. The Commission and the Council should promote training in the new technologies, through the European Social Fund and through positive schemes, for male and female teachers of all subjects and at all levels. This is essential — not just to enable women to maintain their position in the profession, but also to ensure that they are not missing when programmed courses are designed.

Mrs Roudy remembers a number of organizations at a Paris conference having a bad impression of the small number of women involved in training programmes — 20 % — which is far too few.

I have found, from conferences and answers to questionnaires, that a whole range of initiatives of all kinds are being taken in many parts of the Community. One of the duties of the Social Fund should be to coordinate and pass on information about them, creating a network of data on the most promising experiments.

The second point is on making employers and employees aware of the problem and mobilizing all

the women's movements. Women have to take up the challenge laid down by the new technologies, particularly in education and training. They should be careful about any development of work in the home that could lead to them being deprived of the social advantages attached to employment.

The EEC, with the Community strategy it has to implement in this field, is in a strong position when it comes to solving the social problems facing the women of that Community.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR FRIEDRICH*Vice-President*

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE), co-rapporteur. — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, gentlemen of the Commission and, for once, Madam Minister, in this debate, which must really be regarded as an evaluation of the outcome of the debate we had in 1981, it is my task to comment on the European Social Fund and specifically on the position of women in relation to this Fund.

In 1982, at the request of the Committee of Inquiry, I made a thorough study of the way in which girls and women take advantage of the Fund. The findings of this study were certainly not encouraging. It emerged, for example, that the effect of the special budget item for projects for women, an item of which we have always been so proud, had in fact been marginal. In 1981, for instance — although the figures for previous years are roughly the same — over 1 000 m ECU was spent on various European Social Fund projects. All the special budget item for women got out of this was 22 m ECU, which is less than a quarter of one per cent. The number of people who benefited from the ESF in 1981 was over 1.3 m. The number of women benefiting from the special budget item was 10 900. I then turned my attention to the number of women who took part in the other projects, that is to say, the other 99 % of the European Social Fund. And after a careful analysis I found that about two-thirds of the participants in the ESF projects were men and about one third women. The same was true of the projects for young people, even though the statistics show that two-thirds of unemployed young people are girls and one-third boys.

I was also able to find practical confirmation of these figures. In 1982 we joined Parliament's Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on a visit to a number of ESF projects in Italy. It may have been a coincidence, but we did not see a single girl at any of the projects we visited. We asked the appropriate authorities how high the average participation of women was in ESF projects in Southern Italy, and it was estimated at 10 % at that time.

Maij-Weggen

In 1983 we went to Greece and visited two vocational training institutes that were being financed by the European Social Fund. At the first we found twelve girls among the several hundred pupils. But these girls were not operating lathes, nor were they sitting at computers: they were in the typing class, and they were not using new, computerized typewriters but extremely antiquated machines. The second institute was closed for the holidays. We were told that no girls were enrolled there. Nor was the newly built institute designed to accommodate girls. There were no dormitories, showers or toilets for girls in the school or the boarding facilities attached to it. When asked about this, the Greek authorities excused themselves by saying that girls were not interested in this kind of training. I must say, however, that the Pasok government certainly is interested in these problems, but there is obviously still a great deal to be done in Greece.

My study also revealed that girls and women are neglected far more in ESF projects in the southern countries than in the Northern European countries, with the possible exception of Ireland.

Mr President, I have not delayed my search for solutions to this problem of the neglect of women by the Social Fund until this debate. As you know, I presented the report on my study and our demands for a better distribution of resources during last summer's debate on the reform of the European Social Fund. Parliament approved our arguments and our requests at that time. And in October the Council of Ministers, after consultation, included an article in the new Social Fund regulation that calls on the Member States to ensure that a reasonable number of women participate in ESF projects from 1 January 1984, the date on which the new Fund came into operation. We have thus won this first battle. But it is very important for this principle to be observed, and I have consequently asked once again in the resolution now before us that the annual report on the Social Fund state very accurately how many men and women participate in the projects in each Member State. And I have also requested in a resolution that, where Member States repeatedly fail to observe the principle of equal allocations, the resources for the projects concerned should simply be blocked. I think that would be a good way to go about it, because people are usually quicker to change their ways if they are deprived of money than when confronted with principles. It is surely a good thing to look the facts in the face for once.

Mr President, I should also like to say a few words in this debate as my group's spokesman rather than in my capacity as a co-rapporteur. Firstly, the work of eighteen co-rapporteurs — and they have worked well — has produced a 500-page report and a resolution consisting of 100 paragraphs. The danger is that, if we ourselves do not set any priorities in this resolution, the Commission and Council will do it for us, and the

question then is whether their priorities will be the ones we really want. I shall therefore take the liberty of indicating some of the priorities, and I invite Members to give me their support or, provided they mean well, to criticize my choice.

I believe the first priority should be control over the implementation of the three directives that already exist: the directive on equal pay, the directive on equal treatment and the directive on equal social security. I believe that to be priority number one.

The second priority — and I have tabled an amendment on this — should be, I believe, the earliest possible adoption by the Council of the four new directives on the equal treatment of women which are now being discussed. They concern, among other things, the equal treatment of part-time workers, the equal treatment of temporary workers, the equal treatment of men and women in respect of social security at work, and maternity leave. I should like to ask Mrs Roudy — and I have set this out in an amendment — whether she would be willing to organize a special Council meeting to be attended by the Ministers and State Secretaries responsible for matters relating to emancipation so that the decisions can be taken on these directives. They are now being discussed in the Social and Economic Affairs Council and, Mr President, if we are not careful, that is where they will stay for the next four years. I hope the House will approve this amendment.

My third priority, Mr President, is the earliest possible submission of the directives which the Commission promised in the programme for action it proposed some two years ago. These directives concern the equal treatment of people who work at home, the equal treatment of men and women under industrial safety legislation, the equal treatment of self-employed men and women, the improvement of the position of women who help in family business and — a very important matter — the equal treatment of men and women under tax legislation.

The fourth priority, Mr President, should, I believe, be the reform of the European Community's social, regional and development funds so that men and women benefit equally from these funds, as I was saying a moment ago.

Fifthly, Mr President, I feel we should be paying more attention to education. Madam President of the Council of Ministers, is it not possible to convene an early meeting of the Council of Education Ministers to reach actual decisions on the matters that Mrs von Alemann mentioned?

Mr President, I have set five priorities in the order I think they should take. I think it necessary to set priorities, otherwise we shall get lost in this resolution with its 100 paragraphs and this report with its 500 pages, and that is the last thing that any of us would want.

(Applause)

Mr Eisma (NI), co-rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I am the first man to speak in this debate on women. As a man, I did my best to improve the situation of women while the Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe was in operation. This was taken amiss by many people, because the view that women are best left to worry about their rights themselves is still widespread. I dispute this, because fair-minded people must surely realize that we shall not serve the cause of women by polarizing the two sexes. The improvement of the situation of women, especially in the labour market, is, in my opinion, very closely connected with the situation of men. If we are going to give women the same rights as men — and that is what we want — the situation of men must be adjusted accordingly, a step backwards for men in the labour market in favour of women and a step forwards for men when it comes to looking after the children and doing the housework.

Mr President, a great deal has been done for women since 1981 on the basis of the report we discussed at that time. But in very many respects a great deal has not been done, not even by the Commission. I would refer you in particular to the section for which I am responsible, women and health. Practically nothing we asked for at that time has been put into practice. I am therefore pleased that my proposals have been accepted by the parliamentary committee and will probably be approved by this Parliament this evening. What we want to do is to bring some pressure to bear on the Commission again to draw up a recommendation to the Council concerning better information on breast and cervical cancer and the organization of mass examinations to enable these diseases to be detected in the early stages. We also urge the Commission again to coordinate and improve sex education for young people and adults in the Member States and to coordinate research into new contraceptive devices for men and women. We call on the Commission to come forward with proposals for harmonization of legislation concerning the availability of reliable contraceptives. We appeal to the Member States to make contraceptives available to men, women and young people. The Community means not only economic cooperation but also cooperation in social and welfare matters. We must increasingly build on this and give it increasing attention.

Since our last debate on women time has not stood still. Some of the proposals we are now discussing are consequently new. They concern sexual assaults on women and children. Mr President, where these proposals are concerned, I have obtained a great deal of information in my country from the Emancipation Council, the Ministry of Public Health, the emancipation institute of my own party, D'66, and various experts. The problem of sexual violence, which is receiving increasing publicity in my country, has also been recognized by colleagues of mine from other countries. We therefore call on the Commission to

carry out an investigation — no more than that — into the incidence and causes of sexual assaults in the various Member States. We ask the Member States to regard sexual assaults as offences for which the offender can be prosecuted whether or not the victims press charges. It should also be possible for women's organizations to act on behalf of the victims of sexual assaults so that they do not have to sit through a psychologically agonizing trial. Women police officers must be available, and the police must change their attitudes towards the victims of sexual assaults. This is a very important point, as we were able to see here in Parliament from an Italian television film that I showed in this building two years ago at the request of a number of my colleagues.

Mr President, I will conclude with two points. They concern matters on which I made proposals that have not yet been approved by my colleagues. I am not therefore now speaking as a rapporteur but as a representative of my group. Firstly, there is the 'housewife syndrome', which is increasingly being recognized in my country. This is, if you like, a kind of occupational disease of a psychoneurotic nature from which women suffer because they are exclusively occupied with housework, which offers little variation and few challenges. They often seek refuge in alcohol and sedatives as a result. I have tabled an amendment calling on the Commission to encourage research into this phenomenon at European level and to draw up proposals for practical measures to be taken by the Member States to prevent its occurrence and to care for and counsel women and also to give special thought to encouraging self-help groups, by which I mean groups of women in the same position who can help each other because they all have the same problem.

Mr President, the Commission should also study the situation of older, unmarried working women at European level. The combination of going out to work and looking after their homes or families is often too much for them. All kinds of measures could be taken by the Member States on the Commission's recommendation to ease their situation. I have tabled amendments on the last two of these subjects, and I would appreciate it if Parliament could approve them.

Mr President, I would and could go on for a long time, but I do not want to try your patience. I have tabled amendments concerning the improvement of the safety of men and women at work. I believe that the standard set for women as regards ionizing irradiation and lead at the workplace must become the standard for men and not the other way round, because that would mean worsening the position of women at the workplace.

Mr President, I have called for a clear statement from this Parliament on the reduction of working hours. It is not enough to say that working hours must be reduced. We want a 32-hour week in 1990. That is a clear target date.

Eisma

I will conclude by thanking my lady colleagues for the way in which we have cooperated in the parliamentary committee over the last twelve months. From time to time I was very annoyed with some of you because of political and factual differences of opinion. But I felt the same about male colleagues, so it does not matter. We are all fighting for the same cause, which in my opinion is the emancipation of human beings.

(Applause)

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, Minister, Mr Commissioner, the question of migrant women and wives of immigrants is a twofold problem: it is a female problem, in addition to being an immigration problem. But it also comprises a whole set of other problems, and it is difficult to say which of these is the most serious — illiteracy first of all, both in the native language and in the language of the host country; social and cultural isolation, and class and sex discrimination; rigidity in relation to job roles, professional downgrading and the jealous protection of ancient values.

In addition, it is the migrant women who are most subject to the economic, social and cultural repercussions of the present crisis. It is amongst the migrant workers that we find the greatest number of unemployed, and of these unemployed, women form the majority. The highest figures, however, relate to the young generations in the second generation of migrants, which experience the greatest conflicts of culture and generation alike: especially amongst the mothers, who dream of far-off societies that are distant in both time and space, and among the young, who are in contact with a society that is changing rapidly, and in which human values are often trampled on, for the benefit of profit: where the children, in short, no longer speak the same language as their mother.

Whilst we were preparing our report we found ourselves faced with a worrying human fact: migrant women receive only the crumbs of an opulent society, and do not benefit from those improvements in living and working conditions that are obtained elsewhere. Nor do the principles of equality apply, even where their residence permit is concerned, which is sometimes linked with that of their husband. This all reflects on the family reunion which, when it happens, takes place in the most broken-down houses in derelict town centres abandoned by the local population, or in dormitory areas which only accentuate the isolation and lack of understanding with the resident population. From here, it is a short step to racism and xenophobia. We call on Parliament again to make its position clear — as it has done in the past — on this subject, since migrant women are more sensitive than others to feelings of hostility that accen-

tuate their nostalgia for their homeland far away, and emphasize their separation from other women, and their isolation from the rest of society — an isolation that is harmful to human relations and to their own health. And they have all this to put up with, despite the knowledge that they are useful to the society in which they live, and contribute to our economic well-being and our social progress.

Twenty years ago, Martin Luther King, the negro martyr, said: 'I have a dream'. The dream that we are attempting to translate into reality is in effect a duty, and a modest one at that. Let the migrants be given additional basic training, and let the European Social Fund devote its attention in particular to training trainers from the migrants' own native countries, who can help the women adequately on their way to their new horizons, without allowing the continuity to be broken, and with the help also of the migrants' associations, which should therefore be supported.

The Commission of the European Community must also ascertain in which countries migrant women do not have independent rights of residence, and they should arrange, in accordance with inter-State agreements, to pay family allowances to whomsoever is effectively in charge of the children, in cases where one of the parents avoids his responsibilities, as often happens both in cases of divorce and when one parent leaves the other.

But, above all, the directive on language instruction for the children of migrant workers should be made operative in every country in the Community. It is a directive that had raised so many hopes, but which has caused so much disappointment, and which certainly does nothing to help overcome the lack of understanding between parents and children, nor their isolation from society.

The second generation of migrant women, moreover, should be helped to break away from doing their traditional jobs, and the programme of action on equality of opportunity may contribute to this. But, in the light also of the new situation that exists within our Community, the programme of action must above all be updated in favour of migrant workers and their families, and policies for migrants agreed at Council level so as to constitute the basis for the foreign worker's statute. And above all we, who as a Parliament have called for a policy for our families, must also legislate for the families of those with different names, skins and languages from ours, and allow them to live as true family nucleuses, and not as refugees. We must above all guarantee certain civil rights, such as the opportunity for Community citizens to participate in the European elections, and the opportunity to vote at local elections for all resident foreigners who pay their taxes, so that their responsibilities are compensated by the acquisition of important rights.

Squarcialupi

The construction of Europe also means giving emigrants what we owe them for everything that they have given us.

(Applause)

Mrs S. Martin (L), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, Honourable Members, since the beginning of the century, our society has undergone major changes and, in many cases, it has to be admitted that they have been all the better an experience for women having been involved in them.

We expect other changes too. So our aim has been and must continue to be to enable women to take their rightful place by removing all obstacles to equal opportunity and choices between men and women.

I, for one, shall stress the situation of women in the independent professions, in particular agriculture, trade and crafts. So far, our Community has more or less passed these women by. Yet in everyday life, they take on a large part of the work and the responsibility in the firm. More than this, it is clear that a firm's earnings and development are closely linked to the extent and quality of women's involvement.

In spite of this, these women tend not to be recognized as full professionals and, under national laws, they only have a few rights *vis-à-vis* their firms. So the Community has to be the spearhead that incites the Member States to bring their legislation into line with the actual situation.

This is why I am so insistent. The Commission, as it has announced and promised on a number of occasions, should lose no time in producing a proposal for a directive to ensure that women in this profession have a legal status whereby, whenever a firm set up, operational or closed down, they have the same rights as their spouses and a social status based on specific rights and also, particularly when having children, rights equivalent to those of women working in other socio-professional categories.

If this is to be achieved and access to training is to be facilitated, then it is vital to provide assistance with the setting up and running of replacement services.

One other item in the report attracted my attention and should also attract the attention of this House. It is the reduction and reorganization of working time.

Over the past decades, there has been a gradual and considerable reduction in working time, in line with the increase in productivity. At a time when our competitiveness *vis-à-vis* other continents is so fragile, is it reasonable to make deliberate plans for a systematic, across-the-board reduction in working time? We already know from France's example that this does not lead to a reduction in unemployment. Could it be managed without a reduction in purchasing power, which the low-wage earners could no doubt not cope with? Let us therefore take care not to work against our aims.

I am, however, convinced that the reorganization of working time, with the development of part-time work and flexible timetables, is what women want, as they are hoping for more choice when it comes to harmonizing and reconciling their profession and their private and family life.

In conclusion, I should like to say that we are about to see profound changes, particularly with the introduction of new technologies. If things are to develop in a balanced manner, then it is perhaps important to fight against the way women and their image are used in advertising. But above all, it is vital to implement the means to enable women to participate freely and fully in these developments. This is behind the proposals of the Committee of Inquiry, which, I hope, will attract a very large majority of our votes.

(Applause)

Mrs Lenz (EPP), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, colleagues! I should like to say a few words as rapporteur of the Committee of Inquiry into Women in the Institutions of the European Community. With more than ten thousand officials and other employees and more than 50 % women the European Community is a microcosm — some even say macrocosm — in which it has been possible to realize in an almost ideal way the demand for equal pay and for equal access to jobs. All the countries of the European Community were in agreement; it has been possible to realize some of our demands in an excellent way since educated women of all nations work in the European Communities.

We are of course far from being able to describe the European Communities as a model institution. Despite the extraordinarily favourable material conditions, which apply to all officials, there are problems here too, especially the statistics which show that it is almost as rare for a woman to be allowed to penetrate the top echelons of the Commission as it is for the famous camel to pass through the eye of a needle. And who is in the Commission heaven? You guessed: men.

The exceptions confirm the rule. If we take advancement to A1, the highest career bracket in the Commission, or the next lower brackets A2 and A3, and increase the proportion of women by 50% or 100% this increases the total percentage for women from 2 to 3% or from 2 to 4%. Even the famous 25% women in high positions in the European Court of Justice amounts to only one woman to four men. On the other hand 62% to 90% of the female staff are in categories B and C, which is the picture which is also familiar from national civil services.

The Commission could set a real example and we hope that it will do so in future. When we started to work in the Commission in 1958 we were only minor

Lenz

officials who did not dream that the European Community might be not only a model of peaceful collaboration between the nations of a continent but also the champion of equal access for women to jobs and careers and of equal representation for women on staff committees, promotion committees and all committees which form part of the internal administration of the Commission. At that time we were a long way from it.

More than 50 % of the women in an administration also means that women are under an obligation to take charge of their own destinies. Training is a key word here. It should be open to all grades without difficulty, but it should also be utilized by women more fully than hitherto. We women in Parliament are only too aware of the difficulty of keeping control of careers, families and our own problems, and our proposals to the Commission aim to overcome these difficulties. The Commission is the largest employer in the Community and during the preparation of this report — I mention this fact in its praise — it gave us nothing but help, and we very much hope that the other institutions of the Communities will follow this example.

(Applause)

The best example — and may I address here the President — in — Office of the Council and the Member States — would be of course for capable women to be appointed to the highest levels of administration in the Community, e.g. the Commission of the European Community.

(Applause)

Let me now as spokesman of my group say a few words about this opinion. By means of its directives the European Community has made possible progress towards the implementation of equal rights without any regard to political ideologies. It is the wrong way if we want to do justice to all the wide variety of areas which involve women in the Community. Nevertheless they are for all of us a way of working with men objectively and reasonably to achieve equal rights. Women have found a strong ally in the European Parliament in spite of all political differences. Even if the number of our male colleagues in the committee was limited — my group nevertheless provided the committee with a vice-president of Parliament and a representative of the younger generation — we must still ask ourselves sometimes whether Parliament's will for reform in this field does in fact bear fruit.

Nevertheless we did succeed in making women's affairs the subject of work in the Parliament and this was justified by the opinions obtained from all the committees of Parliament. We are especially pleased today that they are being relayed by the press and the media and we take it as an especially good omen that the debate today is being broadcast direct to one

Member country, and I say this with pride, to my own country. We welcome this

(Applause)

and hope that other debates which are of decisive political importance for European unity will in future be relayed more often via television screens in our countries.

(Applause)

The realization of European unity and equality of opportunity for women have one thing in common: the elimination of many hurdles, the setting aside of self-interest, the formulation of goals which embrace all categories and do not just benefit one particular group of people and nationalities, the perseverance to overcome obstacles and the ability to compromise. In this way the European Community has achieved more for itself, but perhaps also for women, than national governments.

We are faced with far-reaching changes in our world as we know it, which threaten the self-confidence which women have achieved and they continue to need help and understanding in order to retain their place in society and at work and to carry out their task as partners in the family in difficult times, endeavouring to reconcile a multiplicity of functions. We too are against their being forced back into a role which they no longer want. Like all our female colleagues we are calling for education for the world of tomorrow. 50% of women in the Community unemployed is no fit state of affairs after all the investment which is at last being put into education for women and girls in all countries! Women's share in business life, their role as consumers in the economy, their influence in education, are an important indication that women must be given their place in education and training in the world of tomorrow with the technologies of tomorrow.

For us policy on women's matters is not a weapon with which to enforce ideologies, it is the embodiment of the concept of human dignity and the impossibility of substituting one person for another. Our group will vote for this report in its broad outlines. We have supported the rapporteur's demands in the Committee on Budgets as well as in Parliament. We shall be vigilant however where the opportunity for women to attend to family duties is restricted by one-sided policies.

For us family policy is a global policy: it must be just as possible to reconcile it with labour market policy as with social market policy and vice versa. We want a global policy and not a sectoral policy. We shall not permit any one-sided return to restricted roles which are not the result of decisions freely taken by women and their marriage partners. Part-time work, flexible hours, job-sharing — all these are for us not rigid rules but possibilities for shaping the lives of people in general — and of marriage partners *vis-à-vis* their families — and therefore women must share in the

Lenz

decisions taken on these matters. We shall bear this in mind when we are voting in committee. We shall take care that these demands are upheld also on the questions of social security, the protection of pregnancy and motherhood and the status of women in small firms and family businesses.

We not only have economic obligations to the Third World, we also have obligations to the women of the Third World. We ought to respect other people's traditions. But we do not have to condone them if they are contrary to human rights and human dignity. Here too we women and all our male colleagues in the European Parliament should set the pattern for the future so that the position of women in the Third World is more justly dealt with than has been the case hitherto.

The second European direct elections are approaching. If we in this Parliament want to give a visible sign of the concern of the European Community for its citizens we shall continue — and this is what we want to do — along the path of peaceful emancipation for men and women. I believe that the Europe of the Ten is worthy of the votes of all our peoples because European Community means — and in my view we realized this in the microcosm of the Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe — sitting down at the table to transform conflicts into positive solutions for the future.

Mrs Lizin (S), rapporteur. — (FR) Honourable Members, when I and one or two of you began seeking the signatures we needed to set up our Committee of inquiry, I had no idea how much work we would have to do, how much information we would collect — or how bad we would find the situation to be.

The women of Europe are faced with their biggest challenge since the war — that is to say an internationalized labour market, now undergoing a complete change of structure, which will have very little to offer them unless they put up a fierce fight. By the year 2001, women will be the exceptions that prove the rule on a masculine, computerized labour market. And — here lies a paradox — it will be at the very moment when physical strength has lost its importance because there will only be a few buttons to push that they will have gone back into the home because men have replaced the work argument with a cultural argument.

Yet in spite of that, in spite of the seriousness of the moment, in spite of the campaign they have to wage in their own countries, these women wanted to talk about the women of the Third World, of their relations with them and of the solidarity that unites them. There are two reasons for this. The first aspect of this solidarity is a conviction that the exploitation of women is the same phenomenon even if geographical and social forms differ. Exploitation in an African hut

and a bourgeois residence is different in form but the psychological and sociological foundations are the same — contempt for a particular sex. So there is solidarity with these women who work to ensure their family's survival but have the right to self-expression and social existence denied them. The second aspect of this solidarity derives from a more economic and perhaps self-interested analysis of the ties that bind us. If the labour market in Europe has changed so profoundly, it is not independently of the conditions of exploitation of labour in the Third World.

If we want to bring back balance to the labour market here in our countries in such a way as to benefit the workers, be they men or women, if we want to bring back the idea of a right to work, through, in particular, a harmonized reduction in working time, an important objective of this report, then working conditions in the Third World, an economic competitor of Europe, are not a matter of indifference to us. More than 75 % of the working population of the Third World are women, so their living and working conditions and their wages and training are an integral part of our analysis, because they have an effect on our own labour market. Our reforms will only work if, alongside, the lot of the working population in general and the women of the Third World in particular improves. It is easy to see what 'improving the lot' means when you know about the illiteracy, the total lack of health education, the 18- or 19-hour working day, the children who work in rural areas, the prostitution and the trade in little girls in the Third World. This is something that this report, unlike Mrs Roudy's report, failed to mention. Perhaps the words frighten us. Briefly — everything that goes to make up the daily round of women in the developing countries is also an element of comparison of the labour markets here and there and so it is an element of our situation too.

But our sole aim was not to produce an analytical report. We also wanted it to be a concrete report to the Commission and the Council, asking them for a certain number of reforms — bigger budgets for projects designed specifically for women in the developing countries, priority for projects affecting women in rural areas, priority for women's training budgets, aid with training women instructors in rural technology, health education, design procedures and monitoring of European cooperation projects taking account, at each stage, of their influence on women in the area in which they are implemented. We are also calling for specific criteria to take account of the effect of EDF projects on women, pre- and post-assessment of projects mentioning the effect on the women concerned and the creation of specialized departments in the development cooperation ministries. Lastly, our Committee is calling for special attention to be paid to refugee women, quoting the dramatic case of black women from South Africa who have fled to neighbouring countries.

Lizin

This is a series of measures seeking the desired aims of creating and giving practical shape to solidarity between people of the same sex and between two different worlds. Only the future can say — and it may take 20 years — whether it is easier to bring the two worlds or the two sexes together. I am convinced that the women of today are the bearers of a social project and that they are far too timid in their way of expressing themselves — as our report in fact stresses. If they want, they can both create ideas and put them into practice to make our society develop over the next 10 years.

(Applause)

Miss Hooper (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, the press release issued by the United Kingdom Information Office of the European Parliament starts with the words: 'Between 1981 and 1984, the situation of women in Europe has deteriorated.' These words have been echoed by several speakers this morning. I recognize that this refers specifically to employment statistics quoted in the report, but otherwise it paints only half the picture and therefore distorts the picture.

Dramatic changes in social attitudes cannot be achieved overnight, and I believe that the choice and opportunities available to women are greater now than ever before. It can be both depressing and counter-productive to exaggerate the difficulties.

The mere fact that this is the third major debate on the topic within the first five years of the life of the directly elected European Parliament, which is, after all, composed of a majority of men, is on the one hand an acknowledgement that problems still exist, but is surely also a sign that time and consideration are being given to tackling those problems.

Within the other European Community institutions, we can point to the Commission's action programme on the promotion of equal opportunities, to the formation of the Commission's Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunities and to the active surveillance of existing Community legislation by the Court of Justice in Luxembourg. All are signs of progress in the right direction.

In my view, therefore, today's debate and the report on which it is based have not so far introduced any startling new ideas or requests. Anybody coming here and expecting to hear something novel must therefore be disappointed. But the main purpose of a debate such as this is to give maximum publicity to the issues and to the achievements and to try to get the right message across. In order to do this successfully there is no doubt that you have to follow the old advice; say it, say it again and then start all over again. The message we want to get across, again and again both to men and to women, is that what is needed are equal rights and equal opportunities not just on paper but in practice too. It is vital to ensure that women are

aware of their rights and opportunities in order that they can choose whether or not to exercise them or to take them up. I believe that there must be that element of choice, since rights and opportunities also bring duties and responsibilities and, after all, some women prefer to opt for the traditional role in the family.

The Commission's action programme on the promotion of equal opportunities for women puts it well, I think. It states that the information activity remains of key importance, not only to ensure that women are aware of their rights and responsibilities as workers and parents but also at a more general level to enable a wider public, particularly through the mass media to accept women as equals in all areas of society and to understand the positive aspects of this development.

In order to encourage greater activity and participation amongst women in public life, we must not dwell solely on the difficulties. We need to underline successes and achievements. We should not forget for example, that for the first time in history, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom is a woman, that the first President of this directly-elected European Parliament was a woman and that there is a higher percentage of women in this Parliament than in any other elected parliament in the world — even though that only amounts to some 18 %. I must add that I am not sure about the total as a result of the recent Danish elections, although I know that within the Conservative Party over 30 % of those elected are women.

In preparing my report on information policy, I felt it was essential, first to recognize that the majority of women do have special needs, particularly married women and mothers of families, in that many are housebound and cut off from sources of information and social contact available at the workplace. At the same time, they have their own special channels of communication in the specialized magazines, papers, radio and television programmes and through a multiplicity of voluntary organizations.

Secondly, I felt it was important to contact and consult many of these specialized agencies as well as Member State governments — of whom, incidentally, only three replied — and the Community institutions in order to get an up-to-date picture of the situation and to see where best we could suggest or request action. The detailed replies to my investigations are summarized in my report of inquiry, which is No 13 in Volume C of the report.

In order to meet these special needs and taking account of the situation, I have to admit that, apart from calling for greater activity and cooperation generally, the only specific request which we are competent to make as far as information policy is concerned — something that was successfully pursued in the debates on the budget — is to urge the budgetary authorities, the Council and the Parliament, to ensure

Hooper

that adequate budgetary provision is made for increasing the number of staff dealing with women's affairs, bearing in mind that they should be established as an autonomous unit within the Commission's information departments.

To date, the tiny information section of the Commission has done tremendous work. It needs far more support. I therefore ask the House to support this request and also Amendment No 21, which calls on the Commission to set up appropriate units in its information offices in the Member States to provide information on the activities of the European Parliament relating to the problems of women.

My only regret as far as this report is concerned is that, as a result of the length of time it has taken the Committee of Inquiry to prepare the report, the request for a special campaign to precede the forthcoming elections in June of this year does not seem to be materializing. We had hoped for something specific in view of the effectiveness of the specific campaign organized to precede the 1979 elections and also the fact that a recent Harris poll conducted in my country shows that a larger percentage of women than men are dissatisfied with our Community membership. That, I am told, is largely because of the association of the EEC with increasing food prices.

I will conclude by reiterating what I said earlier. The major purpose of this debate is to publicize and spread information about women's rights and, in particular, about the European Community's active involvement and achievements in this field. I consider it time well spent if those objectives are satisfied.

(Applause)

Mrs Le Roux (COM), rapporteur. — *(FR)* Mr President, there are millions of women across Europe anxious to live free, equal and responsible lives. Now that scientific progress offers women unprecedented possibilities of seeing their family and professional lives transformed and equality become not a dream but reality, what do we find?

That the momentum of the women's liberation movement of the seventies is coming up against today's crisis, which affects women first and foremost. Changes over recent decades are used by the employers against female workers, resulting in a deterioration of women's living and working conditions. Yet inequality is not, as some people would have us believe, the price of progress. The work of the Committee of Inquiry has highlighted the unfortunate consequences of the crisis on women's lives and we congratulate it. We cannot but join with the rapporteur — to whom I pay friendly tribute — in deploring the fact that the Community institutions have done so little about the recommendations adopted by this House in 1981.

We are forced to admit that, in spite of these recommendations, the situation has not improved. Quite the

contrary. No doubt we should add to existing directives and introduce new legal instruments, but, ultimately, there can be no real progress with equality for women outside new economic and social channels.

One of the virtues of the Committee of Inquiry is that it tied the improvement of women's status to economic recovery. Instead of increasing the number of barriers, the Community would do far better to encourage and assist those countries that are now trying to implement such a policy and use the Social Fund to promote training and employment rather than to subsidize austerity policies.

Equality of employment, the right to a proper job, a decent wage and proper training, which women are calling for, all mean further growth.

And something else is necessary too — a reduction in working time to bring the weekly timetable down to 35 hours. A broad work-sharing campaign is currently being orchestrated in Europe. But this is the wrong sort of answer and it in fact only leads to perpetuation of the vicious austerity-unemployment circle.

We are pleased that the Committee of Inquiry unequivocally proposes that a 35-hour week be introduced as soon as possible.

In the name of equality, the forces of conservatism and the employers would like to force women to renounce long-acquired rights and social protection and impose, for example, night work. Women do not want to turn the clock back 100 years, as all their struggles show, and we have every reason to believe that the plan to enlarge the Community would lead to a levelling down of their status.

As far as women are concerned, everything, obviously, is not a question of work. They want an occupation, to take part in all aspects of life, and they want children and the means of raising them.

The Committee of Inquiry asked me to look into this aspect of the situation. And what is that situation? That the birth of a child, that privileged moment in the life of women and couples is still all too often a time when the woman stops work and the family income drops, when she loses her financial independence, sees her professional chances decline and stops being promoted.

There is discrimination against women as future mothers and there is also inequality between women as regards the effect of motherhood on the health and social life. The risks facing a woman and her future child can vary from one to four depending on her job and her rung on the socio-cultural ladder. The women at greatest risk are immigrants, skilled workers and housewives in the most underprivileged classes. This is why doctors concerned with prevention in this field talk about socio-professional and socio-cultural risks and why Professor Minkowski, whose information and

Le Roux

experience were so valuable to our committee, spoke of the vital importance of preventive care and of the fact that, as far as child-bearing is concerned, the socio-economic environment is more important than purely medical considerations.

These are the findings that guided us in the proposals put forward by the Committee of Inquiry — the abolition of discrimination, particularly at work, the alignment of laws on those offering the best socio-medical protection to women during pregnancy, the development of the infrastructure relating to treatment, supervision and consultation and measures to humanize and modernize maternity units.

And so that women can play the parts of mother and worker to the full, the Committee of Inquiry emphasizes the need to develop the services that look after young children. Such facilities are still totally inadequate in the EEC — and they are generators of employment.

It is perfectly clear that such a programme cannot be put into effect without means. And where can they be found? How can we meet the families' needs for socio-cultural facilities?

The Committee does not answer these questions. Allow me to give my answer. We have to tackle the waste generated by capitalism, the system which refuses economic growth and work for women and the right of women to be complete individuals. Women are fighting for these rights and their fight, which is being waged differently in our 10 countries, cannot be separated from the fight that leads to economic, political and social change.

Equality for women in Europe means building another Europe — a Europe of social progress, democracy and peace.

(Applause)

Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, before I speak to the general tenor of the report, I should like to address some remarks to the recommendations contained in paragraph 16 of the resolution and which flow from my reports and studies into the taxation system within the Community.

The committee was pleased to note in the Commission's three-year action programme that the Commission had stated its intention to carry out a comparative analysis of the taxation systems in the member countries. My understanding is that that analysis is now well advanced and I hope that Parliament will endorse the recommendation contained in our report namely that if the Commission's analysis shows there to be inequalities, the Commission will bring forward a directive. On the basis of my own studies I am quite confident that the Commission's comparative analysis

will disclose inequalities. Indeed, I would say that in the field of taxation lie some of the greatest inequalities in the legal systems of a number of the countries of the Community, my own included. A married woman has her income treated as her husband's. She has no separate existence as a taxable person. In several countries she is not required to complete the tax form; she is merely required to inform her husband of her income and he completes the tax form. I congratulate France, which has very recently remedied that particular inequality in their system. A woman, then, has no privacy in tax affairs.

But the biggest anomaly of all is the manner in which the tax systems of some countries act either as an encouragement or a deterrent to a married woman to go out to work. In the United Kingdom the tax system positively encourages a married woman to go out to work, because where husband and wife are both at work they get a bigger allowance than where only the husband is working. That in itself seems to me to be quite an extraordinary anomaly because I would have thought that a larger allowance was needed when there was only one breadwinner maintaining the married couple and possibly the children. In Germany the position is exactly the reverse. Under the tax splitting arrangements obtaining in Germany, women are deterred from going out to work, and I am advised by some of my German colleagues on the Women's Committee that husbands very often exercise quite considerable pressure on their wives not to go out and achieve economic independence quite simply because of the nature of the tax system.

I do not think that this tax system was decided upon as a positive act of inequity or discrimination against women. I believe it is simply based on a social structure that is now thoroughly out of date and which has not, as yet, been properly reviewed, at any rate in most of the countries. I have already paid tribute to changes which France has made. Italy has also made some changes recently. In my own country there is a green paper which has now been in existence sufficiently long to be growing a certain amount of green moss and we still are battling away to get it translated into something more practical.

The recommendations which I have put forward in paragraph 16 derive from my belief that the decision whether both partners in a marriage should go out to work should be a personal one by the husband and wife and that there should be no bias in the tax system to influence that decision. I have therefore proposed that the tax system should be neutral as an interim measure which I believe that the member countries could move to fairly quickly. In the long term, I believe and I recommend that there should be a mandatory independent system of taxation for all individuals.

Shelagh Roberts

I would ask Parliament to reject the amendments which have been tabled. They are not fundamentally at variance with my proposals but, apart from the fact that in one or two instances they are not particularly clear — in one case, indeed, I have not got the faintest idea what is meant by the amendment — they tinker with detail. What I have put in this report or have attempted to do is to enunciate broad principles concerning the lines which we would wish the Commission to follow. The detail can come at a later stage. I hope that Parliament will give the go ahead to the Commission to deal vigorously and urgently with this matter. I believe myself that the achievement of economic independence within the family will strengthen the bonds of marriage, not weaken them, and that therefore this would be a very worthwhile improvement to the taxation system which would contribute to family life within the Community.

If I can turn to the main report, I would like to say at the outset that my group is wholly committed to the principle of equal treatment for men and women and we are wholly committed to a policy of securing equal opportunity for men and women. Indeed, in Denmark and the United Kingdom we have a pretty good record in that respect. I think that our actions endorse my words. Nevertheless, I do not subscribe, nor does my group subscribe, to every recommendation that is contained in the report, and Mrs Cinciari Rodano in introducing it herself referred to the fact that it was not perfect. She may differ from me in the reasons why she feels it is not perfect. I believe that some of the assertions are extravagant and some of the recommendations irrelevant. But they do not detract from the broad concept of this report which is to further equality of treatment between men and women, to which I hope the entire House will subscribe.

Now, why have I uttered criticisms of this report? The 1981 resolution ranged far and wide beyond what was within the competence of the Community, and I think that a report which is reviewing progress made on that resolution is bound to follow the same path. But I think that that is a pity. I do not believe that you can put the whole world to rights in the space of a report which is supposed to be dealing with the problems of women in the Community. For example, how can we in one and the same report be calling for improvements in the educational system within the Community and, at the same time, talk about the problems of the Third World where in many cases if a child gets a sum total of one year's schooling in the whole of his childhood he will be considered fortunate. I think that we detract from the sincerity of our concern for the people of the Third World by trying to include their problems in an exercise of this nature where we are seeking to improve the position of women in the Community, and we may as well acknowledge from the outset that with all the imperfections and inequalities in the Community, we are infinitely better off than are the people of the Third World.

I think, therefore, that we should be concentrating on the areas where we have competence and where we can make progress. The report deplores the lack of progress that has been made on the 1981 resolution. But, you know, in very large measure we have ourselves to blame for that, because we put so much into that report that we set the Commission an impossible task. Consequently, the Commission has been free to choose its own priorities. I think that the choosing of priorities should be the prerogative of Parliament. Our job is to speak up for the people of the Community. We should be enunciating the principles and indicating the priorities. Then let the executive action rest where it should be as the proper function of bureaucracy.

So I enter this plea to Parliament today; the Commission and the Council have accepted the three-year action programme. Let us build on the good will and acceptance of that programme and get it translated into reality.

It covers many, many important aspects with which we are all concerned. It aims to strengthen the rights of individuals, to extend equal treatment in the social security field and, of particular importance, in the field of occupational pensions. It deals with taxation, it deals with parental leave, it deals with monitoring the existing directives. There is a whole load of extremely useful work to be done there which would be welcomed and appreciated, I believe, by women throughout the Community.

The second plea I would utter is that we should not display excessive rigidity, that there should be flexibility. This is why there are amendments tabled in the employment section. We will not serve the cause of women well by imposing burdens on industry which industry cannot bear in times of economic recession. I have no sympathy with the sort of administrative arguments which are always advanced to the effect that 'it is not convenient' or 'the time is not right' to deal with a particular matter. I do not sympathize with administrative arguments, but I do believe that we should be practical. Parliament should be the pacesetter but not the pace-wrecker. If we try to do too much, it is my fear that we shall wreck rather than help this three-year action programme.

To achieve equality there has got to be more than legislation, although I am one of those who believe that legislation can do much to bring about a change of attitude and that you can legislate to change attitudes. It makes a contribution to doing so, but it is not the whole story. To achieve equality we have to bring about a change of attitude: a change of attitude first and foremost amongst parents as to the role for their daughters, as well as their sons; a change of attitude amongst employers and a change of attitude amongst employees; and again, perhaps just as important as amongst parents, a change of attitude in

Shelagh Roberts

schools. So, I welcome many of the recommendations on education, but I am opposed to the proposal which would deprive parents of parental choice if they wished to send their girls or their boys to a single-sex school. I think that that is going beyond the competence of the Community and will not in itself further the cause of equality of opportunity.

I do believe that persuasion and reasoned argument can do much to further the cause of equality. I believe that this Parliament has cause to be pleased that its 1981 resolution acted as a spur to bring forward the three-year action programme. I think we have cause to be proud of the zeal and concern which we have shown towards the problems of women in the lifetime of this Parliament. But, before I become too euphoric, I remind myself — and it is a somewhat sobering reflection — that the three directives specifically concerned with this problem were all in existence before the lifetime of this Parliament, and we have not, as yet, brought into being another directive, nor are we likely to do so during our five-year term.

Perhaps it is because we tried to do too much too quickly. Well, that is not in itself a bad epitaph for any Parliament, but I would like to think that the next Parliament will claim that it tried to do less and achieved more. I believe that that would be in the best interests of women in the Community.

Miss de Valera (DEP), rapporteur. — Mr President, colleagues, in my view one of the most important aspects of this report is the section dealing with education for equality. If equality is to be achieved then we must first begin to see changes in the attitudes underlying our school curricula and a greater choice of schools must be made available, such as taking measures to facilitate a fully co-educational system of further education. A review of vocational guidance is essential for girls.

I agree fully with the section in this report which calls for measures to be adopted to ensure that women are properly represented in leading administrative posts at all levels in the schools. We need further training and re-training of female staff to ensure that teachers of both sexes provide instruction in all subjects including scientific and technological subjects. I am in total agreement too with the amendment tabled by my colleague, Mrs von Alemann, on adult education.

Although there is criticism at the moment of the training courses available, some of it justified because of the lack of coordination between those running the courses and those involved in local industry, I am happy that Commissioner Richard gave me the assurance that in reviewing the European Social Fund those who would benefit from these courses would not simply be those who are between the ages of 16 and 18, but that it would be extended to the age of 25.

At a time of recession and with the implementation of new technology it is women who will suffer most in the job market. So the training for women in new technologies is vital. We need positive measures in all employment sectors currently undergoing technological reorganization and to increase awareness of those changes among the social partners and among women's movements. Special attention must be given to providing specific measures for vocational training for women who are self-employed, particularly in agriculture, business and the craft trades with particular reference to business management.

Specific measures for the employment of women are necessary. This can be done by offering low interest loans and tax incentives to small and medium-sized enterprises and the craft trades and by granting aid for the organization of cooperatives. At every opportunity in such debates as these I have proposed that these areas — the small and medium-sized enterprises, the craft sector and cooperatives — should be encouraged as the opportunity is greatest in these areas for women. But in order that we may develop along these lines, subsidies must be granted to the Member States to develop infrastructures and social services, especially in the less well-off regions of the Community so that local industries may be established and further necessary services such as crèches, pre-school and nursery school facilities may be laid on.

We need integrated development programmes in regions of high levels of unemployment. In my own report I have asked that a check-list be drawn up so that the areas of most need may be highlighted and in order that the financial allocations to the Member States from the Regional Fund may be continually monitored to ensure that unemployed women receive the financial commitment necessary to find employment in their local area. In my opinion drafted for the Women's Committee on the review of the Regional Fund which I presented to this Parliament, I called for a specific reference to women and young people so that women for the first time were recognized as having an equal right to Regional Fund financial allocation with men. I am happy to say that this Parliament supported me in this matter and I can only deplore therefore the slowness of the Council in amending the Regional Fund regulation to include the specific mention of women and young people in this regard.

The area of reorganization of working time could be of great benefit to the employment of women and I would support such pilot projects as are mentioned in the report. I also favour a general directive being adopted to regulate voluntary part-time work and the new forms of flexible working hours. I totally agree with paragraph 66 of the report which calls on the Commission to conduct a study into the economic and social value of work in the home and the likely legal implications, particularly as regards social security rights.

de Valera

A major criticism which I have of this report is that there is not enough attention paid to the plight of those single women who may have given up their job and career to care for elderly relatives and who find it difficult — indeed some find it impossible — to obtain employment when after a period of absence they wish to return to the workplace. Much discrimination against such women is in evidence. We must ensure that action is taken to eradicate such injustices.

There are other criticisms which I could level at this report and indeed I hold some reservations about some of the paragraphs, but on the whole I believe it to be a useful document for a number of reasons — not least that it has created an interest in the media about the problems pertaining to women from education to employment. It has highlighted the need for specific information programmes to inform women of legislative initiatives which affect them, taken at both Community and national level. There has been much debate as to whether there should have been a Women's Committee here in the first place, but I have always agreed with that committee and the existence of that committee and I would urge that the Parliament elected in 1984 set up a permanent committee to carry on our work and I also appeal to the Member States to take note of the work done by our committee. I also appeal to the media present to cover the many subjects referred to in this report and to recognize that it has a wide term of reference. In highlighting the many areas under discussion they will be helping this Parliament to further inform women on how to attack the many problems from education to employment.

Mr Estgen (EPP), rapporteur. — (DE) I am departing from my usual pattern and making my remarks in German today in deference to German television which considered this debate important enough to be broadcast in full. I believe this to be no mean contribution towards a change in attitudes and therefore also to the work of education for equality of opportunity for women in Europe.

Colleagues, a German psychologist wrote a paper with the title 'What keeps women from power?', which could be a heading for all the work of the Committee of Inquiry. I would give a rather simplistic, but not I think fundamentally erroneous, reply to this question and say, firstly, the narrow-minded fears and prejudices of many men, secondly, the fanatical, aggressive inhibitions of some women and thirdly, the mistakes made in the education of girls and also of boys.

For years the supporters of women's rights, sociologists, psychologists, journalists and politicians have been trying to get women to commit themselves to their own cause and to make it clear to men that democracy and technology, war and peace are not their province alone. All in all we have had little success. We cannot deny that in spite of very good

beginnings we still have an authoritarian patriarchal society. To my mind the reason for the slow pace of female emancipation lies in education and training. I am thinking primarily of education in the family. Since in many cases it is the mother who is the first if not the only teacher of daughters as well as sons, it is possible to say that it is often women who keep women from power, that it is often the mother who prevents the daughter from achieving equality. Perhaps this is even the subconscious reason why there is often so little solidarity among women. Women do not trust women.

My investigations are not confined to the family, they also extend to the field of education in the Member States of the Community. I know that some States consider that education is nothing to do with the Community, but when it affects the area of human rights in general, and I believe the educational opportunities of women do touch upon human rights in general, then it is a matter for the Community.

My inquiries covered two fields: firstly, on the formal side: is there any Member State which does not comply with the provisions relating to the education of women or in which there is resistance to them? Here I have to say that generally speaking there is not! Things are however very different in the second area of inquiry, namely the spirit in which these provisions and directives are implemented. It is in this field that there seems to me to be a lack of conviction, an absence of inspired and inspiring initiatives. We do not need any more liberating legal provisions on education for women, what we need is a positive open-minded attitude towards them. I think that in the field of education it is essential to have a goal. The education of both boys and girls must put them in a position where they are equally able to perform their obligations within the family and within society so that they become real partners capable of a critical and constructive attitude to the problems of society and their responsibilities as marriage partners and parents. In the same way that we must teach girls in school that they do not necessarily lose their femininity by changing the piston on a car or by solving a computer problem, we must also teach boys to cook and make it clear to them that there is nothing dishonourable in sewing on a button, cleaning shoes, making the bed or changing a child's nappy.

(Applause)

I am genuinely deeply convinced that women are no less intelligent, no less skilled, no less capable than men. On the contrary! They are probably in a position to take over the task of leadership and to surpass men. Margaret Thatcher is a shining example of this, even if we Europeans are not entirely happy about it.

Simone Weil was a great president of this Parliament. I leave you to compare her with the men.

(Applause)

Estgen

Women are also able to do so-called typically male jobs. Millions of women demonstrated that during the war. In addition they can bear children and nurse them. If society really wants to educate more women according to their abilities then it must give them more active support and have more understanding for their totally different starting points.

If we want to have real women in leading positions in society and not just hard, cold, masculine women then their education must take more account of their actual situation than it has done so far. This includes trying to do justice to the role of mother in advanced and further education — and in the later stages of schooling — in a way which does not damage the family.

For me as rapporteur there remains ultimately one worrying, even oppressive question. Ladies, please do not misunderstand me: I am afraid of the neurotic desire for uniformity which characterizes our time. Should we not once more learn to accept differences? The madness for uniformity as we find it in the Greek fable of Procrustes terrifies me. Do we not need, especially in education, the saviour Theseus? I would give a great deal if someone could give me a definite answer to the question of whether the brain has sexual characteristics.

(Protest)

Are we inflicting intellectual castration on both sexes by our obsessive desire for uniformity?

(Laughter)

I do not know the answer to this but as an educationist I am disturbed. Should sexuality, which marks the very fibres, really be reduced to physiology and a few hormones? In other words, should the contribution of women in the family, in the State, at work, in politics, extend only to a quantitative instead of also to a qualitative expansion of capabilities? If women were in control would there not after all be a better relationship between economy and ecology, between the desire for profit and social ethics as well as a substantially different policy for peace? Is the emancipation of women concerned only with apeing men? That would be a pity! If there is in nature the typically female as well as the typically male a place will have to be found in education not for a role-specific dimension, but for a sex-specific one — unlike things so far. But my enquiries in the Member States did not find any current studies in this direction.

The polarity between man and woman is one of the happiest experiences in love and eroticism. Could it not also be so in genuine partnership and mutual cooperative fairness in work, society and politics? Finally I appeal to the men. The emancipation of women is too important to society for us to leave it to women alone. Sleeping Beauty is stirring after her long sleep and waiting for man's kiss to free her!

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

Mrs Macciocchi (S), rapporteur. — *(IT)* Madam President let us have done, therefore, with this talk of the Sleeping Beauty and the Prince's kiss, which is nonsense within the framework of this debate. We are not asleep, we are ultra-awake, Mr Estgen; we are women with a long battle history, and a long history of awareness.

My report, which is entitled 'The position of women in the decision-making centres', deals in effect with many problems that have already been referred to. And when all is said and done, I should like to remind members that our century opened with a declaration that was never more widely publicized, nor more dishonoured. I mean the declaration to the effect that it was within the power of every cook to become Prime Minister. The truth is that cooks do the cooking — just as it is equally true that the level of civilization of a society is marked by the position that women occupy in that society. This also was a famous declaration that was dishonoured, except by a few States. As someone has reminded us, it is now 1984: Orwell's year. There is no shortage of 'Big Brothers': indeed, there are any number of them, and they are on the offensive with their reminders that women are best employed in the 'Ministry of Love and Procreation'. Today we are at a stage of history that is different from that which followed the great, enthusiastic first wave of feminism that unleashed energies in the forefront of European life. We are at a stage that, in my writings years ago, I called post-feminism, in which woman proclaims herself once more inside and not outside the institutions, and wants a place in the decision-making centres. 1979 was the key year, the turning point, with the elections to the European Parliament by universal suffrage, and the election of a woman, Mrs Veil, as its president. Today we can well assess the importance of all that: this Parliament, 16% of the members of which are women, is the one which, with the exception of Denmark, has the greatest number of women in its chamber.

The size of the female presence at Strasbourg, however, only serves in contrast to emphasize the scarcity of women in the national governments, and their total absence in the Commission of the European Communities. In the governments, out of a total of 187 ministers there are only 16 women, that is to say 8.5% of the total figure; out of 222 Secretaries and Under-Secretaries of State, there are only 16 women, or 7.1%. Despite the fact that we have on various occasions explicitly made known our wish that the Commission should number a woman amongst its members, it is still a completely male organization, like some kind of great Last Supper, or great synod, that still does not allow female membership. And this

Macciocchi

is in contradiction to its own directives, such as the one on 'Equality of opportunity' that was approved on 11 February 1980. This is a problem on which the Commission will be giving us — I hope — an answer.

In the national parliaments the number of women in no way truly reflects the extent of their participation in political life. In many countries — despite the fact that the parties of the Left, as in France, claim to have reached a quorum of women members — it is quite impossible for women to prove their worth in this way. Now, if we add together the number of women in the two chambers in each of the ten countries in the Community, the highest percentage is found in Denmark, with 23.46 %. The lowest is in Greece, with 4.33 %. In descending order between the two countries referred to above, we find Holland, Germany, Belgium, France, the UK and Italy. The percentage fell, so far as my inquiry shows, round about 1969-1970, when there was a wave of refusal on the part of the feminist movement to take part in politics, which caused a kind of apartheid to develop between women and politics that has however been overcome today in this new fight, this new feminist struggle, this 'neofeminism'.

With regard to these percentages I was astounded to find, as I drew up this report, that — with the exception of the UK — in various countries, so far as the presence of women in parliament is concerned, we are going back to the figures for forty years ago. In West Germany, for example, in 1983 we find the same number of women members of parliament as in 1979, or 9.8 %. Some strange explanations of this phenomenon are sometimes produced: women don't vote for women, male candidates are preferred to female ones, and so on. But the truth is that, in the political struggle today women lack money, and lack the protective clans of the parties to make their electoral campaigns easier. They always lack, everywhere, that basic solidarity on the part of those who, despite that, still declare in their electoral slogans that they wish to give women the role that they deserve.

My inquiry is concerned also with the cultural sectors. As an educated woman I have tried making enquiries within the university, and I have discovered also that, following the spread of new technology, horizontal and vertical segregation is accentuated in the universities, in consequence partly of the old division between the humanities and the exact sciences. In West Germany, out of 28 220 university professors and teachers in large schools, there are only 1 491 women — a proportion of 5.28 %. In the University of Rome, out of 11 000 students every year half are women: but this half are virtually all of them humanities students — only 10 % of them read science. One of the women university professors we interviewed for this inquiry told us that there will be no role for women in the society of the future, and that they would be destined to submit passively to the changes produced

by technological progress, and will remain once more shut out. In the UK, out of 3 742 university professors, there are only 102 women, or under 3 %; of these, 1 % are in engineering, 2 % in architecture and 25 % in commerce and administration. France has undoubtedly the highest level, with 8 % of professors holding chairs at the university, and 35 % of women who are only university lecturers: of these, 16 % hold chairs in literature, and 5 % in science and medicine. Out of 754 'Education and Research Units' (U.E.R.) in France, only 44 go to women. However, it must be recognized that it was France that offered a woman, Mrs Helen Ahrweiler, the presidency of Paris University; that there is a woman university president at Angers, and that there are two women rectors.

As far as the political parties are concerned, the proportion of women — who often represent well over a third of the party membership — never exceeds 17.5 % in the executive bodies. We were informed that 'as soon as the number of women exceeds 20 % in an executive body of the party, it means that the decisions are taken elsewhere'.

Of the 17 European trade union organizations that replied to the inquiry, all of them have less than 10 % of women in the management committees, and only five trade unions have slightly over 10 %.

The powerful Confederation of German civil servants — with 815 515 members, 26 % of whom are women — has not even one woman amongst the four members of the executive Secretariat, and only one woman in the president's office, which has 31 members. Under these circumstances we can indeed speak of the 'trade union feminism' of the CGIL, whose 144-strong central committee has 11.8 % women members.

Where the mass media are concerned, in the great television networks, which are the nerve centre of consensus and power, women are kept on one side, in some cases with the argument — at one time used by Mussolini — that their voices are less persuasive, less dictatorial. In West Germany, out of 17 % of women journalists, 13 % work in radio, television and the newspapers, and 26 % in women's magazines. In the newspapers, the same thing happens: women are not political commentators — they are only, as in the case of 'Le Monde' or 'Repubblica' employed as special correspondents. There is only one woman departmental manager in each of the newspapers mentioned. We have to praise once again the good example set by France which offers — with Michèle Cotta, the High Commissioner for Radio and Television, and Christine Ockrent, who provides the daily political comment on Antenne 2 — two unique examples of the success of women in the mass media. In the diplomatic field, which is one of the most closed careers, neither Italy nor Greece has a woman ambassador. In Denmark and in Germany there are only two, in the UK three, and four in France. Taken

Macciocchi

overall, amongst the ten Member States, there are no more than 6 % of women in the whole European diplomatic corps. The most significant step forward in Europe has taken place in the field of law. In France, after the most recent promotions, 1 750 out of 5 605 magistrates are women — over 31 %. One woman, Mme Rozes, has been appointed President of the Appeal Court, and Mme Ezratty has been put in charge of the judicial administration. In the UK, there are 10 000 women lay Justices of the Peace, out of a total of 26 000.

I will conclude, Madam President, by saying that feminine ambition is rising again in politics, and in the universities. As Chateaubriand said, 'Ambition is something that all men have, but it guides small minds, whereas great minds guide it'. I will end on that note, without in this case quoting either Rosa Luxemburg or that great mind, Madame De Stael. Instead I shall remind you of what was said by the Spanish Saint Teresa d'Ávila when she declared 'There is no cure for our ambition', in defiance of the Bishop of Piacenza who forbade her to teach, calling her a 'vagabond and rebel'. And so, too, are we 'vagabonds and rebels' sometimes, as we go from one point to another in Europe, determined to occupy those decision-making positions to which we are entitled within the world of political 'education'. Seeing that we have to put up with all the hard knocks that politics deals out, all its upsets and all its bitterness, we are by the same token worthy to assume all the responsibilities for policy in the centres of power where decisions are made.

President. — I am very happy — and here I believe I am speaking for us all — to welcome the President-in-Office, Mrs Roudy, whom we know of course as a colleague. In giving her the floor we consider it important to consider her, in a sense, as still being a colleague.

We trust that the Council presidency will give the closest consideration to one of the issues to which this Parliament is most deeply attached, that of European unity.

(Applause)

Mrs Roudy, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(FR)* Madam President, Honourable Members and, if you will allow me to say as much, dear friends, it was with great pleasure and interest that I accepted your invitation to attend this sitting on the report from the Committee of inquiry on the situation of women in Europe. This, in a way, is the continuation of the work we began together.

You have done a considerable amount of work because it has taken more than two years and been an opportunity to pay detailed attention to the institutional, social, economic, political and cultural

machinery whereby the women of each of our countries are in situations that are sometimes a long way from those to which they are legally entitled.

My presence here today, as the French government Minister for women's rights, is a significant illustration of our desire to recognize women's rights in all sectors of economic, political, social and cultural life.

I studied all these reports with great interest and I should like to tell you what my reactions to them are. But I have to congratulate Mrs Cinciari Rodano and all the rapporteurs on their high standard of work and the virtually exhaustive manner in which the subject has been treated. When I read this mass of documents, I rather felt we had at least 10 years' work ahead.

All the reports emphasized the fact that the progress made with women's affairs in the seventies was fragile progress. I think the economic crisis that all our countries are still experiencing to one degree or another makes it even more fragile and we therefore have to be even more on our guard and boost our efforts so as not only to preserve what has been achieved, but to foster progress too. Everyone knows that, in a period of crisis, attitudes are even more of a problem for women. In these difficult times, developing their autonomy is even more of a problem. And yet, in spite of the crisis, more women work today — although they are, as we know, far more prey than men to unemployment.

It would therefore be tempting — and the idea, as we know, is current in some circles — to seek a way out of the crisis and to keep the division of roles whereby women are only in second place in sectors demanding the poorest qualifications and therefore paying the poorest wages.

The government to which I have belonged for the past two and a half years considers, on the contrary, that women have to play a full part in developing the country, shouldering their responsibilities with equal rights. This idea will guide me in my work on the Council. However, I should like to tell you that, as soon as I was appointed to the government, one of my priorities for my ministry was the defence of women's employment, women's training and women's information — that is to say a search for equal opportunity in all areas.

It is to look into the different proposals on campaigning against unemployment among Europe's women that I shall be inviting the European ministers of labour, employment and social affairs to a meeting, on 8 March, on Community action for women's employment in a European context of economic, technological and social change.

(Applause)

Roudy

This is the framework within which I intend dealing with the priorities that Mrs Maij-Weggen has just proposed. You see, Mrs Maij-Weggen, we think alike.

I expect a lot of this meeting, of course, and I hope, during the French presidency, to succeed with a specific scheme to combat unemployment among women in Europe and encourage positive action.

As I said earlier, women's work has always been a special sector with its own characteristics — particularly poor qualifications and, as a direct consequence, low wages.

Unemployment is higher among women than men in a period of crisis. Unemployment among women has its own characteristics and it should therefore be studied and handled in its own particular way.

Social programmes are vital, but we have to go further and make the campaign against unemployment much more economic in content.

Would aid for employment, soft loans and tax relief for small and medium-sized businesses encourage the development of work for women? This is an idea I found in your reports.

It could well be so. But I, for one, have opted for other ideas, in particular an increase in significant, positive schemes, a range of specific training schemes in all fields where opportunity is not equal and, above all, the development of plans for professional equality that can be negotiated by employers and workers in a firm, with the most significant plans receiving state aid. This is one of the very important aspects of the law on professional equality I managed to have adopted in my country on 13 July 1983.

(Applause)

I am in particular agreement with Mrs Paola Gaiotti when she says that the guidance-training-placing trio conditions any equal opportunities scheme.

We should not content ourselves with strictly defensive action here. The Athens seminar came up with proposals that seem to me to be worth looking into.

With this law I had adopted on 13 July 1983, France has given itself what I consider to be an original instrument in the field of the defence and development of job opportunity. I shall tell you about it briefly, because I think it is important.

The text does not confine itself to acknowledging the principle of equality in employment. It does not confine itself to setting out the general principles of non-discrimination in job appointments, promotion or dismissal either. It does, in particular, do away with the 'legitimate reason' for refusing a candidate that used to exist in France and employers used to use when they wanted to keep women out of certain types of job.

Another original thing about this law is that, in cases of individual discrimination, judges can rule that measures to restore equal treatment must be introduced.

Furthermore, in cases of dispute, it is no longer up to the employee to supply proof of discrimination; it is up to the employer to disprove it. This is a reversal of the burden of proof I saw you called for in your text. We have also introduced the possibility of trade unions going to court on the employee's behalf (unless she objects) and claiming respect for her rights.

The new law also gives a more thorough definition of the equal value of work. This adds precision to the previous law on equal wages which so far, alas, has been of no use whatsoever. In the new law, we say that jobs demanding a comparable amount of professional know-how — diplomas or experience — responsibility or physical or nervous stamina must be recognized as of equal value.

But I wanted to go further and bring practical instruments of implementation and control into the law. So, each year, firms will now have to supply a report on the comparative situation of men and women and this will be a basis for a professional equality plan providing for temporary measures to enable women to catch up. This is one of the most dynamic parts of the new law.

Lastly, this law creates a permanent forum for social debate as it institutes a higher council for professional equality, combining employers and trade union representatives, which will help define and monitor the policy which the Ministry for Women's Rights implements in the matter of professional equality.

I also think it is vital to have the right instruments in the employment services. It is vital to improve the employment offices and make them aware of specifically female problems. This is one of the conditions of the effectiveness of any campaign to combat unemployment among women. This is why I have appointed someone in the offices of the regional labour and employment directors to take charge of improving the way women are received and guided in local employment exchanges.

Mrs van den Heuvel wants to see a more precise definition of the notion of indirect discrimination and the third directive extended to fields not yet covered. I think this is a most interesting proposal.

I was very interested to read Mrs Heidemarie Wiczorek-Zeul's report on the reduction and reorganization of working time. Indeed, you recently adopted a resolution here in the European Parliament calling for a 10 % reduction in working time to be phased in. This seems to me to be moving along the right lines.

Roudy

As far as part-time work is concerned, it is my belief that we need a European directive setting out workers' rights. In France, part-time workers have had exactly the same status as full-time employees since 1982. The rules say that part-time employment is a matter of choice and that it cannot be forced upon the worker or used as grounds for dismissal.

But should we not also be planning to develop full-time work with short daily timetables as part of the modernization and restructuring of our firms? This is something that should not be overlooked. For the moment, we in France are meeting individual requests for part-time employment linked to such things as the birth of a child. This is why the French parliament adopted a law last year to improve our legislation on parental leave and introduce total equality between parents. This now means that both parents are entitled to suspend their contracts of employment or work on a half-time basis for two years so as to be able to care for their child alternately or together.

This is an interesting law because, as Sylvie Le Roux said, the infrastructure provided for young children is vital because childbirth is a crucial time when it comes to social and professional discrimination against women. This law reflects the priority most of the rapporteurs suggested should be put on encouraging the sharing of family responsibilities.

I share Mrs Spaak's concern about work in the home and I should like to see studies run on this subject.

One point raised by your rapporteurs worries me particularly and that is the problem of night work attendant on technological developments. Is our protective legislation not applied today? Will our protection not exclude women from certain new occupations? This is something we should think about seriously.

The introduction of new technologies can, I believe, be an opportunity and a challenge for women. In her excellent report, Antoinette Spaak emphasized the urgency of running schemes to make people aware of this problem. She suggests a directive making information science a compulsory subject for both boys and girls. That, I think, is an excellent idea. In France, at a recent colloquy on information science and education, the Ministry of Education announced various projects along these lines.

Mr Estgen's conclusions tie in with what my ministry has been doing with its information campaigns and schemes to change the educational guidance given to girls. I am running joint schemes with the Ministry of Education — and we have the support of the local authorities here — to train teachers and combat sexist stereotypes in school textbooks.

But attitudes will not change so fast. It has to be realized that this is a long-term affair and we therefore have to start in early childhood.

Mrs Maij-Weggen proposed organizing a conference of education ministers to discuss girls' education. I am taking this idea up and I shall put it to my colleague, the Minister of Education.

Mrs von Alemann's concern about vocational training parallels the aims of the policy of my ministry.

At a time when the prodigious development of the new technologies is about to transform our economy, we must, above all, ensure that women are offered training courses in modern techniques. And as I have already said, instead of fearing the effects of the new technologies, we should take their side and find a way of turning them into a new opportunity for women. It is with this in mind that I shall do my best to implement exemplary schemes by taking over the running and remuneration of pilot courses to train women in these new technologies.

In addition to these measures, which are intended to help women catch up, we have set up various one-off schemes to enable them to train for and obtain employment in areas traditionally reserved for men. Vocational training should make the diversification of employment possible and also ensure that women can be redeployed in sectors where there is work. The professional equality plans I already mentioned are an additional instrument for developing female participation in in-service training and preparing a switch to other fields.

The last, and by no means least, advantage of the law on professional equality which I have been concentrating on is that it encourages employers and employees to shoulder responsibility by involving them in the drive to adapt to the new technologies.

I agree with Mrs Maij-Weggen's criticism of the old European Social Fund. Undeniably, women have benefited less than men from the European Social Fund, although European women, particularly the young ones, are harder hit by unemployment. The Fund's new policies seem to me to be more helpful and I hope that the focus on young people is not to the detriment of women. I myself intend launching a broad information campaign on the Fund's new approach and I shall be telling the regional delegates in my country all about the Community instruments.

As I have already said on a number of occasions — and here I go along with the ideas in Gloria Hooper's report — there is no point in having rights if people do not know about them or they are not recognized.

This is why I have made information one of the key sectors of my ministry. And I have not hesitated to run large government campaigns, using modern means of communication, to inform the public about contraception, about professional equality and, currently, about vocational guidance for girls.

Roudy

These campaigns have been very favourably received and they have had excellent results.

The associations, lastly, which should not be forgotten, have a very important part to play. I wanted this part to be even more important in my country, which is why women's associations proposing programmes for women have had state aid over the past two and a half years — my budget enables me to finance specific schemes and assist the most dynamic associations.

There are now also four times as many information centres on women's rights as there used to be and more than 30 000 copies of a monthly bulletin from the ministry are distributed all over France. The wives of tradesmen and craftsmen have not been forgotten. Since 1982, they have been able to opt for the professional status of their choice — associate, employee or assistant of their spouse.

The status of women in agriculture is now also being looked into.

Dame Shelagh Roberts has made a long-term objective of separate taxation for men and women. I share her concern and I must say that an excellent report on independent taxation for women by a French woman MP has just been transmitted to the Prime Minister.

But married women who go to work already have tax relief on the costs of child-minding.

I also think that Mrs Lenz's idea of a report on the situation of women in the European institutions is quite an interesting one.

I shall conclude my remarks with Mrs Macciocchi's report, which suggests that progress — albeit inadequate — has been achieved as regards women obtaining posts of responsibility. As we well know, there are any number of women stuck in subordinate posts and only a handful in leading ones. The idea of a European conference on power-sharing seems to me to be an interesting one! I have already met my Swedish counterpart to talk about this and we decided, she and I, that we would discuss power and power-sharing in the autumn.

For all too many women, the idea of taking power is still taboo and only rare ones dare to try. Women are trapped in stereotypes of submission and the only power they ever get is what people are willing to give them. For them, power is either clandestine or delegated or illicit. The number of women in this Parliament, as we are well aware, is quite exceptional. And we are also aware that women will only have genuine influence on the institutions when they take up at least a third of the seats in this House — pending 50 %, which would be quite legitimate.

Madam President, Honourable Members, dear friends, during the coming six months, the French presidency

will be an opportunity for me to propose to the Community a series of measures that I have already started implementing in my country. I have listened carefully to your proposals and I shall get the maximum amount of inspiration from them. I do not underestimate the obstacles in my path. I can, unfortunately, not stay this afternoon, and I am sorry about it, but I shall be told about the rest of the debate. You know you can count on me and I know I can count on you.

(Applause)

Mrs Vayssade (S). — *(FR)* Madam President, first of all allow me to welcome the fact that the first appearance of the French presidency in this House should be for a debate on women. I hope this augurs well for the completion of our work.

(Applause)

Three years after the 1981 debate and five months, to the day for my country, from the European elections, I should like to stress the importance of this debate — something of which, I believe, we are all aware.

The defence of women's rights and action for the promotion of equality has been one of the most positive things this Parliament has done. I would go so far as to say that this was made possible by the action of the women MPs themselves and that the socialists, who twice took the initiative of setting up a special committee on these problems, cannot but feel content at the effectiveness of the procedure.

The possibility these committees have had of putting constant pressure on both the Commission and the Council has been an effective instrument as far as women are concerned and, after this experience, it seems to us to be vital for the Parliament that is elected in a few months' time to have a permanent committee on women's affairs. I am afraid that, unless this happens, women's problems will be put off forever.

(Applause)

The text before you today is not perfect. It is a compromise as in any text we draw up. But, on behalf of the socialists, I can tell you that we think it is sound as it stands and we hope that there will be a few amendments as possible so that the strength and the logic of it are maintained.

I should like to stress those points we feel to be most important, starting with women's employment.

This is to the fore — the majority of the rapporteurs have stressed it — both because the structural presence of women on the labour market has become irreversible and because almost every woman will work throughout or at some time in her life. And also because women are very much affected by the economic crisis and the ongoing changes in industry.

Vayssade

So we attach the greatest importance to anything that affects employment and unemployment — vocational guidance and training for women, proper access for women to the new technologies and the reduction and reorganization of working time. Care must be taken to ensure that working conditions and equal treatment remain a reality in the world of work and that, whenever we talk about altering protective legislation, it is not to the detriment of women, but for the benefit of men — who could perhaps have the protection women have enjoyed so far.

This means ensuring that the existing texts are applied. We found, in the course of our enquiries, that this was still not the case in all our countries. But we also need new legal instruments — and I put in a very strong plea for a draft directive on positive schemes to be prepared as soon as possible, for I believe we have to implement positive schemes for women in all our countries and I believe we have to have a legal framework in which to do so.

I also believe that no time should be lost in abolishing indirect discrimination and reversing the burden of proof in all our countries. We also need to provide for training in rights and I think that initiatives and information meetings across Europe could be useful for women in all walks of life.

Money, of course, is required and women must have their rightful place when the European Social Fund and the Regional Fund are reformed. The effectiveness of Community funds must be practical and analyses must be made by sex, by region and by age to see exactly how they are used.

The second major demand the socialists are making is for women to be recognized as individuals in their own right. This is important for social security and tax purposes. But emphasis should be placed on something that has not been mentioned — family life and, above all, the solitude experienced by women. It would be a good thing to look into the Community measures on the custody of children, the recovery of sums due and — why not? We propose as much in an amendment — a compensation fund for unpaid alimony.

Women also want to be active in the social and political spheres. I shall not return to this, as Mrs Macciocchi discussed it at length, but it is one of our essential concerns. A Community action programme was adopted in 1982 and texts are now ready or being drawn up. So I turn to the President of the Council to ask if, at the same time as it discusses unemployment among women, something we are all pleased to see it do, it could also make decisive headway with the adoption of texts that are already drafted and should now be adopted by the Council. I believe that all women would be satisfied if, in the coming months, decisive progress could be made with directives on parental leave, part-time work, voluntary part-time work and status of women in agriculture.

After the progress the Commission has made possible, and provided the legal instruments are combined with voluntarist instruments of intervention, Europe of the Ten will be able to remain a Community of progressive law for all the women who live in it.

(Applause)

Mrs Phlix (PPE). — *(NL)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, members of the Council, members of the Commission, we have listened to Mrs Roudy with interest. To our surprise, however, her statement essentially concerned French policy. I hope she will not take it amiss when I say that we would have preferred it if she had told us how, as a member of the Council, she intends to safeguard the wide range of women's interests at European level.

Today the outcome of the activities of the Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe is being submitted for your approval. The committee has discussed and explained all the various aspects of the matter. I do not intend to repeat everything here. The change in the position occupied by women is perhaps one of the most important features of social evolution in the western world in the twentieth century. This evolution has clearly left its mark on the whole social system, but it is striking how few of our male colleagues are present, how little interest they are taking, with a few exceptions, who prove the rule. Is this not confirmation of discrimination?

This motion for a resolution, Madam, gentlemen, is the outcome of consultations among the members of the parliamentary committee. It is true that a group which takes on the task of bringing about changes and improvements in its living conditions is bound by solidarity, which is absolutely essential. But this in no way means that women lack independence, that they would renounce their own ideology for the sake of their womanhood and would not strive after an image of society of their own. I cannot agree with Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul on this. It is not enough to be a woman: she must have a clear view of society, and I expect this to be reflected in the vote this evening.

If I may be allowed, I shall explain a number of basic views. For many women the traditional pattern of the roles played by men and women has resulted in very painful situations, which do not comply with the most elementary form of social justice. But we are convinced that the disadvantages will not be removed by imposing a different pattern. We believe everyone has a duty to enter into a social commitment. The way in which this finds expression should conform to the individual's capacities, possibilities and views on achieving happiness for himself and those for whom he is responsible.

When we are then asked, as we were yesterday by the women journalists, whether we think every woman

Phlix

has a duty to work, we must first define what work is. Every kind of work has its own qualities and difficulties. The employment of women has been referred to several times here, but it is not worthy of women that they should be regarded as a reserve for the labour market, a reserve that is gradually written off. Secondly, work as a self-employed person, in her own firm or as a helper in a small or medium-sized firm or on a farm, where women work very hard but in a totally dependent position and without any legal status. Thirdly, work in the family home, which we believe must be shared as the married couple choose, but which has so far been completely underrated, or not rated at all, despite its great importance for the well-being of men, children *and* women.

So there is still a great deal to be done. The family must have the chance in our society to live as a family and to develop. Hence the proposals concerning taxation, which in many countries penalizes marriage.

We believe that new technologies, scientific progress, must be placed at the service of mankind and its well-being, but not at any price. Here again, things must be seen in perspective. If we deny young people a training in new technologies now, they will suffer in the future. On the other hand, a high price sometimes has to be paid for going along with recent scientific developments in the name of social progress. I will quote here the example of the study made in the Federal Republic into the cause of the birth of handicapped children, which appears to lie in the artificial induction of labour, of a birth. I consider that a very high price to pay. Although I am convinced of the need for back-up social services, I must warn against an overly paternalistic attitude that curbs the development of the personality and reduces the individual's ability to defend himself.

This resolution, Madam, gentlemen, is the embryo of a European policy, and women hope that the present directives will be applied and that the rate at which existing inequalities are eliminated will be speeded up. Gentlemen, whether or not here present, you need not worry: women do not want to replace you. What they want is to join with you in constructing a society in which justice and happiness reign.

Mr Brok (EPP). — *(DE)* Madam President, colleagues. The work of the Committee of Inquiry and this debate have shown that prejudice against women at work, in society and in politics is far from being abolished and that the concept of partnership has still not become universally applied in practice, and I say this with a slight feeling of guilt on my wife's birthday.

I think that we must in fact change the understanding of roles. In small practical things this means the division of the burden of family and housekeeping, as well as increased job opportunities for women, but it does not mean that women have to be forced one-

sidedly into wage-earning. I consider it imperative that the social, legal and financial conditions be created for men and women to have the possibility of making a choice, for them to decide whether to take up a career or to concentrate on child-rearing for a certain time. In this case concentration on child-rearing must receive greater social recognition. The man or the woman who takes this on must receive an independent right to a pension. By this I mean the men and women who are prepared to raise the children who will later earn to pay the pensions of the women who have not devoted themselves to raising children. I believe that these men, and more especially these women, really do have such a right to an independent pension. This also implies the introduction of family benefits.

I should like to consider the question of work and jobs more closely. At the present time it is women in particular who are affected by unemployment and among the young unemployed it is the girls who are particularly affected. In this area of working life there really is no equality. The question of equal wages, of promotion chances, the creation of jobs, must be countered by the reorganization of working time. This includes social security rights for part-time workers and the possibility of job-sharing. It should be possible for men and not just women to use these opportunities in the true sense of partnership where the financial base of the family incomes makes this possible.

I have the feeling that up till now unions and employers have been far too unimaginative where the reorganization of working time is concerned. On the other hand it must be said that many women who decide to work part-time for personal reasons — and not just because there is no other possibility — have no opportunity to do so and that we must give them this opportunity so that they can fulfil themselves in the family and at work as they themselves decide.

The question of shorter working hours undoubtedly belongs here as this is an important subject in the battle against unemployment. We should not however concentrate only on the 35-hour week. In my view unemployment, and female unemployment in particular, is only used as an excuse for introducing certain ideological attitudes into the debate. Shorter working hours means finding flexible solutions according to the needs of the sector and the size of undertaking and not in the sense of Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul — Heidi's lawn-mower for eliminating jobs by means of one-sided solutions!

I found it characteristic that in her speech there was virtually nothing in the section on shorter working hours which dealt with the question of costs. I found the way in which she demonstrated to the plenary her antipathy to technology thoroughly irritating. Other speeches, including that of the Presidency, did in my

Brok

view make it clear that women must also be given the possibility of developing new opportunities with the new technologies. The new technologies are not ogres, they do in fact offer the possibility of women's creating better job opportunities.

This means that we must also allow women the chance of training. If Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul is advocating legal action in her report then I think it is to the two sides of industry that we have to speak on the subject of shorter working hours. Mr Breit, the President of the German Trades Union Association, criticizes the German Chancellor for his critical attitude towards the 35-hour week, because it interferes with the independence of wage agreements, but Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul is proposing a solution which will put independent wage agreements out of action by legal means! We should, I believe, give women a chance to find their place in society and at work, but we should not use the disadvantaged situation of women to destroy the foundations of the economy and thereby destroy jobs for men and women!

(Applause from the centre)

Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul (S). — *(DE)* A point of procedure: Mr Brok could perhaps have read the written report in which we expressly state that it is precisely because of the low wages paid to women that it is particularly important for the incomes of the lower and intermediate wage brackets to be safeguarded in any reduction in working hours!

President. — That is not a point of order, Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul.

Mrs Focke (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, colleagues. The report of the Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe and today's debate come at just the right time: to put a stop to conservative tendencies in Europe which are trying to undermine equality of rights — and we have just heard a very clear example of this; to make clear to women in the European Community the advantages to be gained from the action programme of the European Community and above all from the European Community policy on directives — directives on equal pay, directives on equal conditions of work, above all on equal rights in matters of social security; and to make dilatory governments move faster, to get them to introduce new legislation.

This applies particularly to the government of the Federal Republic of Germany and — dear Mr Brok — what counts is not elegant speeches on the saving effect of part-time work, nor the prettifying of new technology, nor demagogic tirades against the 35-hour week, what counts is deeds in Bonn! The EC Commission has in fact brought an action against the Federal Republic of Germany in the European Court of Justice because the EC harmonizing law which trans-

poses the European Directives is entirely unsatisfactory. In addition three German women have brought an action before the European Court of Justice for discrimination during job applications and are basing their case on the European directive because it is more progressive than our national law.

Not least the urgent need for overdue secondary legislation on the second EC harmonising law in the Federal Republic of Germany is again emphasised by the report of the Committee of Inquiry which says so in black and white. It is time for our *voluntary* provisions relating to neutral wording of job advertisements to be translated into *mandatory* provisions, for there to be an end to direct discrimination, and for the burden of proof to be reversed, i.e. in the case of job advertisements the burden of proving that there was no discrimination is placed on the employer; for there to be real penalties for infringement of the law and for these laws to bite. This relates no less to the policy on maternity leave in the Federal Republic of Germany. The Federal Government is in the process of abolishing it, whilst at European level there is the impetus to change it into parental leave so that the father has the right to opt for it so that there is no discrimination against women in the labour market.

The action by the Commission against the Federal Republic of Germany in the European Court of Justice, the action by three courageous women in the same European Court and the report and demands of the Committee of Inquiry unanimously reveal that the Federal Republic of Germany is not a model pupil in the matter of equal rights! The Federal Republic is under pressure to act and this is increased if we compare its policy with the exemplary initiatives which the French minister has just explained to us. The Federal Republic has been put under pressure by the more progressive EC law, which is better than the national law; by the European Parliament, which has given the highest priority to equal rights from the very beginning and — I hope — by increasingly well-informed women who assert their rights ever more strongly and who will learn from this debate that they have a strong progressive ally in the European Community and in the European Parliament!

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Pauwelyn (L). — *(NL)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, Mrs Simone Veil has tabled an amendment proposing that an annual prize should be awarded to a woman who distinguishes herself in some field or other. I support this proposal because women in particular lack models to which they can aspire. I therefore hope that the media will take notice of this Liberal proposal. I also expect the other groups to support this proposal, which is in the interests of all European women.

Madam President, equal rights, equal opportunities for women are a must. This statement usually applies to

Pauwelyn

working women, but other categories of women are sometimes less privileged. I would remind you in this context of housewives, who are often classified as non-working. If housewives are regarded as being at a disadvantage because they are not paid a wage or salary or do not enjoy social benefits, then words fail me to describe women who are the real victims and to whom little or no attention is paid: women who are ill-treated.

Our society is unfortunately not free from taboos. We avoid talking about situations which do not accord with the civilized world of which we are the so-called representatives. Ill-treated women live in circumstances to which we react only with silence. This is not a question of equal rights or equal opportunities. This is simply a question of injustice.

The phenomenon of the ill-treated women occurs in all socio-economic classes and in all strata of society. The facts often remain concealed because the women concerned are offered no alternative to their present situation. Socially and morally, they are obliged to maintain a given status, especially for and by their husbands. If they have had no vocational training, they are in a hopeless position. These women are and remain unknown and unprotected victims. In urban areas one in ten women is regularly ill-treated. There is virtually no information on women in rural areas because what happens there occurs in a fairly closed environment.

In most cases ill-treated women find no sympathy with the local authorities if they turn to them for help. Those who have been trained to fight crime are not trained to look after ill-treated women and are certainly not equal to this task. In fact, some go so far as to accuse the victim of having provoked the ill-treatment. In other words, they asked for it. In addition, the criteria governing intervention are often so strict that slight, but visible, injuries are not enough for the offender to be punished. Women must then leave it at a simple complaint, but it is a complaint that may have far-reaching and inhuman consequences for them.

Our judicial system also favours the physically stronger. Obtaining a divorce on the evidence of blows and injuries is still a very difficult and wearisome business. A husband who rapes his wife is not punished in most Member States. Our preventive facilities are inadequate. In short, when the law permits action to be taken, it is usually too late, the evil deed has already been done.

I therefore call for an increase in the number of reception centres for ill-treated women, where they can obtain professional advice. Above all, I call for a change of attitude in our society.

I stress that we cannot claim to be living in a developed, modern world as long as we fail to stand up for

these women. I call for equal rights and opportunities for women, but let us first ensure that the most elementary things are done and particularly that violence is combated and all victims of violence are given a chance to lead a life worth living.

(Applause)

Mr Gauthier (DEP). — *(FR)* Madam President, Honourable Members, the report before us on the situation of women in Europe clearly shows that the different authors who worked on it have poured all their conviction and all their talent into a subject that has been examined from every angle.

It is true — no one will deny the fact — that, over the past decades, there have been profound changes to women's situation in society, or, to be more precise, to the perfectly normal desire of a certain number of women to play a part that it would have been difficult to imagine them playing before. Although a brief glimpse at the history of our civilizations — but who learns history nowadays? — will show that the balance of power, if I can call it that, between men and women has evolved considerably on a number of occasions, very often in the opposite direction.

So there is nothing surprising about the fact that our era, which is prey to considerable technological, industrial and social change, is faced with a problem as old as the human race itself but which calls for an answer that is right for our time.

The Group of European Progressive Democrats approves what the Committee of Inquiry has done and pays tribute to the large amount of research and investigation it has carried out. But what solutions are we offered? And, above all, what conception of women are we given?

As we have already said, the problem is not one of women and women's rights, as if there were just one sort of woman in the whole of Europe. It is one of the right to be a woman and to fulfil oneself as such in a highly developed, highly male-dominated, industrial society. That is the real problem. And in this report — and this bothers me — there is an underlying desire to globalize and standardize which, to my mind, in no way reflects the real situation in any given country and even less in the variety of countries, that go to make up Europe today or will make it up tomorrow. There is a kind of desire to define a European woman — which seems to me to be a simplification that is both wrong and dangerous. Wrong because it denies everything that a minimum of elementary psychology tells us about men and women. They are physiologically different, but the differences in awareness, fortunately, are equally large. The traditional picture of the respective roles of men and women, which comes in for violent criticism in this report, reflected a real situation. But, and this is

Gauthier

something we are willing to admit, this picture has become less faithful over the centuries. Secondly, it is dangerous to define a European-type woman because, in the end, this desire, which is not based on any real experience, to iron out differences and achieve an enforced and absurd egalitarianism prevents men and women from flourishing and getting the most out of their reciprocal specificity.

Ultimately, the heart of the matter is, in fact, freedom. If we agree, as the report says, that undesirable sexist stereotypes have frozen situations that called for spontaneity and freedom, I fail to see how the opposite sexist stereotype can help us gain any individual freedom.

Although we give all our support to the positive sections of this report — the very necessary equal opportunity, training possibilities and remuneration — we categorically reject the egalitarian philosophy that underlies it, as this would be a source of even more frustration than the previous situation. Any improvement in women's status will get our support — provided the women themselves are behind it. So we fully approve the proposals on improving the Community's legal provisions on equal treatment, access to training and the use of Community funds for underprivileged regions which have the highest rates of unemployment among women, but we have more reservations as to the methods of improving women's status in the developing countries. Are we sufficiently familiar with their traditions to intervene effectively? Are we not trying to force our own cultural patterns on them? There again, we should like to be certain to meet their aspirations rather than add new constraints to old.

I should like — very rapidly because time is getting short — to deal with two other aspects, negative ones in my view, of this report. First, the illusion involved in letting people believe that a reduction in working time could reduce the very difficult problem of unemployment among women. We have no right to give the impression that a simple — simplistic even — measure could solve such a complex problem. Second, that part of the report on the specific role of European women in defending peace, as if defending peace or human beings or human life was a woman's job alone! In the name of what? Is not this introducing a stereotype that is rejected elsewhere?

Madam President, I only regret the thing that, to my mind, weakens the report — the egalitarian philosophy which tries to use I know not what intellectual terrorism to impose one type of society and one type of relations between the sexes. This type of report would be the negation of that freedom of destiny which European women and European men should be seeking together.

Mrs Hammerich (CDI). — (DA) Madam President, it is very important to consider the present position of

women, for today the trend in regard to women's emancipation and equality is backward rather than forward. The very first precondition for woman's equality is for her to be able to care for herself and her children. Therefore there must be work and a reliable, well-funded social security net. And what do we find today? Unemployment is hitting women harder than men. In Denmark unemployment among women is 23 times — I repeat, 23 times — as high as in 1973, whereas it is nine times as high for men. At the same time the social security net in our country is riddled with holes, that the most vital factor for equality is under attack and, with it, the chance of women supporting themselves and their children with a decent standard of living. Something must be done and it should be discussed thoroughly. But in Denmark women doubt whether they can achieve equality through the debates, action programmes and directives of the European Community. They doubt it and they are right. A red thread of double standards runs right through the Community's policy on equal treatment. There is a wide gulf between the fine words and the deeds. The Commission's action programme says, among other things, that social security provisions, for example, crèches and nursery schools, are necessary for sexual equality, but at the same time that selfsame Commission sends economic guidelines to my country, advocating social cutbacks which hit at women's living conditions. Where is the sense in that? Fine words and hard actions, that sort of double-talk creates distrust.

Another example: the Community agreed that a certain amount would be spent in 1983 on schemes and activities for women who are out of work. The sum was 145 million kroner. That was DKR. 29 for every registered unemployed woman, that is, every woman who is out of work can go into a café and buy a cup of coffee and a packet of cigarettes once a year and no more. That sort of thing does not create confidence in the Community's determination to do something special for unemployed women.

And the images of the Community which women in my country see on television and in the papers also arouse scepticism about the Community as an instrument of women's emancipation: those hosts of tailored suits occupying the most important desks and those hosts of women behind humbler desks and with cleaning gear; not a single woman Member of the Commission, etcetera.

But the greatest scepticism about the Community's role as champion of women's rights concerns unemployment trends. I have said that women's unemployment was 23 times as high as in 1973, when we joined the Community, and what is more it is particularly young women who are affected. No one in my country imagines that unemployment can be blamed on our membership of the Community. The economic crisis is affecting every country. But when

Hammerich

we compare ourselves with other countries which have kept out of the Community — Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Austria, the contrast is striking. These countries have managed to keep unemployment down to a third of Denmark's and that is no coincidence. It can be explained. For all these reasons there is a strong yearning among women in Denmark for a different future for our country — one outside the Community. 63% of Danish women wish that Denmark could be extricated from the EEC, compared with 53% of men. That is not because Danish women are nationalistic. Not a bit. We are well aware that the problem of women's rights is a universal problem and that women's movements must and will help one another internationally. But a single, unemployed mother finds it hard to understand all the Community's words about solidarity when she considers the hard facts — and that she most certainly does. Women are not so naive as to put their trust in a strongly hierarchical male-dominated bureaucracy, which is set up to make life easier for the multinationals, which are also run by men. Women believe in the sharing of family responsibilities and in self-fulfilment, which they are well-placed to judge and to foster by fighting for them. We do not believe that we should expect miracles from the Community. We know that we must ourselves take up the cudgels where we work and live and, moreover, work together with other women throughout the world, regardless of frontiers.

Mr Fanti (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Communist and Allies Group wishes to express its full appreciation for the work that has been presented to us today by the Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe.

We were convinced of the need for such a report: not a corporative and sectoral need, but a general, overall one. And, for that reason, it has had the full commitment of our group, which was expressed by the Chairman of the committee, Marisa Rodano, to whom, as to all the rapporteurs and members of the committee, we offer our sincere thanks.

This can be seen clearly from the results that have been put to us. There are in fact two central points, on which the whole of the analysis and the proposals that we are discussing turns.

In the first place, in recent years — and this is a frightening thought — as part of the serious overall picture of unemployment in Europe, we have an increase in female unemployment. The reasons are twofold — the consequences of the conversion of production, and the social security systems crisis.

In the second place, there is the concrete danger of a retreat: the wearisome and hard-won conquests of the 1970s in relation to equality and the rights of women are again being questioned. Mrs Roudy has called these victories 'fragile', and we would add, in the light of the results of the inquiry, that they are furthermore

being subjected to very considerable pressures from within our own Community.

The two questions are very closely connected, although they are not identical. We intend to support the proposals indicated, which are of a precise and concrete nature, and we hope that the European Parliament will approve them.

We should like to emphasize two essential points.

First, the question of work: without employment there can be no effective emancipation. The question of female employment must therefore be given priority, within the framework of the wider battle for economic recovery and employment in Europe. This battle is being and will be fought with both general and specific measures, at both Community and national levels. In this field also there is a need for coordination within the Community. We have appreciated the commitment of Minister Roudy, on behalf of the Council, in the sense that, at last, the Council of Ministers is also taking an interest in this question, and is able to tackle it.

The general measures include a different economic policy, and a different social policy based, in the first place, on the reduction and reorganization of working time. And, within this framework, the Community can develop a series of exemplary measures that will indicate a method and an approach that are valid for all countries.

The second essential question is the problem of equality. The struggle to abolish discrimination against women is still and will always be a great civil, cultural and democratic struggle that is the hallmark — real and plain for all to see — of the degree of real development of a society. The tendency to turn back the clock on the victories of the last decade must be resisted most energetically. In addition to watching the application of the directives that have been issued on the subject, and taking whatever steps are possible to improve them, the Commission can — as the resolution asks — prepare new Community legal instruments, and promote the positive measures provided for by the new programme of action.

But these two great questions — work and equality — which, I repeat, must be tackled with great determination on pain of a general retreat in the battle for emancipation, are very closely connected, and together constitute a part of the more general, wider battle that we are fighting.

Which Europe, in fact, which Community, can give the answer that is called for by these demands and proposals that we are discussing and putting forward? Certainly not this Europe, nor this Community, paralysed and incapable as it is. This Europe, which stands before the eyes and conscience of the great mass of women as a land that has seen the installation of an arsenal of nuclear arms, with the imminent threat of a nuclear holocaust.

Fanti

These answers, which are awaited, could however be given by the Europe and the Community that we want to see — a Europe and a Community with new policies, new institutions, and a new capability for financial action. And it is in the pursuit of this Europe that the call goes out today to the great mass of women all over Europe, inviting them to play a leading part, as directly and vitally interested persons, in this encounter.

I think that it is also advisable to take the necessary steps to ensure that this imposing report that has been completed by the Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe does not become just something else for filing.

First of all, information procedures must be put in hand to enable women's organizations and the political, cultural and social forces of every country in the Community to acquire and verify, critically, this body of data and proposals, which must therefore first of all be quickly published in its entirety.

In the second place, the new Parliament, which will be elected in June, must be given the resources and instruments to ensure that, in this relaunch of the Community for which we are fighting, the questions regarding the situation of women that emerge from our debate are given the priority to which they are entitled, and to check that this is being done.

For these reasons we Communists will support the setting up of the Standing Parliamentary Committee in the next Parliament.

(Applause from the benches of the Communist Group)

Mrs Schleicher (EPP). — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen! All my colleagues in the European Parliament, men and women, must agree with me that we are far from having equal treatment for men and women in all our Member States. 566 pages of comprehensive report are an eloquent demonstration of this. Many people are complaining that the report has become too long, but surely this is an indication of just how much remains to be done and what women have to do.

My colleague Dr Focke deplored the fact that the German Federal Government was admonished over the EC harmonizing law. I find it difficult to understand why precisely Dr Focke, who was a minister in the former socialist-liberal coalition, deploras this as it was her government and the political climate of the parliament at that time which passed the law in that form. The EC harmonizing law was not taken up by the Federal government then and the Commission has already issued a warning that no action was taken by the socialist-liberal government. If the end result is unsatisfactory the blame should be placed not on the present Federal government but on the political majority which was responsible for it at the time.

Moreover it is imperative that progress be made. We must also admit that political ideas of the form solutions should take are very different and it is of course why different ideas were expressed in the political debate.

If I might just refer to the question of shorter working hours: it is not a question of whether rigid or flexible hours are better for women. In all the Member States at the moment the labour market is rigid rather than flexible. If women are to play a greater part in working life, then it is certainly not possible with a rigid labour market; shorter working hours do not mean that the rigidity of the labour market is ended automatically. The idea that this would give men and women more free time and more time for their families has been proven to be wrong in the past whenever hours have been shortened.

For this reason our group is in favour of more flexible working arrangements, in contrast to Mrs Focke's group. We are convinced that this offers women more opportunities in the labour market because they are able to integrate with the work process by deciding for themselves how to divide their roles, instead of having it determined by someone else, if for example they want to devote more time to their families for a while. A rigid labour market offers no chance at all of their being able to fit in according to the division of their roles.

The same holds good of other areas, for example social security. Here too there is a great political debate on the question of whether improved provision of benefits for women in old age is not just a question of better integration of women in the labour market and better pay or whether it is those women who do not go out to work who are at a disadvantage as regards retirement benefits and some balance must be achieved if they opt to have a family. This has nothing to do with conservative attitudes; women are known to want to devote themselves to their families and their children and it must be made possible for these women to suffer no disadvantage because of their decision.

In the health field too there are a number of ideas that must be developed for the sake of women. We know that whatever decision they take, women pay with their health if they are overtaxed. It is our opinion therefore that a great deal more must be done in the health sector to give more help to women where the burden is too great. On the other hand it is also clear that it is imperative that women be given more opportunities so that they are not left feeling that they have to put up with disadvantages in society merely because of a personal decision.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.05 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

*President*4. *Topical and urgent debate* (announcement)

President. — Pursuant to Rule 48(2) of the Rules of Procedure, the list of subjects for the topical and urgent debate to be held from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. on Thursday, 19 January 1984, has been drawn up.

*(The President read out the list of subjects)*¹

In accordance with Rule 48(2), second subparagraph, any objections to this list of subjects must be tabled and justified in writing by a political group or at least 21 Members by 3 p.m. the next day. The vote on any such objections will take place without debate at 6.30 p.m.

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, I am very grateful to you for including my resolution in the list that you have read out. I would suggest, however, that as the resolutions by Mr Møller and Mr Marck are so similar, they could perhaps be taken jointly.

President. — Mr Provan, we decided not to do so. We initially considered taking them jointly, but, because the motion by Mr Møller is very specific and concerns a very precise problem in the Community, it is probably better to deal with it separately. That was what was decided by the group chairmen. That decision, however, can be changed tomorrow, but that was the background.

5. *Question Time*

IN THE CHAIR : LADY ELLES

Vice-President

President. — The next item is the first part of Question Time (Doc. 1-1268/83).

We begin with questions to the Commission.

Question No 1, by Mr Bord (H-284/83):

Could the Commission outline the consequences for the Community of the withdrawal of one of the Member States from the European Monetary System?

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — *(NL)* If one of the currencies now participating in the EMS were to be withdrawn from the system, it would obviously no longer be subject to the whole system of EMS mechanisms. And that would mean that its exchange rate would float against the other currencies belonging to the EMS. The Commission has always

taken the view that a situation of this kind would weaken the EMS as an exchange rate mechanism. Apart from having this purely monetary consequence, the withdrawal of a currency from the system would have the following repercussions.

Firstly, the European Monetary System would be weakened as a framework within which the discipline and cohesiveness of economic policy are improved, economic convergence being just one of the requirements for lasting economic recovery.

Secondly, the internal cohesion of the common market and more specifically the European Community as an economic entity would be weakened.

Thirdly, the role of the EMS as a factor for stabilization at the level of international monetary relations would be weakened. In view of the international situation, it is obvious that such a development would be extremely undesirable. I think it important to say that the withdrawal of a currency from the EMS would not mean that the country concerned would no longer be governed by the provisions of Article 107 of the Treaty of Rome, which states that the policy pursued by a Member State with regard to rates of exchange should be regarded as a matter of common concern and treated accordingly.

Mr Bord (DEP). — *(FR)* I should like to thank the Commissioner for his particularly interesting, not to say very important, reply. But perhaps I may be allowed to put to him a supplementary question because, as this House has seen, there are many who deplore, condemn even, what they regard as the irresponsible forcing up of the dollar.

Whilst it is certainly true that, as far as our own economies are concerned, a strong dollar has certain adverse effects, it is no less true that any substantial weakening of the dollar would entail — automatically, I fear — a significant rise in the mark. Would not such a rise force a number of Community countries, France in particular, to withdraw from the EMS?

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* I believe that speculation on trends in currencies and their value in international transactions in public assemblies such as this one is in itself a dangerous element as regards the possible implications of such a trend. I say this not so much in my present capacity but from my experience in a position I occupied earlier in my political career. I shall therefore refrain from saying what precisely would be the consequences of substantial changes in the parity of the dollar and the implications they would have for the European Monetary System. All I will say is this: I am firmly convinced that, from the time the EMS came into being, the changes in parities in the Community have been less pronounced than they would have been if the EMS had not been established, despite the fluctuations there have been in currencies outside the system.

¹ See Minutes.

Mr Provan (ED). — I am sure nobody wants to contemplate a weakening of the EMS by the withdrawal of any currency. Can you give us any indication as to what the likely consequences would be for MCAs if all currencies of the European Community were members of EMS?

Mr Andriessen. — (NL) — I cannot help thinking that this is less a question for me than for the Commissioner responsible for agriculture, who is sitting behind me. I believe that if all the currencies — or at least all the really important currencies — in the Community belonged to the EMS, the fluctuations in these currencies would be less pronounced than they are now and that this would therefore have a stabilizing effect on the development of the MCAs.

President. — Question No 2, by Mr Papaefstratiou (H-522/83):

In view of the fact that the Austrian Government, following Yugoslavia's example, has now also announced an increase of 50 % from January 1984 in the special road-transit charge paid by goods vehicles crossing Austrian territory, what really forceful measures does the Commission propose to take to secure the withdrawal of this unwarranted decision, which directly affects Greece and the other EEC countries in respect of the transport costs of their products?

Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) On 29 November 1983 the Austrian parliament decided to increase the road-transit charge with effect from 1 January 1984. The charge has been raised from 0.25 schillings to 0.35 schillings per kilometre/tonne, by 40 % that is. The Austrian Government justifies this increase on the grounds that the charges had remained unchanged since 1978, whereas inflation since then has risen by 30 %. The other 10 % is to offset future inflation, because the charges are amended at only very infrequent intervals. The Commission protested to the Austrian Government as soon as it heard that this decision was pending, and I personally called in the Austrian ambassador on 25 November, before the Austrian parliament took its decision, that is, so as to convey to him the Commission's objections concerning the law which, at that time, his national parliament was due to vote on. The matter was also discussed by the Transport Council on 1 December of last year. Austria finally decided to make the increase, but the Council and the Commission have taken the view that it is inadvisable, at this stage, to recommend to the member countries that they take counter measures, given that we are currently negotiating an overall settlement of our transport sector relations with the Austrian Government, and that the question of road-transit charges forms part of these relations. That is what I have to tell Parliament in connection with Mr Papaefstratiou's question.

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE). — (GR) I have listened to the informative reply of Commissioner Contogeorgis with satisfaction, given that the Commission has already made protests. My question remains, however. In view of the fact that Austria enjoys special relations with the Community, and that negotiations between the European Community and the Austrian Government are still under way, why has Austria gone ahead with this unilateral action which damages certain countries of the Community, Greece among them?

And why, therefore, given that the imposition of this exorbitant charge seriously affects the transport of goods between Member States of the Community, is the Commission reluctant to recommend the taking of counter measures against Austria as it did against Yugoslavia when that country took a similar decision some months ago?

Mr Contogeorgis. — (GR) I would like to restate the fact that we are at this time engaged in negotiations with Austria in respect of our transport sector relations taken overall. The charges levied on vehicles in transit are an aspect of these relations. We take the view — and the Council concurred with this on 1 December — that we ought not to proceed with counter measures against Austria at this stage. We shall decide on our position according to the progress and outcome of the negotiations.

Mr Nyborg (DEP). — (DA) I should like to ask the Commission whether it has considered negotiations with Austria? It is easy to say that Austria has failed to do such and such, but is there any intention of giving anything in return? So far as I know, there are special charges on motorways in Italy applying equally to Austrian transportation, goods vehicles, passenger cars etc. When Austrians drive into Germany, there are checks on whether they have more than 50 litres of diesel oil in their cars. There are thus charges in other places. Are there plans to negotiate with the Italian and German Governments with a view to reducing or abolishing these charges in return for the Austrians giving up theirs?

Mr Contogeorgis. — (GR) Austria's relations with the Community are governed by the agreement between the Community and the countries of EFTA. This agreement covers the customs sector. It does not cover transport, nor does it provide for special arrangements on transport matters. In principle each country is free to make its own internal tax arrangements. However, given that close relations exist between Austria and the Community we have commenced difficult negotiations with that country which encompass many sectors, including, as I have said, the transport sector. We hope that the Austrian side will show understanding. If we do not get a proper response we shall, of course, take action on the matter.

Mr Seefeld (S). — *(DE)* Commissioner, would you be kind enough to clarify this matter for the benefit of public opinion by confirming that the unilateral measures imposed by the Austrian Government could have been pre-empted by timely implementation of the resolutions adopted by this House and if the Commission had been empowered to conduct in-depth tangible negotiations with the Austrian authorities and that the sole culprit for this present state of affairs is the Council which, as always, has just registered another failure in the field of transport policy. Seen in this light, Mr Papaefstratiou's question is quite justified.

Mr Contogeorgis. — *(GR)* The Commission agrees with Parliament and with what Mr Seefeld has said, and it did recommend to the Council that our negotiations with Austria should include financial questions and also the possibility of the Community's contributing to expenditure on the roads infrastructure in Austria through which much Community traffic passes.

However, the Council refused to allow this side of things to be included in the negotiations and restricted the Commission's freedom of action in the matter. But on 1 December the Transport Council finally agreed to allow financial questions to be included in the negotiations. Since then the negotiations have been proceeding in the way I mentioned previously.

Mr Gerokostopoulos (PPE). — *(GR)* In view of the fact that the Commissioner has confirmed for us that negotiations with Austria are in progress I would like to ask whether the issue of this special road-transit charge has been raised during the negotiations and, if so, whether the response of the Austrian negotiators has been positive or otherwise.

Mr Contogeorgis. — *(GR)* We learnt that Austria was planning to make this increase in the transit charge and, as I said at the beginning, the competent senior official of the Directorate General on Transport, who is presiding over the negotiating committee, was instructed by the Commission to register a protest. But, as I have told you, financial questions were not, at that time, included in the negotiating framework. This framework was widened only after the Transport Council took its decision on 1 December following its acceptance of the Commission's recommendations on the matter. The negotiating committee has not convened since then and consequently we do not have any more recent response from the Austrian side.

Mr Nyborg (DEP). — *(DA)* A point of order, Madam President. I simply want to say that I have not received from the Commission any answer to the question I posed: is there or is there not anything to be given to Austria in return?

Mr Contogeorgis. — *(GR)* The Austrian Government insists that the Community, which for the most part uses the roads of Austria for goods vehicle transit purposes, should share in infrastructure costs. As I have said, this aspect has been excluded by the Council from the negotiations up until now. However, on 1 December, the Commission received the go-ahead to include financial questions in its negotiations with Austria on transport relations. Hence all these matters, including road transit charges, will come up at our next meeting with the Austrian Government side.

President. — Question No 3, by Mr Vié (H-526/83):

An article has appeared in the French press under the title 'The EEC finances subversion', accusing Mr Cheysson, at the time the Commissioner responsible for relations with the Third World, of having persuaded the EDF to provide finance under the Lomé II Convention for the airport of Pointe Saline on the island of Grenada, which was built by Cubans with materials supplied by Algeria and Libya.

The existence of this airport, whose capacity seems by far to exceed the requirements of tourism on the island and suggests that it was built to fulfil military rather than civil needs, prompts the question on what criteria the Commission based its case, assuming that the information reported is accurate, in order to obtain financing from the EDF?

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — *(FR)* The Commission has always — or at any rate since it was first approached about it — supported the building of tourist airports on the islands of the Caribbean. It has done so on several islands and it saw no reason — not at the outset at any rate, nor subsequently after a careful study of the proposal — to deny Community aid to Grenada. Indeed, Grenada has considerable potential as a tourist centre; the airport it was proposed to build was necessary to enable Boeing 747s to land there. The facts show that the announcement of the building of the airport did help to develop tourism, for in the space of three years investment in tourism also rose very significantly. As for saying that an airport built to take Boeing 747s cannot be used by military aircraft, that the Commission will not do. It would simply point out that the air traffic control installations were not protected in the way they normally are at military airfields and that no provision was made for stocks of aviation fuel; under such circumstances, it is inconceivable that military activity in times of international tension could ever be all that intense. It is my belief, therefore, that the question raised, apart from its specifically French aspects, is not worthy of too much time being devoted to it, especially today.

Mr Lomas (S). — Did the Commissioner know — and it might be interesting for Mr Vié also to know — that Plessey, the British construction company, was involved in building the new airport and that they have stated quite categorically and in some detail since the invasion that it was being built to civil specifications? There was no way that it would or could be used as a military runway, and the firm completely discounted the suggestions that it could.

Secondly, was not the EEC aid, in any event, mainly going to train air traffic controllers rather than to the actual construction of the airport?

Mr Pisani. — (FR) On this second point, it is true that the EEC aid programme was intended to be in part a contribution to the cost of air traffic control equipment, including the training of personnel to operate it. But, coming back to Mr Lomas's first point, may I say first of all that, financially, the Community's share amounted to something like 3% of the total, whereas the United Kingdom contributed 12 million, that is about 15%, in loans for the construction of this airport. But, to enlarge on what I said to you earlier, there are a number of facts that I should like to cite which I am sure will be of interest to the European Parliament.

Firstly, the original study entitled 'Airfields for Grenada and for St Vincent' was prepared in 1955 by the British firm of Scott, Wilson, Kirkpatrick and Partners. It recommended Pointe Saline as an ideal site for an airport that would eventually take over from the small Pearls airport. In July 1960, the now defunct Federal Government of the West Indies appointed a committee on civil aviation, which recommended that work on Pointe Saline 'be started as soon as possible'. In March 1967, the Tripartite Economic Commission — consisting of the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada — set up in 1966 to determine the obstacles to the development of the smaller islands did a study on the very same issue, and so it went on until Plessey Airports Limited put forward a proposal which eventually led to the airport being built. I believe that what we are up against here — and I really feel I must say this — is one of those cases where, faced with a purely economic situation, even though objective analysis adequately explains and justifies certain decisions taken by the Community, nevertheless there are those who feel moved to inveigh against them for reasons that many might consider surprising.

Mr Simpson (ED). — I am not criticizing the Commission for not checking on who was building the airport or who supplied the materials, but should the Commission not have exerted some control on the size of the airport? To say that the fact that it was not defended did not put the Commission on the alert seems somewhat naive. Is the Commissioner

suggesting that anti-aircraft guns should have been included in the original estimates? Was the Commission not a little bit gullible about this, and should it not take more account of political realities in the world today?

Mr Pisani. — (FR) Like the honourable Member, I too learned from the newspapers that the Grenadian forces of aggression were represented by two mortars, 17 heavy machine-guns and 300 rifles, and indeed I trembled for the power of the United States which felt itself threatened in this region by such weaponry.

Furthermore, I have not heard any mention of defensive weapons around the airport.

Thirdly, if I know one thing, it is that the airport has been used for military purposes for the past two months.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (DE) Commissioner, you will recall that we tabled a question concerning this airport quite some time ago when information as to its real intended purpose came to our notice. The information which has come to light at present contradicts the statement you have just made. The events which had been taking place had become something of a scandal for quite some time because of the Commission's reluctance to become involved at a time when it would have prevented the construction of the airport to serve the purpose which ultimately culminated in the present tragedy.

Mr Pisani. — (FR) I do not understand the honourable Member's question or his point of view. I thought I had made it fairly clear that whilst this airport was capable of serving, in a secondary role, as a military airfield, it was not actually equipped to do so.

It had neither defence systems to protect its air traffic control installations nor stocks of aviation fuel with which to refuel planes operating from its runway. In other words, I have no proof whatever that this airport was intended to be used for military purposes.

Secondly, like other airports in the region, this airport was designed to meet the technical requirements of Boeing 747s, whose purpose was to carry tourists, principally from the North American continent, to the Caribbean.

Thirdly, Mr Habsburg, I should like you to try to look at what happened objectively. It was discovered — somewhat belatedly — that the head of the island's government was making efforts to bring about change and to steer his country towards general appeasement; however, it was only after his death that we found this out.

Mr Seefeld (S). — (DE) Commissioner, you have just provided a very noble and reserved answer. Would you, therefore, be kind enough to confirm my contention that suggestions to the effect that your predec-

Seefeld

essor, Mr Cheysson, paved the way for Community financing of the overthrow are totally absurd and even stupid.

Secondly, would you confirm that the sole criteria of the Commission in providing financial aid to Grenada was that of bolstering tourism, so vital to the island's economy and of improving air-passenger safety and that any other suggestions are simply flights of fancy designed to serve a political end and do not conform to available facts.

Mr Pisani. — (FR) I am one of your old-fashioned civil servants and for me the concept of a predecessor does not exist. There is a Commissioner for Development, a Commission which remains the same, responsible for the same areas of activity and answerable in the same way to the bodies entrusted with monitoring what it does.

Some time ago the Commission adopted a position on this matter and today it is reaffirming it. How could it do otherwise?

Having said that, I should like to reply to Mr Seefeld's very specific question by saying that, looking at it quite objectively, I see nothing of a technical nature, nothing of any substance to suggest that this airport was intended to be used for military purposes or that it was being constructed with military uses in view.

I believe fundamentally that this is a case of imputing sinister political motives to what is simply an infrastructure project designed to aid tourism.

Mr Moreland (ED). — Perhaps I should preface my question by saying that I visited Pointe Saline's airport about nine days ago. I would have thought that the important question does not relate to past history, as to whether this was military or non-military, but to what the Commission is actually going to do now. Perhaps the Commission does not realize that the airport is largely built and that the runway is down. I would have some dispute over the judgment of past history. Be that as it may, at the moment most of the EDF commitment to the island as a whole is not being spent. There is a widespread view from all political quarters that it would now be an excellent thing for the Community to be participating in completing the airport.

It is very sad indeed — and people are very upset to hear the rumour — that the EDF committee will not be visiting Grenada in its forthcoming visit to the Caribbean. Will the Commissioner see to it that the committee does visit Grenada and that it will consider as a matter of priority completing the airport now for civil purposes?

Mr Pisani — (FR) The procedure for handing over the final instalment of the appropriations necessary to complete the airport is well on the way to being completed and the Community, through the medium

of the Commission, intends meeting its obligations to the full and, specifically, proposes to equip the air traffic control installations and train personnel to operate them.

Do we foresee any additional expenditure over and above what was envisaged under the initial project? It is up to the government of Grenada to put in an application, to which the Commission will react positively, given that, now just as before, without any new information on the matter, the Commission takes the view that this equipment is necessary to the island's development.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 4 will be answered in writing.¹

At the author's request Question No 5 has been postponed until the next part-session.

Question No 6, by Mr Pintat (H-536/83):

In line with the Communication from the Commission to the Council of 9 February 1982 ('An Energy Strategy for the Community: the Nuclear Aspects', COM(82) 36 final) and the favourable opinion given by the Pintat report, which was adopted by the European Parliament at Strasbourg on 18 June 1982,² a large public-opinion survey was conducted by the Commission; its findings were published in October 1983. This investigation of European public opinion and energy objectives offers the advantage of having been carried out simultaneously in the 10 Community countries and has the credibility of a study conducted by an international organization. Energy problems have a decisive effect on the economies of the Ten; the Commission is therefore to be congratulated on its contribution to the raising of public awareness in this field.

The study reflects European public opinion as it was in 1982. How might the Commission follow up this initial study so as to permit the various authorities responsible to provide, with maximum public acceptance, the new power-generating facilities that are essential to ensure European independence?

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — (FR) The Commission is more than delighted at the reception given in interested circles, and among Members of the European Parliament in particular, to the recently published report on European public opinion and energy matters. At the very least, these favourable reactions show us that the initiative was a timely one, that the public opinion survey covering all 10 Member States was carried out under rigorous conditions and at the same time that the results have been reported honestly.

¹ See Annex of 18. 1. 1984.

² OJ C 182, 19. 7. 1982.

Pisani

This was the first survey of its kind to reach out to the Community as a whole and, as such, it was of an exploratory nature. It is the Commission's intention to pursue its examination of the shifts in European public opinion with regard to energy problems by taking regular soundings. Specifically, but without going into the nuts and bolts of it, this being neither the time nor the place for it, we intend, given adequate resources, periodically to update the 1982 survey, sometimes focusing on a narrow range of questions which analysis has shown to be of special importance, and at other times taking the broad view of the whole range of problems raised during the first survey, both methods of approach being necessary and indeed complementary.

The Commission is prepared to listen to the advice of Parliament's appropriate committee on all of these points. If, to improve the questionnaire, in order to be able to make the best possible use of it, it should prove necessary to expand it or vary it, the Commission would be ready to consider any suggestions offered. Essentially, what I am saying is that we at the Commission are well satisfied with this initiative. It demonstrates at once the uniformity and the diversity of opinion in our countries where problems related to energy are concerned.

Mr Pintat (L). — *(FR)* I am satisfied with the Commissioner's answer, which proves the necessity and value of a campaign to provide objective information on a European level on energy-related matters.

I would like, however, to put a supplementary question to him: has there been any official reaction by the governments to these initial studies and, more specifically, has the OECD, which publishes similar surveys, involved itself in these studies?

Mr Pisani. — *(FR)* So far as I am aware — but I could of course be wrong on this — there has been no reaction from the governments other than on a purely technical level.

As regards the OECD, this organization did initiate a survey at more or less the same time as we embarked on our own, but their survey had neither the same objectives nor the same scope. In other words, the Community's studies and those of the OECD tend, if anything, to complement each other rather than overlap. Moreover, the technical departments of both institutions maintain close contacts to compare the results of their respective surveys.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Does the Commission agree that there is growing support among the citizens of the Community for stepping up the development of alternative energy sources, and has the Commissioner any good news today of greater priority being

accorded to the various possibilities, namely, wind, wave, peat and solar energy? Would he not agree that, at a time when we are trying to generate sympathy with the elections coming on, there could be no better symbol of Community interest than a Community-aided windmill on the top of a hill?

Mr Pisani. — *(FR)* According to the studies available to us, and which are unlikely to be proved wrong, new and renewable energy sources — wind, solar energy, biomass, waves, and so on — will continue to account for only a very small proportion of Europe's overall energy consumption.

Having said that, the EEC — and the Commission — has in fact taken certain initiatives in this regard, but each Member State is vigorously pursuing its own policy of research, of stepping up research, of exchanging ideas, all with the specific objective of ensuring that new and renewable energy sources play the greatest possible role in the Community's overall energy balance.

Turning to the question of wind power in particular, some highly sophisticated wind-powered generators have been developed and a fair number of these are scattered across Europe. The results so far, in terms of kilowatt-hours, are encouraging, although the costs as such are high. However, I can see an obstacle looming to the spread of these windmills for, if they were put up in sufficient numbers to make a meaningful contribution to the total energy output, they would ultimately constitute something of a blight on the European landscape.

What I am trying to say, therefore, is that if it is true that Europe and the Member States are not entirely single-minded in seeking to expand the use of new and renewable energy sources, it is not just because their sum total could never hope to meet more than a small fraction of Europe's total energy requirements.

Mr Purvis (ED). — The Commissioner states that he sees no sign of any response from any government on this public opinion survey. I really cannot see much point in spending money on public opinion surveys if no subsequent action or pressure is brought to bear.

Is it not true that the Commission is really in a cleft stick on this question of energy strategy? If we do contemplate long-term security of energy supplies, it involves substantial investment and perhaps Community preference, which is detrimental to competitiveness and the tax base. Yet, on the other hand, this is the direction in which the Commission would like to go. How is the Commission going to bring this home to the Member State governments, which, I am afraid, will always tend to work for the short term rather than the long term?

Mr Pisani. — (*FR*) I am bound to say that the honourable Member's assessment of the position is a little unreasonable. A number of European governments, if not all — I think I would rather stick with 'a certain number of European governments' — have in point of fact mapped out and are actively pursuing a long-term policy which, whilst being open to question, is in certain respects giving very positive results.

As regards the Member States' reaction to our survey, I should point out that the results of this survey were not presented until September 1983 and that, in the circumstances, there is certainly nothing odd about the fact that we have as yet had no response from them, it being reasonable to suppose that the Member States will first want to analyse the results of the survey and to exchange views among themselves. What I can say to Mr Purvis is that the Commission will remind the Member States of the desirability of their letting us have their comments on the results of the survey so that meetings can be organized for the purpose of exchanging views and consultation, along the lines I have just suggested.

Mr Collins (S). — With reference to the Commissioner's reply to Mrs Ewing on windmills, would the Commissioner agree that the problem of powering windmills suggests a better use for certain politicians than has so far been devised?

Mr Pisani. — (*FR*) I am of course aware that the political significance of windmills and of energy from biomass may very well depend on how far off we are from the elections.

President. — Question No 7, by Mr Gauthier (H-545/83):

According to information from the International Agency, from 1984 onwards world oil consumption will start to rise again for the first time since the 1979 price increases. Can the Commission state whether it has taken account of this economic forecast in its proposals to the Council for a Community energy strategy?

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — (*FR*) The answer I propose to give to Mr Gauthier does to some extent help to put the previous question in perspective. It concerns the forecasts of oil consumption in the European Economic Community.

The Community's forecast oil consumption breaks down as follows: in the short term, that is to say for the year 1984, having seen a fall of 4.6% in 1983 in relation to 1982, and — hold on to this figure — of 27% compared to 1973, oil consumption is expected to rise by 0.5% in 1984, compared to 1983.

It is worth taking a closer look at these figures and asking ourselves what lies behind these swings. The fall in oil consumption is due partly to reduced

economic activity but partly also to other factors such as more efficient use of energy and the use of other forms of energy.

In the medium term, according to the Member States' own forecasts, oil consumption should show a slight rise between now and 1985, reaching the equivalent of 435 million tonnes (compared with the present 410 to 412 million tonnes), after which it will stabilize or possibly even fall between 1985 and 1990 if continuing efforts are made to restructure the demand for oil.

In the longer term, that is to say up to around the year 2000 the market for oil is likely to continue contracting. Incidentally, I must draw your attention to the fact that the Commission intends in 1984 to increase its cooperation with the Member States in analysing the long-term energy demand in order to lay down new energy objectives for the Community covering the period up to 1995. This would be the first time since 1979, but this rise, assuming it did take place, would no doubt be absorbed by countries that are not members of OPEC stepping up production.

The continuing rise in world oil consumption between now and the end of the century is likely to be accounted for largely by the developing countries. As the Seligman report which the European Parliament will be debating during the course of this session points out, this demand represents in fact approximately one quarter of present total world demand and could go on growing at the rate of 4 to 6% per year. I believe it is necessary for Parliament to realize that, in a few years' time, with demand in the developing countries rising and their oil output playing a decisive role in the world market, the world market for oil is in fact going to be dominated by buyers and sellers from the Third World. Reinforcing the Community's energy policy — which was designed to reduce our dependence on oil, and on imported oil in particular — has the threefold objective of minimizing our vulnerability, reducing the dangers of a worldwide imbalance between a restricted global oil supply and a demand that is rising too quickly, and also thereby encouraging economic growth in the developing countries, which will inevitably remain largely dependent on oil consumption. I hope that by introducing these few facts I have succeeded in answering the honourable Member's question.

Mr Gauthier (DEP). — (*FR*) I thank the Commissioner for his wide-ranging and detailed reply. However, he did say that the studies that had been undertaken were helping to reduce the Community's energy problems. Well now, he quoted some figures and in particular figures relating to the short-term situation, that is to say for 1984. These conflict with

Gauthier

figures published by the International Energy Agency, which forecasts — if only for the first quarter of 1984 — a rise of 3.2% which is quite considerable in view of the measures that have been taken up to the present time. For 1984 as a whole the International Energy Agency is predicting a rise of 2.1% which is already much greater than the figure of 0.5 % that the Commissioner is suggesting.

Does he not think that this growth, this large rise — for the figures are, after all, quite high in relation to the gross national product of countries like France and certain other countries in the Community — is liable to interfere with not only the financial measures that have been introduced in an effort to stabilize these rises somewhat, but also the production or improvement of other energy-generating products? I am thinking here especially of coal. We would all, at the present time, like to see it given greater importance, as it would enable us not only to save jobs, but also to absorb at least a part of the Community's stocks of coal.

Mr Pisani. — (FR) I should like to give Mr Gauthier an analysis of the growth in world energy consumption, and I must say I do not feel altogether happy at the prospect. However, I shall do my best.

First of all, I think that we have somehow misunderstood each other. I indicated that oil consumption, since that was the subject of your question, would rise by 0.5% in Europe, compared to 1.8% for the world as a whole. If you look at the figures that you compared you will see that they do not in fact contradict each other at all: it proves merely that the rise in oil consumption in Europe will be lower than the rise in oil consumption taken worldwide.

Secondly, I said that the rise in world oil consumption would — in the immediate future — be covered by the output from non-OPEC countries, and that, as a result, the situation where a group of countries could dictate oil prices to the rest of the world — as OPEC did — would not arise in the immediate future.

Thirdly, it would appear that a number of finds have been made in non-OPEC countries and that this has had a moderating influence in what has become an extremely alarming confrontation between the oil-importing countries and OPEC.

Fourthly, let me say that at the same time as an apparent fall in the price of oil — in terms of the dollar that is — there has been, as far as most oil-consuming countries and Europe in particular are concerned, a corresponding rise in the dollar itself, and that, in the final analysis, the results are largely offset or even outstripped by the changes that occurred in the past.

Finally, as regards coal, let me say that any rise in oil consumption would be bound to work in coal's favour. We, for our part, believe that to set such changes in

motion would be desirable, for there can be no doubt that nothing could be more dangerous than an illusion of permanently stable oil prices that would lead to the abandonment of coal, when we know for a fact that in the long run coal will be for us a vital necessity.

Mr Seligman (ED). — As the Commissioner said, we shall be debating this matter tomorrow under the Energy Action Programme. But many others have forecast a rise in oil prices in the next few years — the Chase Manhattan Bank, the Institute of Energy and Economics in Japan and even the US National Energy Political Plan — all forecast a doubling of energy prices in the next 12 or 15 years. So this points to an oil crisis, does it not, within the next few years. Does the Commissioner, not agree that the only way to avoid a third oil crisis with the resultant recession and unemployment is to implement the Commission's five-year energy investment programme which we shall be debating tomorrow?

Mr Pisani. — (FR) I need hardly say that the Commission wishes that the Council and the Member States would take the proposals it has put forward into consideration. An elementary and fundamental tenet of the body to which I belong is in effect that, far from giving itself up to the illusion of a rosy future in energy terms, the European Economic Community should take advantage of the respite given it by the crisis by laying down a policy and then putting it into effect. As regards the forecasts of a renewed world rise in energy consumption, and in particular in oil consumption, one can be wrong about the timing but one cannot blind oneself to the fact that it will happen. One can be wrong in saying that this rise, this doubling of consumption, will take place one year rather than another, but everyone knows that sooner or later it will come and in that case the Community should prepare itself. The Commission hopes that, with Parliament's support, the Member States and the Council will finally come round to treating this programme as a matter of overriding priority.

President. — Question No 8 by Mrs Lizin (H-555/83):

What is the Commission's opinion as to the admissibility of the actions brought before the Court of Justice by a number of Luxembourg communes against restructuring decisions?

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) As Mrs Lizin is perfectly well aware, we are talking here of an action pending before the Court of Justice in which, may I point out, our Commission is not the plaintiff but the defendant. The honourable Member will accordingly readily understand that, in order to allow the Community's judicial process to take its course without let or hindrance and to preserve its

Thorn

independence, the Commission would prefer not to reveal its position, with which Mrs Lizin appears to be familiar. The Commission therefore asks the honourable Member to kindly refer to the Court's decision, whenever it is handed down. I am sure the European Parliament itself would not wish to be involved in discussing points of law, for which the proper place is the Court of Justice.

Mrs Lizin (S). — (FR) I quite understand Mr Thorn's reply. I believe that what one needs to do, given the seriousness of the situation in which certain regions find themselves, is to highlight this particular problem of *communes* faced with restructuring. Both the Commission and Parliament are calling for social measures to compensate for the direct effects on the workers involved. But apparently no thought has been given to the indirect effects, and so my supplementary question is as follows: how could the Commission envisage a policy which would seek to compensate the indirect effects of restructuring plans, to which it is giving its approval or encouragement, on the *communes*, that is to say the social effects? For example, in Seraing, and in other *communes* in the Liège basin, the situation is affecting not only the steelworkers but also the whole financial structure on which local community and social policy is based. Direct social measures apart, could the Commission envisage an overall programme that would also cater for the indirect effects? Does it envisage proposing an even harsher line as regards the general objectives in relation to steel in the relatively short term?

Mr Thorn. — (FR) There appear to be three parts to your supplementary. Naturally, the Commission has always seen it as its duty, under the ECSC Treaty, to take measures. That is why we have our programmes of restructuring and of social aid that you yourself mentioned. There are certainly many things that need doing. This is not to say that, when we are able to see the overall situation more clearly, the Commission will not be forced to review the whole set of measures to be taken. When the time comes, we shall have to assess the situation of the various basins, the situation of the various communities affected and look at the whole problem afresh.

As regards the objectives in relation to the steel industry, it is not to me that you should look for an answer. Perhaps we could return to these discussions when I have had a chance to consult my colleagues. I am not able to give you an answer off the cuff. However, I would like to come back to the problem of the court action, which was the subject of your question, and say that, if we are arguing about the admissibility of this action, then that is another matter entirely.

The Commission's decision, which is the subject of the court action, is based on both the ECSC Treaty and on the EEC Treaty, and I would remind the honourable Member that, in accordance with Article

33 of the ECSC Treaty, apart from the Member States and the Council, only undertakings or the associations referred to in Article 48 of the Treaty may institute proceedings against decisions or recommendations of the Commission concerning them, or against general decisions or recommendations which they consider to involve a misuse of powers.

There you have our position. You can guess what it is from the ECSC Treaty and from what I have told you. As regards the EEC Treaty, Article 173 provides that, apart from the Member States, the Council and the Commission of course, any natural or legal person may, under the conditions laid down in the aforementioned article institute proceedings against any decision addressed to that person and against any decision which, although taken in the form of a regulation or a decision, is of direct and individual concern to that person. There you have your answer to the main question and I think I have acknowledged as fully as possible the powers of the various institutions.

I look upon your supplementary, Madam, as an exhortation to the Commission to see, given the scale of the problem, on what scale it can suggest solutions to it, and I give you my assurance that we shall set about it right away.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 9 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 10, by Mr Marshall (H-497/83):²

To what extent has the Italian tobacco industry complied with existing harmonization measures? What success has the Commission achieved in ensuring that imported cigarettes are allowed to compete on equal terms with Italian cigarettes? What further steps, if any, does it intend to take?

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — I assume that the honourable Member is referring to the provision of Article 10 of Council Directive 72/464/EEC of 19 December 1972, under which the specific element of the excise duty on cigarettes must amount to at least 5% of the total fiscal charge. The Commission has already taken infraction proceedings against Italy under Article 169 of the Treaty for non-respect of that provision, and in its Decision No 41/82 of 7 December 1982 the Court of Justice ruled that Italy had failed to fulfil its obligations. Italy did not adapt its legislation following that ruling, and the Commission therefore opened new proceedings against Italy under Article 169 of the Treaty for non-respect of the Court's decision. The letter formally requesting Italy's observations in that case was delivered on 14 July 1983. The Commission will do its utmost to ensure that the proceedings advance as rapidly as possible.

¹ See Annex of 18 January 84.

² Former oral question without debate (0-66/83) converted into a question for Question Time.

Mr Marshall (ED). — May I say that that answer sounds very similar to an answer given in this House by one of Mr Tugendhat's colleagues a long time ago? Would he not agree that the whole sorry story is one of deceit and delay on the part of the Italian authorities? Would he not agree that the time is long since past when there should be a fair common market in cigarettes?

Mr Tugendhat. — I certainly agree that the time is long since past when the Commission's proposals in relation to the harmonization of tobacco taxation should have been adopted by the Council and, indeed, by the Parliament, I hope that Parliament will act on the honourable Member's injunction. I also agree that the time is long since past when there should have been introduced a common market in cigarettes. However, I cannot subscribe to the rather harsh language which the honourable Member used. The Italians have made efforts to adapt their market, and I must point out to him that Italy is by no means the only Member State of the Community that sometimes has difficulty in adjusting as rapidly as others might wish to Community rules.

Mr Hord (ED). — Would the Commission not agree that this example, raised by Mr Marshall's question, serves to make a lot of people feel — particularly people in business — that the common market has little chance of being perfected? In this case, one Member State is failing to comply with the judgment of the European Court, and it seems to me that the Treaty of Rome needs to have some worthwhile sanctions for such cases. I wonder whether the Commissioner would agree with that observation?

Mr Tugendhat. — I do have sympathy with the observations made by Mr Hord, but I would point out that creating a common market is a very long-term business because of the interests groups that are built up in all Member States, and sometimes there are very great difficulties in overcoming them. I can assure him that for its part the Commission pushes ahead as rapidly as possible, but I feel that were we to go down the road he suggested, one can imagine circumstances in which there would be a great many protests in some countries at the kind of powers which the Commission would have to use against Member States. I see him nodding his head. I cannot help wondering, since we are of the same nationality, what might have happened if Commission policemen had turned up at the quayside at Newhaven, for instance.

President. — Question No 11, by Mr Rogalla (H-357/83):

What action does the Commission think should be taken to counter the clearly growing belief among the general public in the Community that

the process of European integration is incapable of producing any specific measures which are generally felt and easily appreciated by the average citizen?

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr Rogalla is quite legitimately anxious to know how the Community's achievements could be made to impinge on the everyday lives of its citizens. I happen to believe that a considerable number of our Community's achievements already do impinge on the every day lives of its citizens: I am thinking in particular of the free movement of goods and persons.

The Commission is nevertheless aware, perhaps more so than others, that our record is far from perfect, that we have certainly no cause to rest on our laurels and that there is still a great deal to be done. The efforts we are making in this direction surely prove my point.

Allow me to quote a few examples to illustrate the situation. The number of complaints by citizens against violations of the principle of free movement keeps growing month by month.

In order to protect the interests of our citizens, the Commission has stepped up in a spectacular manner its prosecutions of infringements against Member States. It has submitted over 80 reasoned opinions and brought actions before the Court of Justice in 59 cases, whereas 10 years or so ago there were only four prosecutions. This number is the highest since the Community was founded.

In addition to this, the Council has shown a renewed awareness — or, as I would prefer to put it, come to a sudden awareness — of the need for it to involve itself more in eliminating the various technical barriers that stand in the way of a single market.

A number of significant advances have been made this year in the area of standardization, in laying down a common legal framework for undertakings and in simplifying frontier formalities. As I say, these are just a few examples. All of us wish more could have been achieved. The Commission is making the fullest use of its powers to promote intra-Community trade, particularly on the basis of the 'Cassis de Dijon' judgment of the Court of Justice.

Our initiatives designed to open up public sector procurement, notably in the field of telecommunications, and to promote private use of the ECU all have the same end in view.

The Council of Ministers recently adopted the regulation allowing the temporary use of goods, tools, printing, radio, TV and cinematographic equipment, artists' materials, doctors' instruments, etc., in another Member State. I am also happy to add that there has been some significant progress within the Council on the 'right of residence' proposals.

Thorn

On the other hand, Madam President, all of us in the Commission and in the European Parliament are aware that public opinion has little patience with advances that are too slow in coming, that come along in dribs and drabs, and that are too disjointed and therefore not sufficiently incisive. Each year the Community's economy loses — as my colleague Mr Narjes has said on numerous occasions — tens of billions of ECU as a result of the complexity of checks on goods crossing our frontiers, the delays which hauliers have to put up with, and so on.

The continuing checks on persons crossing our internal frontiers — and, sad to say, these checks are very little different from the checks carried out at certain external frontiers — does untold harm to the Community's image in the eyes of its own citizens. Contacts between transfrontier regions suffer as a result of the shorter opening hours of the smaller frontier posts. Many of you have complained about this. The Commission cannot but deplore the extremely modest response that our initiatives in this regard have elicited from the Council thus far.

I am persuaded, Madam President, and I propose to end on this point, that the campaign for the next elections to the European Parliament should provide an excellent opportunity to make European public opinion aware of the urgent need for progress and above all to exert greater pressure on the governments in order that the Community's achievements might be much more readily appreciated by all of the Community's citizens.

Mr Rogalla (S). — *(DE)* I would like to thank the President of the Commission for taking the opportunity of going over the progress which has been attained hitherto but I am genuinely worried that the Commission, to put it mildly, in emulating our efforts to achieve peace has not adopted the most popular approach, towards the attainment of such peace. Nor will I ask the Commission President and his fellow Commissioners how long it has been since they last dropped into the pub round the corner. One can, as we know only too well, be confused in such places. Nevertheless I would like to ask one question, for it concerns one of my abiding preoccupations: What exactly is the stumbling block and what are these forces which enable various authorities to place obstacles in the way of a rapprochement between Community citizens to the extent that even leading political spokesmen for these citizens, such as you and I, Mr President of the Commission, have signally failed to surmount them and to draw up more elaborate methods for ensuring a greater degree of success?

Mr Thorn. — *(FR)* There is a tendency to say — not without a certain degree of justice — that all these measures are to some extent inspired by protectionism, by a nationalism that rises to the surface in

times of economic difficulty. This is partly true, but it is also a gross exaggeration.

In my view — and this may seem rather a trite statement — the fact that we are suffering so much from these processes that you and I have just been describing is quite simply because the civil servants still have the upper hand over the politicians in these matters. What we need to do is to somehow cut through the red tape, to break the old traditions, change the procedures, change the system by which the civil service works. I am sorry to say that, in the struggle between the politicians and the civil servants, hitherto it has all too often been the civil servants who have triumphed because they have a right of seniority and because, generally speaking, they can outlast the initiative of the politicians. If you really want something, that is no reason for giving up. Let us then, all of us together, once and for all get the show back on the road.

Ms Quin (S). — Does the Commission not consider that a more effective regional policy would be one way of giving people — at least in the poorer regions of the EEC — some feeling that Europe is relevant to their problems? In particular, will the Commission urgently look at the specific problem of getting more of the new technological industries both to move into and stay in our declining industrial regions?

Mr Thorn. — *(FR)* In principle, yes. If this is a supplementary to Mr Rogalla's question, it should relate to the trans-border regions which are of primary importance: unfortunately, this is much less a regional problem than a problem of centralization. Be that as it may, I really do believe that we have our work cut out when we come to a review of our regional policy. The Commission has drawn up relevant proposals and this answers the criticisms levelled earlier. You will have observed, in the context of the Athens Summit, as with earlier Summits, that all the attention is being focused on agricultural problems and on budgetary problems, while the other problems are rather too often overlooked. Essentially, Ms Quin, I share your point of view.

Lord O'Hagan (ED). — Would the Commission agree that many of its solid and lasting achievements have been obscured by public misunderstanding and, indeed, misinterpretation? Would the Commission accept that some of its actions are unpopular, particularly the interpretation placed on the recent ruling of the Court of Justice about the relation between the prices of beer and wine in the United Kingdom? Would the Commission also accept that there is a severe misunderstanding, particularly in the West Country, about the effect that this ruling will have on the price of cider? Finally, Mr President, would you and the Commission accept that there is a need for you to make a categorical statement that this excellent

Lord O'Hagan

ruling of the Court of Justice on the relationship between these two beverages has no effect on cider whatsoever? It is this sort of misunderstanding which you should clear up as quickly as possible.

Mr Thorn. — (FR) I have to say that the honourable Member seems to be giving me credit for more personal knowledge than I actually possess, especially on a matter which, from the sound of it, appears to be highly controversial. I would not wish to take it upon myself to comment here and now on a ruling of the Court, even though you, Lord O'Hagan, seem to be giving your opinion of the impact this ruling may have on this or that region of the Community. The problem we at the Commission have is that we need to look at the interests of the Community as a whole, and certain aspects of these interests may temporarily and in the short term appear contradictory. To us they are not, for it is the Community's long-term interests that count. That said, I would be prepared to acknowledge that certain Community measures are perhaps liable to be seen in the wrong light and I find it regrettable that the undertaking that we call the European Community should be the one which, in advertising terms, seems to have the most difficulties in selling itself, compared to national competitors.

President. — Question No 12, by Mr Kazazis (H-415/83), for whom Mr Gerokostopoulos is deputizing:

When entering Greece by car, Greek officials of the European Communities are obliged to pay road tax for the duration of the stay.

In view of the fact that the officials in question already pay road tax in the country in which they work (Belgium or Luxembourg), the circular issued by the Greek Ministry of Finance stipulating that staff of the European Communities must pay road tax runs counter to the Geneva Convention of 16 May 1956 and Community legislation on double taxation.

What steps does the Commission propose to take to have this measure revoked?

Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission. — Greece is not bound by the Geneva Convention of 16 May 1956 on the taxation of road vehicles for private use and international traffic as it has not ratified that Convention. Neither do the Greek rules in question here infringe any specific provision of the Rome Treaty. Nevertheless, the Commission would like to draw the honourable Member's attention to the fact that from 1 January 1984 onwards, Greece is no longer entitled to charge road tax in the cases referred to. That is the date by which Member States must have applied the Council Directive of 28 March 1983 on tax exemptions within the Community for certain means of transport temporarily imported into one Member State from another.

Mr Gerokostopoulos (PPE). — (GR) I thank the Commissioner for drawing my attention to the facts relating to Greece's non-ratification of the Geneva Convention. I would also like to thank him for what he has told us about the application from 1 January 1984 of the directive in question. It is a known fact, however, that this directive cannot be applied immediately, but only after national legislation has been passed allowing for its implementation. Can the Commissioner assure us that, by this summer at least, Greek employees of the Community will not be exposed to this unfair treatment when they go to Greece for their holidays, to the injustice of being doubly-taxed by virtue of having to pay road tax in the country where they work and in Greece as well?

Mr Tugendhat. — I am sure that Greek public opinion will be very sympathetic to the predicament of Greek officials working for the European institutions in their desire to return to their homeland. I can also assure the honourable Member that the Commission will do whatever it can to ensure compliance with Community rules. I would point out to him that this is by no means the first or the only instance where rules have not always been complied with, but I am sure that in this instance the Greek authorities will do their best.

President. — Question No 13, by Mrs Ewing (H-436/83):

Does the Commission agree that Consumer Councils throughout the Community — as, for example, the Scottish Consumer Council — have a very important role to play in the Communities prelegislative consultation procedures? Can the Commission confirm that the funds now available will permit a full programme of meetings to be held of those consultative committees on which the National Consumer Councils are represented?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The Commission does not have, at present, any consultative committees on which Member State Consumer Councils are represented as such. The Member may be alluding to the Commission's Consultative Consumer Committee. This committee's statute provides that it shall convene at least four times annually. Although budgetary restrictions forced the cancellation of a meeting scheduled for early 1983, the committee still managed to convene on four occasions during the course of 1983. The Commission feels that the Consultative Consumer Committee has a useful role to play and consults it on decisions which it feels to be of importance in the interests of the consumer.

The Commission has no brief to comment on the role and effectiveness of individual Member State Consumer Councils. It is envisaged that the Consultative Consumer Committee attached to the Commission will convene on five occasions in 1984. However,

Narjes

the parlous state of Community finances preclude me from guaranteeing that such a programme will be adhered to.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — I would thank the Commissioner for his careful answer which may go some way to meeting the point which I was specifically asked to raise. When a body such as the National Consumer Council in Scotland tries to assist the Community legislative process, it will feel it all the more keenly when told that because of financial stringencies it must cut its operation which is working very well. Would the Commissioner look at this again to see whether all the bodies that wish to be involved and have been involved up till now can continue to be involved despite the financial stringencies?

Mr Narjes. — (DE) Madam President, I believe there is a misunderstanding here. The statutory minimum number of four sittings annually has heretofore always been met, and accordingly we shall take the necessary measures to so arrange the agenda of these four meetings henceforth to enable matters pending to be suitably discussed. Meetings over and above these four statutory meetings would be, in view of the evident budgetary difficulties, well-nigh impossible. We look forward, however, to an improvement in these conditions, in the course of the year.

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

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

Mr Hord (ED). — Madam President, I rise to make a point of order in connection with the very substantial interference with Members and others by television crews in the common parts of the *Palais de l'Europe*, including the corridors and staircases. The large number of cables they use are dangerous, apart from precluding Members' rights to pass and repass. I have just been prevented from using the main staircase by a television crew. In addition to the inconvenience, all staircases and passages need to be kept clear in case of fire or other emergency. Will you please ensure that the administration sees to it that these important common parts are kept clear for the benefit and safety of all who use the premises?

President. — Mr Hord, I shall put this question to the Bureau tomorrow so that we may have a precise answer.

6. Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament

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

Mr Cousté (DEP). — (FR) I seize the opportunity of Mr Richard's presence among the Commissioners to ask him a question that is of some concern to me. It is about the directive on temporary work, particularly transnational. Is he going to take into account the amendments we introduced during the debate? That is what I want to know.

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — (FR) Madam President, I wish to speak on a point relating to the Rules of Procedure.

During the last part-session I attempted to put a question to the Commission in connection with the statement from the Commission on action taken on Parliament's opinion and resolutions. The President of the sitting pointed out that my question was not admissible, since the provisions adopted by the enlarged Bureau in September 1982 confined the Commission's written statement to legislative opinions only. Having referred to this decision — I have a photocopy of it before me — I realized that the decisions of the enlarged Bureau referred not only to legislative opinions but also to information concerning aids in cases of natural disasters. Now I only wanted to raise the question of the resolution adopted by the European Parliament on drought in the Sahel region.

I would like therefore to ask the Commission what the position is with regard to the report that it was supposed to submit in January 1984, as was requested by this resolution.

This is January 1984. I think the Commission is perfectly well aware of the importance and urgency of this aid, bearing in mind the fact that the International Development Agency has just drastically reduced its budget as a result of an intervention by the United States.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Madam President, I am afraid there has been a misunderstanding between the honourable Member and the Bureau on the one hand and the Commission on the other over the substance of the agreement that has been reached. Two things were agreed: (a) under this item of the agenda the Commission reports on the action it has taken on parliamentary suggestions, amendments and whatever else is put forward by Parliament after it has been consulted on legislation, and (b) it gives a factual report on the emergency aid it has granted in the event of a disaster.

¹ See Annex of 18. 1. 1984.

¹ See Annex II.

Andriessen

The honourable Member is referring to one of Parliament's own-initiative resolutions, in which policy is discussed. According to the interpretation given by the President of the Assembly and also the signatories of the agreement, this resolution is not covered by the agreement reached with the Bureau and, in accordance with the provisions of this agreement, should therefore be discussed in the parliamentary committee responsible for the subject concerned.

So much, Madam President, for the agreements reached by the Commission and Parliament. You will appreciate that in these circumstances I am unable at the moment to give a precise answer to the honourable Member's question.

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* In spite of all his persuasiveness Commissioner Andriessen has not convinced me. I would almost be tempted to say that his arguments did not seem very serious to me, because the question was put to him already in December.

This is January. Even if his interpretation of the agreement reached between the Commission and the enlarged Bureau was correct, nevertheless he could have made inquiries — we have always been told that the Commission is a collegiate body — from his colleague, Mr Pisani, to find out if the report would be submitted in January. He could have answered my question without sending me back, as was done in December, to the competent committee.

It should also be stated that the lives of millions of human beings dying of hunger and thirst are at stake. So, let us be a little more human, Commissioner, and less bureaucratic...

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* Madam President, there is, of course, absolutely no disputing the seriousness of the matter raised by the honourable Member. The only point at issue is where and on whose initiative this subject should be discussed. One of the aspects of the agreement between the Commission and Parliament was that the committees responsible should establish their own procedures for exchanging views on Parliament's own-initiative resolutions with the appropriate members of the Commission. I am, of course, quite prepared to pass the honourable Member's question on to my colleague Mr Pisani, but I would point out that it fully accords with the agreements reached for the parliamentary committee responsible for this matter to invite the Commissioner himself to exchange views with it. This can be done by word of mouth next week if the parliamentary committee wishes to take the initiative itself.

Mr Eisma (NI). — *(NL)* Madam President, I should like to sound an optimistic note, a note of appreciation. I am glad that we are now taking the debate on

the Commission's report on Tuesdays, because this means we have more time to study the Commission's document more closely. In a letter to the Bureau dated 24 October I asked whether this item of the agenda could be taken on a day other than Monday, and I am pleased to see that the Bureau has reacted positively to my request. I should also like to thank the Commission for its willingness to be present for this item of the agenda on a day other than Monday.

As I have been able to study the document carefully, I have a question to put to the Commission regarding the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. The Commission's response can be found on page 17 of the document. The Commission says that the gradual shift in emphasis towards living conditions can probably be accomplished without its being necessary to draw a distinct line between living and working conditions. We of this Parliament want to see this institute doing more environmental research.

I do not understand the answer, because during the budget debate in December Parliament adopted an amendment calling for the Dublin institute's budget to be split into research into working conditions and research into living, or environmental, conditions. So what the Commission's document says is incorrect and even conflicts with what Parliament said it wanted in an amendment adopted during the budget debate. I should like to hear what the Commission has to say about this, Madam President.

Mr Andriessen. — *(NL)* Madam President, I am, of course, grateful to the honourable Member for his appreciation of the fact that we are discussing this item of the agenda on a day other than one he did not find the most suitable. It is, of course, for Parliament to decide whether or not this practice continues in the future.

However, I must unfortunately disappoint him as regards an answer to the question he has raised. The Commission's document, Madam President, does not have a page 17. I do not have the document before me, but the honourable Member is undoubtedly referring to a parliamentary document in which the views expressed in the House have been summarized for its Members. I am familiar with this document, but I do not unfortunately have it with me and cannot therefore give an answer. I believe the honourable Member's question concerns a resolution that comes under the heading of own initiatives and, as I have just said in the context of another question, they are not dealt with under this item of the agenda. Nor have I prepared myself to answer such questions, but I am, of course, quite willing to pass the question on to the appropriate Commissioner with a request to provide the requested explanation at the appointed place.

Mr Cousté (DEP). — (FR) Madam President, a few moments ago I asked what action the Commission intended to take on the debate we had on the directive on temporary work, particularly transnational.

I am delighted to see that Commissioner Richard is here and I hope he will give a full answer to my question.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — I apologize if we got the procedure a little wrong, but Parliament will realize that this is a somewhat new procedure as far as the Commission is concerned — at least as far as I am concerned. The idea of a Question Time without notice of the questions is something that will take me at any rate a moment to get used to.

But let me try and deal with the question that has been put. As far as this proposed directive is concerned the House will know that it has now been with the Council of Ministers for some time. It would be foolish of me to pretend that it is going through the procedure in the Council of Ministers with a great deal of speed; it is not. In those circumstances it may be — I put it no higher than that — that the Commission would wish to consider again its position on the terms of the proposed directive in the light of what Parliament has said and also of course in the light of what the working party in the Council of Ministers has said. If, and when, the Commission were to decide to reconsider the matter then naturally we would pay great attention to the views that Parliament has expressed. What it would be wrong of me to do would be to give the honourable gentleman a firm commitment today or, indeed, a firm view today that the Commission either will reconsider the position in the immediate future or, indeed, that we will be changing our position. That is not so. All I am saying is that quite clearly in the progress of some proposals for a directive through the Council of Ministers one of the things one has to take into account is the degree of receptivity with which the Member States are in fact looking at our proposals. At the moment I have to say that that degree of receptivity in the case of some Member States is not awfully high.

Mr Van Minnen (S). — (NL) I must ask something about the action the Commission has taken on the decisions, the joint decisions to reform the Social Fund. And in particular I must ask something about the establishment of guidelines for this Fund. The Commission promised us — indeed it was one of the essential points, as you will recall, to emerge from the conciliation meeting we had — the Commission promised us that it would not only draw up the guidelines quickly but also forward them to the Members of this Parliament and, most importantly, those directly concerned. Now we hear, more or less by the way, that the Commission actually and finally adopted these guidelines at the twelfth hour, New Year.

Members have heard nothing of this before, but what is again much more to the point, have those directly concerned been informed, have those who wish to apply to this Fund been informed? Have they received the new guidelines, and what has the Commission done about pursuing an active canvassing policy for the application of the Fund based on the new guidelines? What has the Commission done about deadlines for the submission of applications to prevent a situation in which those with an immediate interest are pressed for time, without themselves being in any way to blame?

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — (NL) Madam President, Mr Van Minnen's question prompts me to say that the new guidelines can be found in our files. And I can tell you that, where the Netherlands is concerned — yes, really, I can give you three copies if you like — I can tell you that, where the Netherlands is concerned, a new manual has already been forwarded to all the municipalities. It was printed between Christmas and the New Year. I merely add this for good measure, because you may not be aware of the latest developments.

Mr Richard. — I am very much obliged for the assistance which, if I may say so, was fluent if a little unexpected. The position is, as Mrs Maij-Weggen said, that the Commission adopted the guidelines on 21 December. The text in seven languages was notified officially to the Council on 6 January and to Parliament on 11 January. It was published in the Official Journal on 10 January.

Mr Van Minnen raises the question of the promoters. May I say this on behalf of the Commission. We adopted a decision yesterday which is immediately notified to Member States and probably has been today to the effect that the 13 March deadline for applications will, if necessary, be applied only insofar as information on the name of the promoter and of the amount requested is concerned. Full details of the application may be delayed until 3 April at the latest. In other words, as those Members of Parliament who have been involved in this issue will know, there was some concern that because of the delay in the Commission's adoption of the guidelines, which I am bound to say was not as great as some honourable gentlemen may have considered it to be, the 13 March deadline would be too premature for some promoters. What we are therefore saying is that provided we are given the name of the promoter and the amount that is being requested, full details of the applications need not come to us before 3 April.

So far as information and informing the promoters are concerned, that is predominantly and must remain a matter for the individual Member States. It is not for the Commission in these circumstances to, so to speak, proselytize in the individual Member States — indeed, I can imagine that some Member State govern-

Richard

ments would be extremely concerned were the Commission to take upon itself the task of informing potential promoters of the scope of the guidelines. I think that must remain where it now lies, namely with the Member States. But as far as informing the Member States, Parliament and Council is concerned, and as far as, if you like, modifying or mollifying the effect of the 13 March deadline is concerned, I think we have done everything that I told Parliament in the debate which took place during the December session that we would do.

Mr Van Minnen (S). — *(NL)* Madam President, it is, of course, very nice for Mrs Maij-Weggen to find the guidelines in her file at the right time, but that is not the point. The point is that distribution is far from complete as long as we are approached — not just me but other members of my group too — by potential applicants who have not yet received the guidelines. That was the extremely topical reason for my question, and that was why I raised it.

7. Situation of women in Europe (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the situation of women in Europe.

Mr Pasmazoglou (NI). — *(GR)* Madam President, changes which affect the working and living conditions of women are of prime importance to the functioning of our society, and I do not need to stress the significance and value of the work which the Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women in Europe has carried out. I too wish to express thanks to the chairman, Mrs Cinciari Rodano, and to all the rapporteurs who have played a part in this work which is crucial for the European Community, and to which the European Parliament can make a decisive contribution. I would like to make three main comments.

First, the importance we attach to being properly informed, to full knowledge, and likewise to education. We need to sensitize public opinion, and each individual in his or her early years, and to ensure respect for the position and rights of women. Associated with this is the question of women's physical and mental health, and I do not need to stress that this is not just a matter of concern for women, but for society as a whole, for all our peoples.

My second comment concerns the question of equality for women, and here it is manifestly apparent that there has to be a change in the customs and ways of our society, and in its attitudes generally. I am thinking of what Mrs Pantazi said today, all of which, in my view, was on the right lines. However, I want to say that it would be a help if, in Greece and all countries, there were less talk and declaration of intent and more in the way of deeds and concrete results, on a non-partisan basis.

Here I would also like to emphasize the importance I attach to the question tabled by Mr von Alemann and other colleagues, me included, on the work of the European Community. Specifically, I would like to ask the Commissioner with responsibility for this how the question of focusing the activities of the Social Fund, and of all the Community's operations, in such a way as to give greater priority to the creation of more jobs for women is being tackled. Everyone has heard how unemployment is particularly rampant among women and young people, and there is a need for action by the Community, or at least action planned by the Community, in order to tackle this problem.

My third comment, and one to which I give special weight, has to do with the whole question of women in the home, the whole question of recognition of the social role of the housewife. I want to underline right away the importance of Article 66 of the motion for a resolution in front of us, and to stress how urgent it is for the Committee to systematically assess all such legal and social processes as will permit recognition of the housewife's role in the social fabric. I disagree altogether with the view that this sort of approach to the problem is tantamount to putting women back in the home or that it sets back the demand for women's equality in employment. To relegate the importance of the part played by women in the home is to ignore reality and the real problems which our peoples are up against.

If you will permit me I will also touch on a special point with regard to Greece. In Greece only 30 % of women of working age are in regular wage-earning employment. There is a real problem then, and it is one we need to tackle. It is a matter of social and national importance that society should accord housewives their due, and that emphasis be given to their role.

Madam President, I would like to stress the importance of this Committee's work and the need for it to be continued, with special attention being paid to the problems I have highlighted. I believe that the purpose of this work should be to get priorities right as far as the sought after objectives are concerned, and to tackle the social and political problems which stand in the way of a fitting and firmly-based realization of these objectives.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Madam President, it may surprise Members to find someone from this particular segment of the political orange saying this, but I am proud to have been involved with the Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women in Europe and to have been a substitute member. I enjoyed the company, the discussion and the arguments that we had. Sometimes this group is suspected of being negative on this matter. Perhaps this false impression comes from one or two particularly vociferous

Purvis

members whom we have. But I certainly am not, and how could I be with two very effective and determined teenage daughters. But apart from that, I am also quite firmly convinced that women have suffered unjustly in many ways in the past and it is up to us to get that put right. There is a continuing need to keep up the pressure and be ever watchful that adequately speedy progress is maintained.

But I do think — if I may direct a little criticism against my colleagues on the Committee of Inquiry — that many of them are excessively sensitive, imagining difficulties where none exist or, at least, where they are not particularly women's problems. For example, there are passages in the report bemoaning the effect of high technology on women's jobs. I can only quote the figures for the United Kingdom. Contemporaneously with the introduction of the new technologies over the ten years between 1972 and 1982 men's jobs fell from 13.6 million to 11.9 million, but women's jobs rose from 8.5 million to 9.1 million. Now it is true to say that at the end of that period men's wages were still 50 % higher than women's. But while men's real wages had risen in ten years by less than 1 %, women's real wages rose by 25 %. So progress is being made and I think we do ourselves an injustice not to recognize where progress is being made, albeit maybe not fast enough.

One only needs to think of the enormous increase in jobs ideally suited to women and eagerly taken up by them in the high-technology industries themselves and in the growing service industries. Certainly, there will be continuing changes: clerical jobs and electronic-assembly jobs may well be replaced by automated techniques. But so has the scullery maid been replaced by the dishwasher. Whether men or women, we must be favourably disposed to improvements in the quality of life both at home and in the workplace. Part of this is maximizing the earning potential and minimizing the cost of goods so that we can provide a better life for men and women. The greatest recent advances have been relevant to women in particular, not least in the home. But they all provide the opportunity for a better and fuller life. So can we once and for all stop tilting at windmills — the imagined threat from high technology. If we do not accept the new technologies in the most positive spirit, they will pass us by. We will neither get the jobs they can bring nor be in a position to afford the benefits they can add to the quality of life. Do we want to be the scullery maids of our American and Japanese economic masters? Surely not! So I ask my friends on the committee, as they go into the future, as I am sure they will, to concentrate their criticism on what really matters: areas where there is still discrimination against women which needs to be despatched for good and not to be grudging in their welcome of the enormous strides forward that we have made and are making now.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) Madam President, no one is going to be convinced, women especially, that all this fine talk about equality between the sexes in the countries of the Community is other than connected with the approaching elections for the European Parliament. Clearly canvassing is going on, and of a very cheap sort as well, because even though it is twenty years since the EEC's competent agencies first broached the issue of improving the position of women in the Community the practical results have been nil.

Now, in addition to the canvassing and the hoodwinking of women, the big employer clique and its spokesmen in the EEC, they too with pompous talk, are attempting to sap the campaigning vigour of the women's movement by creating the false impression that the Community's measures will make equality between the sexes into a reality. However, it is obvious from the EEC's programme of action on this matter that the protective legislation allegedly in favour of women will in fact lead to a levelling down of their rights. Because with the changes in the protective legislation, supposedly in the name of equality and technological progress, even motherhood is deprived of special protection given the curtailment of maternity leave, and the protection of women against intensive working and harsh labour conditions is not guaranteed. For example, the employment of women on Sundays and holidays is not prohibited, nor, on the grounds that the matter is not covered by the international treaties, is the employment of women on night shifts and in quarries and underground mines abolished. In addition the pensionable age for women is made the same as for men, the age at which women become eligible for the pension is raised, that is. Thus on the pretext of establishing equality between men and women not only is the social content of equality — namely the creation of equality of opportunity for women in all areas of activity — diminished, but there is also abolition of the entrenched rights of working women to the benefit of the employers.

The situation of women is particularly difficult in Greece where women's wages average 40 % less than those paid to men, and where female unemployment has taken on huge dimensions with 157 000 women out of work.

Madam President, the rapporteurs who have inquired into this subject have presented a great deal of interesting information and many interesting proposals. What counts, however, is action, and experience shows that only through their own struggle, and with the support of progressive forces in each country, will women be able to improve their lot. In capitalist society complete equality is unattainable. Its structures have condemned women to live as second class human beings. Hence the ultimate objective of their struggle should be to change society at the roots.

Mr Jürgens (L). — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I welcome this report and I feel the discussion has covered many of the problem areas; however, there exists a minority group of women which ought to be mentioned again and to whom we should devote some attention. I refer to women who carry out four occupations. Women from large families of the kind so often met with in rural areas of the Community who are invariably not covered by a national health or old-age pension scheme, to whom 'vacation' and 'regulated working hours' are unknown and who, nevertheless, look after their parents and grandparents up to the moment of death. Social security offices never get to know of such cases and the State coffers are thus spared payments totalling some thousands of millions.

Although some women bear a considerable responsibility they have, more often than not, no opportunity of being politically active.

Hence my belief that this committee should be a standing committee which acts as a trouble-shooter to detect problems specific to women and, on the basis of painstaking deliberation, draws up recommendations for future action. This would be a lobby group for that half of Community voters which has not got one at present. As far back as 1979 the Liberal and Democratic Group made a recommendation for the formation of such a standing committee. An overwhelming majority of Parliament rejected it in 1981. I am somewhat amazed at the extent of the conversion which has taken place in the interval and across party lines in favour of such a standing committee.

Mr Romualdi (NI). — (IT) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I rise to speak not only in order to express the approval of this report by the Italian political Right, which is fully conscious of the need for a better and more detailed understanding of the situation of women in Europe and in the world, and of the problems concerning the protection of their rights and dignity, but also — and indeed above all — to say that this truly massive work that the Committee of Inquiry has produced, based on documents that were already previously drawn up, discussed and approved by our Parliament, by the Commission and by other organs of the Community, must be accorded today the recognition it deserves by our entire Parliament.

We should, however, be less than sincere with ourselves — and in particular with members who have produced the documents that we are discussing, and that we hope will be published in one volume — if we were to say that we are completely satisfied with everything, and that the document that we will approve disposes of all our doubts. The letter of this document is perfect. Equality of opportunity for women, and hence equality of employment, pay, responsibilities and initiative in every field — these are excellent things with which we entirely agree:

objectives some of which have been achieved and some of which still remain to be achieved, and which will have our full agreement and our active support for their achievement. But, between the lines — some of which are devoted to a downright invitation, that is really too brazenly partisan and political in nature, to pacifist demonstrations which, when they are not downright opposed to it, have little or nothing to do with the quest for peace, just as they have little or nothing to do with this document — there is something that is a little disturbing: the feeling that there is someone who thinks that, starting with these equalities, which are as legitimate as they are necessary for the civilized conduct of our society, we must reach — through a different conception of life — as is said at a certain point in the document — a not entirely happy confusion between women and men, whom nature has made to be different, so that they will have a different role in society, with different functions, both of them necessary and fundamental, which no equality can or must eliminate.

Under these conditions, man and woman would no longer have equal rights; they would be in competition, and we really do not see what advantage this would be to the women. And man and woman would no longer be one another's companions in their common destiny, as protagonists in this splendid though all too often sad, dramatic adventure which is life. They would only be stupid, arid enemies.

Mr Enright (S). — Madam President, this morning Mrs von Alemann quoted from Orwell's '1984'. I too would like to give a quotation, but I would like to quote from 'Animal Farm': 'All pigs are equal, but some pigs are more equal than others'. In this case it is the male chauvinist pigs who are more equal than the others, who will not take their noses out of the trough to let others join in and get just a little food. The women to whom I would wish to see given priority are the working women in the United Kingdom and throughout Europe, and not the women who have already succeeded, because that is where the need is.

I was horrified this morning when the spokesman for the Liberal Group put the emphasis on the women in the top positions and, indeed, in the same breath she had the temerity to state that she wanted women in the top positions, but that her group would not be backing the 35-hour week. That 35-hour week would give jobs to a large number of women — estimated at one million — who do not have a job now. And that is where their priorities lie. It is a callous rejection of a sensible and sensitive proposal.

But their attitude looks positively left-wing if you turn to the way in which the Tories behaved yesterday: utterly disgraceful and discreditable behaviour trying to denigrate the reports that have been presented here today. I hope someone will apologize for it. But just ask for a moment why they did it. They did it because

Enright

they are trying to distract attention from their utter failure to put into effect legislation which would fulfil the requirements of the three directives. Furthermore, there is nothing proposed in our Parliament at the moment and there is nothing in the pipeline which would come within a million miles of proffering a hope to the women in the United Kingdom who are receiving unequal treatment at this moment in terms of social security. That is where misery and poverty flourish and that is where the greatest need is and that is where the steely hearts are — over there.

Mr Purvis asked a number of questions on this, but I see that, like Pontius Pilate, he does not wait for an answer. I can tell him now that we do not have equal treatment in terms of maternity leave, not in terms of benefits for single parents, not in invalid care allowance and certainly not in invalidity pension where married women are appallingly dealt with although all men can receive some benefit. The list is endless — I will stop it there — but I recommend and will sell to you this publication from Leeds, published at the price of 80p.

But just quickly on the Equal Pay Act, to finish up with. That Act was supposed to have been put into effect three years ago. That has still not happened in the United Kingdom and the House of Lords, when it passed enabling legislation, commented that it did not fulfil the requirements of the first Directive. I beg this House to pass this motion and to ensure that it is put into effect in all countries, particularly in the United Kingdom where the worst offences occur.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Madam President, I am beginning to see that the purpose of this debate, as far as the Socialists are concerned, is not to do anything to help women at all but to launch their election campaign. I do not wish to do this.

(Interruption from Mr Enright)

I merely want to move a number of amendments which are tabled in my name. Mr Enright, I will, indeed, touch on the topic you raised.

The first amendment I want to move concerns the subject of education. It is a very limited matter I want to talk about but rather an important one. It concerns sub-paragraph b on single-sex schools, of paragraph 23 (ii).

I have been reading the justifying statement on education, and I must say I could find no real reason why the Committee on Inquiry into the Situation of Women in Europe wishes to be so dogmatic about the abolition of single-sex schools. It talks about the 'unjustified divisions into single-sex schools for girls or boys'. Quite apart from the question as to whether the Community is, in fact, competent to lay down provisions on the matter or even to discuss this matter at all, there is quite a large body of opinion which says that the interests of women and girls are actually served at certain stages in their education by being in

single-sex schools. That is a matter of debate and certainly does not allow the kind of dogma which we have here in this report.

My amendment, however, concerns an even more limited field and is specifically related to those groups in our Community — notably Muslims — which do in fact call for single-sex schools. It is something they feel very strongly about. Is it not rather absurd that we devote a great deal of effort to trying to preserve the ethnic integrity of our minority communities, in education going so far as to subsidize the teaching of their mother tongues in our schools, and, at the same time, say that we will not provide the opportunity, where a particular religious or ethnic group wishes it, for their daughters to be educated separately from boys? Mr Enright comes from the north of England, and he will know that the Liverpool Council, which is being very dogmatic on this matter, is going to run into a great deal of difficulty if it tries to impose on ethnic and other minorities, including Roman Catholics, the idea that they have no prospect of sending their children to single-sex schools.

I come to my second area of amendment and not surprisingly it refers to the section concerning the reduction and reorganization of working time. I would warn the House against swallowing what Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul said this morning when she appealed to the majority of Parliament not to be swayed by arguments from this quarter into rejecting her conclusions. I would say that the boot is on the other foot. I would appeal to those who support, in general, women's rights and equality of opportunity for women not to swallow hook, line and sinker a whole series of doctrinaire socialist and economic nostrums masquerading as part of a report on the situation of women. You have to look at the report of inquiry to see precisely what Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul is driving at. A 35-hour week may or may not be attainable; but when we get statements such as the one on monetarism where it says:

Since 1979, the number of people out of work has doubled. Despite this, the aim of monetarist economic policy has not been achieved; in 1979, the average rate of inflation in the European Community was 10.6%. Today it is 10.2%.

We see what kind of statistical fiddling this report is based on. It is the countries with monetarist policies like my own which have actually brought the rate of inflation down below 5%, and it is the countries pursuing socialist policies that have increased their rates of inflation. It is for precisely that reason that we cannot go on to accept her next conclusion:

Since a policy of growth no longer offers any hope of success the most suitable means of combating unemployment is a policy of comprehensive reduction in working hours and a redistribution of work.

Patterson

If you start with unsound statistical bases, it is not surprising that you arrive at an unsound conclusion.

We have been over this many times indeed. I will give Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul and her report of inquiry the credit of having gone into the matter in some detail, but her conclusion is that the only model she has found where the reduction in working hours would in fact produce a reduction in unemployment is the Belgian Palasthy model, which provides for an increase in shift-work, and she concludes by saying that 'this model is, however, incompatible with the European Parliament's report on women, which called for shift-work to be reduced.'

It is for that reason that I think the whole of this section is unsound and should be rejected. However, I conclude by saying that it is not that we are against equality of opportunity for women; it is rather that we do not wish women to be deluded into thinking that their interests are best served by this sort of extremely unsound socialism, which would produce more unemployment, not less, and women would suffer the most.

(Applause)

Mrs Boserup (COM). — *(DA)* Madam President, I was glad that we set up this Committee of Inquiry and I have been waiting expectantly for its report. I must therefore admit — at risk of being taken for a British Conservative — that I am angry at the way we have been treated. I have been active in politics for many years. I have even drawn up long lists of instances where men have done women down in political life and I have seen a great deal of that. A Norwegian woman politician, Berit Ås, once drew up a list showing how men mistreat women in politics. And among the means used by men is to drown us in a mass of detailed information all at once when we haven't a hope in hell of doing anything with it. And it is precisely the same shoddy male tactics that the committee has now employed. I deplore this.

When I got to the end of it, I said to myself that the 600 pages may well serve as educational material for study groups for women and as such might be of some use. That is not the case. It is full of mistakes. On our humble little country alone I found three errors in 10 minutes and some of the text is in a language which one could not expect the women who most need help — and there I agree with Mr Enright — would be able to read at all. For instance, Mrs Macciocchi's pearls of wisdom could make you sick. No ordinary woman could swallow them. It was as much as I could do to stick it out and I am not one to give up lightly.

Thus we are told that we must take care to ensure that women are drawn into decision-making bodies and they repeat that with reference to politics; but they will only do so by occupying the seats which men occupy today. It can be done. We have proved it in

the party to which I belong — the Social People's Party. We have a woman's quota for all seats on all the leading bodies and committees in the party. That works very well, but it means of course that the men have less place. However, they put up with it.

Mrs Krouwel-Vlam (S). — *(NL)* Madam President, in a political debate on the situation of women a number of important aspects closely related to the welfare of women must not be overlooked.

In the 1970s the radical feminist elements of the women's movement did pioneering work by adopting an active approach to the oppression of women. They ensured that problems which had long been suppressed, such as assault and rape, whether committed by a man on a stranger or his own wife, and the ill-treatment of women and children stopped being regarded as taboos, and rightly so. A secure and protective family can sometimes become a very dangerous environment for a child. In their early years many women have been assaulted by their fathers, brothers, uncles or cousins. Studies have shown that 97 % of all cases of incest, or at least of all known cases, involve girls. The silence maintained on incest does not protect a child against sexual abuse: it merely prevents help from being given in good time and results in the offender getting off scot free. Where no kind of help is given, the result is a lifelong trauma, with all that that entails: personal misery that is the consequence of an unjust balance of power between men and women. This unjust balance of power finds expression at work. It is not only shame but also fear of losing their jobs that leads women employees not to disclose that they have been molested by their male colleagues. We call this 'unwanted intimacy'. Men have always been able to take many liberties in this society, at home and outside, but there has never been any excuse for sexually violent behaviour. Many women who are raped do not report the matter. The police and the authorities are officious in the assistance they provide and the approach they adopt, which does not bear witness to good taste and a fair attitude. When interrogated, women who have been raped are treated more like suspects than victims. Reception centres for women and children who have been ill-treated are badly needed, but they will not solve the problem in the long run. What are needed are rigorous measures. Ill-treated women are often forced to return home, after all the misery they have suffered, because society does not have any better facilities for them. We are still living in a society in which many men consider it far better for women to stay at home and look after their husbands and children. Fortunately, those times are past. The younger generation of women has become more self-confident and, fortunately, more emancipated. They are bringing things to light which the other sex — men — consider a threat.

Krouwel-Vlam

Members of the Commission, you still have a great deal to do. A great deal of research is still needed into the scale and causes of ill-treatment and sexual violence such as rape, incest, pornography and unwanted intimacy. The Commission must encourage the Member States to involve more women in the business of improving the quality of care, help and services. The Commission must also pursue a policy designed to improve the welfare of individual women. Once again, Madam President, I call on the Commission to pay particular attention to the aspects of an improvement in the situation of women that I have mentioned. Concern for welfare is, after all, a political concern.

(Applause)

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE), Chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. — *(GR)* Madam President, dear colleagues, the presentation by the Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women in Europe of the report — on which I congratulate Mrs Rodano as rapporteur, coordinator and chairman of the Committee, along with the co-rapporteurs — and the debate on it today certainly make for a new and significant step towards equality of the sexes.

There is no disputing the fact that the European Parliament has time and again assumed the mantle of unwavering champion of women's rights as regards the protection and extension of equality of opportunity, the safeguarding of employment and the promotion of equality of participation between the sexes in political, cultural, social and family life. Moreover, this strenuous and unceasing endeavour is dictated by the general spirit of the 1957 EEC Treaty of Rome, as well as by many of its provisions.

As chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment please allow me to dwell a little on the issue of employment and the social sector in general, because it is a fact that we are going through a crisis characterized by specific problems. These are, firstly, the rise in female unemployment, especially among young women; secondly, the financial crisis in the social security systems of the Member States which has hit women comparatively harder; thirdly, the introduction of new technologies which threatens women's jobs in particular.

With regard to these things I think that, within the terms of the European Economic Community, the main responsibility for giving a concrete lead, and for implementing appropriate measures, rests with the Member States. From the Community standpoint the problem comes back to the economic crisis and unemployment. It must be stressed that the European Social Fund is an instrument for combating female unemployment, and I glad to be able to say that in

the recent guideline directives adopted by the Commission, following a recommendation by our Parliamentary Committee, special care has been taken in the 1984-86 programme for the provision of support for women.

Allow me to say a few things about women's matters in my own country, Greece. I am proud to stress the following points. Firstly, the undisputed role of the Greek women in the preservation of the national identity through the family, and her role in the country's social, national and cultural development. Secondly, her contribution up until now to the arts, to letters, to education and to the economy. Thirdly, her participation in public affairs, which though still limited is increasing all the time. And, fourthly, her successful participation in the national struggles.

Because there has been, permit me to say, an unfortunate attempt to polarize this very important social issue along party lines — something impermissible because the issue must not be set within narrow confines — I am obliged to say that under the New Democracy Government, and with the 1975 Constitution, full equality between the sexes was guaranteed in Greece in every sector without exception.

We must mention, furthermore, that in social security, in the protection of mothers and of women in pregnancy, and in the achievement of equality in education and professional life considerable progress had been made in Greece, indeed long before the present governing party took office, without implying that it too is not continuing with efforts in this field. But it should not try to claim any sort of monopoly because this is impermissible and harmful.

I hope that Mrs Rodano's report will be accepted with alacrity by our Parliament, and indeed by all the other Community institutions as well, and that all the Member States will implement it as and where appropriate.

IN THE CHAIR : LADY ELLES

Vice-President

Mr Kyrkos (COM). — *(GR)* Madam President, the fact that today we are debating the problem of the situation of women in Europe in itself indicates how backward we are. It is truly inconceivable inconceivable we should ever find ourselves discussing in this Chamber the situation of men in Europe. We must put the remaining traces of an age-old mentality of bondage behind us and press forward vigorously with all those measures which will compel complete equality between the sexes in every facet of human relations and social activity. With their struggles the women of Europe point us to our duty.

Kyrkos

I salute the present women's movement. It is one of the forces which are impelling change in both the relations and the attitudes of our times, and I regard the motion in its entirety and the report presented to us by Mrs Cinciari Rodano as positive, with the hopeful anticipation that we shall not for yet another time confine ourselves to declarations and wishful sentiment. We believe that the key to the situation of women in the European society of today is their position in the labour market, and that women must be availed of equal access to vocational and technical training opportunities and to employment so as to erode the notion that they are a sort of reserve workforce which can be got rid of more easily in times of crisis, because this is a factor which heightens the problem of female unemployment, especially in the less developed regions. The comments in the report regarding the participation of women in centres of decision-making touch directly on this, and we ourselves call for those measures to be taken which will vanquish the prevailing ideology which has it that a woman's place is in the home. The social and economic importance of household work should be recognized, and changes are needed in the present legislation in order to make provision for the health and social security of women and for their role as mothers, and to eradicate every form of violence against women, violence which is one of the most abominable and common crimes in Europe. We draw attention, also, to delicate matters relating to the attitude of society towards women both as human beings and workers. We mean the subject of abortion and, with regard to this, believe that women should be protected by the law and should be free to decide for themselves to terminate pregnancies.

Colleagues, without being confined to narrow economic issues the women's struggle, linked as it is to other movements in society, and especially to that of the working classes, is the struggle of all of us, and we want to stress the importance of what Mrs Pantazi said with particular reference to the role of women in the fight to preserve peace, and by the same token mankind itself.

Mr Alexiadis (NI). — (GR) Madam President, colleagues, answers to the question as to what has been the most significant happening of this century vary. Some say the splitting of the atom, an event which has led to radical changes not only in industry but in munitions as well. The Communists say the Russian revolution, which they see as having put an end to the exploitation of man by man. Others opt for the conquest of space, and some, perhaps cite other things.

In our opinion the greatest revolution, of this century, the main achievement, has been the move towards equality between the sexes. This has released the

talents of more than half of mankind, of those who for centuries were tied to the home. It has placed at the disposal of science and the arts, and of progress generally, a new and vigorous force, the equal of men in intelligence but endowed by nature with greater endurance because, as the statistics show, women live longer than men.

They contribute more than we men to the continuation of life. But has equality between the sexes been achieved fully in actual practice? The truth is that in the main there is equality only in the eyes of the law. The superstition and prejudice of millenia cannot, unfortunately, be overcome in the space of a few years. Attitudes need to change, and this takes time. The women's struggle must therefore go on, and men who have accepted the principle of equality must play their part also.

It has been said by a likeable lady rapporteur that only socialism advances the equality of the sexes. Reality says otherwise. With the exception of Romania, with its hideous memory of Annan Paouker, the willing tool of the Russian army of occupation, none of the socialist countries has ever had a woman prime minister. Whereas in the United Kingdom Mrs Thatcher governs with a mandate from the people, Mrs Gandhi governs India, and Mrs Bandaranaike used to be the prime minister of Sri Lanka. There are, certainly, in the socialist countries, cases of men and women doing the same job of work. There are women construction workers and women miners. But that is another story. Previous speakers mentioned instances of the reduced situation of women in certain countries. But we are talking of details. Equality between the sexes is a fact, and it is being pressed home as time goes on. The course of events can no longer be reversed, and since the motion for a resolution contributes to the desired end we shall vote for it.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — (NL) Madam President, women in Europe should be grateful to the European Community. Almost all the formal progress made in women's favour in Member States' legislation stems from the three Community directives concerning equal pay, equal access to employment and equal social security rights. These directives have also prompted an improvement in social legislation, fiscal legislation and even civil rights. We have also been able to find about the situation in other countries. What has already been achieved in one Member State has sparked off demands for the same in another. In this respect, I should like to express my sympathy with our sisters in Ireland, who are trying to obtain the same rights with regard to contraception as already exist in all the other Member States.

However we cannot fail to detect something of a standstill, even a decline, in the situation of women. Next to no progress has been made since this Parliament

Van Hemeldonck

adopted its resolution in February 1981 and since the 1982 programme for action. One of the reasons, of course, is that the emancipation movement has been thwarted by the economic crisis. But another is perhaps that the means are not appropriate to the end. Formal equality in an environment that creates and supports inequality will lead to nothing. Emancipation means making women free and independent. It does not mean getting women to speak men's language or involving them in an unchanged, unequal man's world, where exploitation is the norm. The comedy of formal equality is brilliantly described by La Fontaine in the fable about the fox and the stork, where the fox invites the stork to join him in a meal which is served in such a way that only the fox can eat it.

That is what we have achieved with a strict interpretation of formal equality. Get out and work, men say to women. But then they burden women with all the unpaid work in society. Get out and work, society says to married women, but it then penalizes the work they do with taxation. Get out and work, the politicians say to women, but then they make rules that mean the game can only be won by men.

The time has now come to call for other measures, for action that enables women to catch up, for positive action and for support measures. The directive on positive action must come next year. That is what we want to say to the President of the Council. Measures that enable women to catch up with men must be taken wherever evolution through changes of attitude is taking too long, for example, by introducing quotas of jobs reserved for women, where women are flagrantly underrepresented, in policy-making positions, in politics.

The governments of the Member States must prove that they take equality of rights seriously. They can do this, for example, by taking positive action in their own administrations, in the public service. They can do so by really using all the aids which the Community offers. In this context, it is shameful to note that the Belgian Government, for example, has not taken advantage of the money available under the special Social Fund programme for women, even though Belgium has the highest rate of unemployment among women in the Community.

We must also emphasize the need for the emancipation movement to be given cultural, psychological and scientific support as well as physical and organizational help. This means learning to think in a different way, revaluing the history and culture of women, setting different accents and involving scientific and technological research to overcome prejudice and obstacles. In politics this means, for example, abandoning aggression — I know that many Members on the other side of the House will find this very difficult — in favour of persuasion. Does this seem like an

overcrowded agenda, Madam President? That is surely the price of democracy. After all, ladies and gentlemen, our system is democratic only if both men and women are able to participate equally.

Mrs Rabbethge (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the wide-ranging solidarity amongst us women members of the European Parliament has spread somewhat in the meantime. Differences of approach, as evidenced by today's debate, cannot obscure the common objective we share on the critical issues. Such wide-ranging solidarity extends to embrace women in the Third World. In collaboration with the Lomé States, the Community has endowed the Lomé Convention with a host of exemplary ideas and plans in the economic field which, with the experience acquired over the years, have been revised and updated. For years, however, in conformity with our Community inventory, we have tried in vain to initiate such measures for the women of the Third World.

The ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly meeting held in Berlin last year enabled us to convince our ACP partners, and this on the decisive point, — and only because we women members of the European Parliament, irrespective of political group, made yet another effort — that women hold the real key for an effective development process in the Third World. For the first time ever a report, analogous to that before the House today, covering the situation of women in the Third World (in this case confined to Lomé Convention States) will be unveiled at the forthcoming ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly meeting in Brazzaville in February 1984.

It is not our intention to thrust upon anyone experiences and attitudes which bear a European imprint. We wish to help, whenever and wherever such help is requested in conformity with the motto of a German writer who may be said to have some relevance for the Third World: 'Give me the composure to accept things which I am powerless to change. Give me the courage to change things which I am able to change, and give me the wisdom to keep the two apart.'

(Applause)

Mrs Baduel Glorioso (COM) — *(IT)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I think it important to emphasize how significant this report is that the European Parliament is delivering, five months away from the European elections, to the men and women citizens of Europe — a report that shows how much can be done in this Chamber — where the proportion of women is considerable — to protect rights that are being withdrawn by a process of putting the clock back, which is the way that many Governments are responding to the crisis. Rights, positions that have been won, civil and private rights, rights to work, the right to defend one's own competence, one's own reality, one's own responsibilities. It is significant that

Baduel Glorioso

this report contains at least one paragraph that refers to peace, to the commitment so generously manifest by European women, to their sensitivity, their determination to demonstrate, so that peace shall remain in Europe and so that there shall be no possibility of a limited war in Europe. Which of us does not remember, which of us can forget, at this time, the women of Greenham Common, the German Frauen für Frieden, and the Italian, Belgian, French, Greek and Irish. women — the women from every country in this Community and all of Western Europe who, in this vast movement of public opinion, and in their capacity first as active, determined subjects — because they were expressing a clear determination to reappropriate their own destiny — then as women — where work and civil rights are concerned — and then as both citizens and women — where the future and the right to live are concerned — moved against the militarization of this society and against the philosophy which says that arms production is apparently the key that will enable us, in conjunction with the reorganization that is necessary, to escape from the present crisis!

The European Parliament pays homage to these women, and declares its solidarity with them.

Mrs Fuillet (S). — (*FR*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, at the very outset I would like to congratulate our general rapporteur, as well as all the rapporteurs who took part in drawing up this document. For my part, I should like to draw the attention of the House to a matter that is difficult to tackle, knowing the way certain men behave. I refer to sexual blackmail in the workplace.

The rapporteur and myself tabled a motion for a resolution asking that a survey be made in the European Community's Member States. I at least had great hopes about the results, but I can only say that I was disappointed.

Women's dignity is dealt with in a general sort of way in conjunction with the problem of battered children, and only gets a few lines at that. This is not enough. This problem should have been dealt with under two headings: health and equal opportunity.

On the question of health, I would like to have seen figures given for social security expenditure caused by stress, depression and other psychosomatic illnesses. Women can no longer bear the thought of having to suffer jeers, snubs and uncalled-for gestures from those we refer to as 'the little bosses'. Unfortunately, it has to be said, there are also the big bosses who use different means for their underhand practices.

About equal opportunity, what can I say! It is, of course, difficult to achieve where it is a matter of competition between men and women. But what are we to think about competition between women them-

selves, where the only factor that decides preferment and promotion is that some women give in to sexual blackmail and others do not?

In this House I have undertaken rather difficult initiatives together with some of my colleagues, e.g. in favour of contraception and voluntary termination of pregnancy, but I believe that this problem that I have raised should not be dealt with in a few lines, even if that bothers certain people, especially bearing in mind that our Community institutions are not entirely free of this scourge.

In my country people are beginning to speak more freely. It proved possible to have a survey of the matter made on television. It took a great deal of courage for those women who agreed to speak, especially when one realizes that they could lose their jobs in the present recession! It is things like this that are the yardstick of the change in mental attitudes and the degree of progress being made. This progress consists in reasserting human dignity whenever it is under threat.

I hope, ladies and gentlemen, that you will help us in this struggle and that the victims, who are watching our efforts with such attention, will not be disappointed. Women want to be free and equal and to enjoy in dignity the fruit of their work. We have not yet reached the end of the road. That is why I associate myself wholeheartedly with the wish expressed by the Committee of Inquiry that a formal Committee on Women's Rights be set up within the European Parliament along the lines of the fully recognized ministry we now have in France.

(*Applause*)

Mr Bournias (PPE). — (*GR*) Madam President, in earlier days in the Council of Europe and in this Parliament in 1981, when my country joined the Community, I was availed of the opportunity to stand up for the sacred right of women to full equality with men, and I agree with the chairman of the Committee, Mrs Rodano, that, happily, a great deal has been done for the women of Europe. In the last thirty years a great deal has also been done for women in Greece, and regards their move into politics, science and public affairs more yet will be done.

I do not intend, therefore, to be contentious when there is no bone of contention, and in any case the subject has been dealt with exhaustively by the host of Members who have spoken. I will just read out a message of greeting sent to you, ladies and gentlemen, via me, by three distinguished ladies who are New Democracy MPs in the Greek Parliament, and who lead the women's side of our party.

It reads as follows: 'Leonidas Bournias, leader of the New Democracy group in the European Parliament, the Grand Hotel, Strasbourg.

Bournias

On the occasion of the debate in the European Parliament on the situation of women in Europe we consider it our duty to send the sitting our greetings and to congratulate the European Parliament and those men and women who are leading the way towards equality between the sexes on the gains they have made up until now for women in Europe and for the female sex in general.

The three of us who sign this greeting, Greek women MPs, represent the Women's Affairs Section of the New Democracy Party, and we express the satisfaction felt by the women of our party whom we number at more than 800 000.

We wish power to your elbow and we request you to read our message to the sitting of the European Parliament during the debate on the situation of women in Europe.

Athens, 17 January 1984.

Anna Synodinou, Member for Athens, Chairman of the Section. Anna Benaki, Unattached Member, Vice-Chairman of the Section. Froso Spentzari, Member for Ilias, Vice-Chairman of the Section.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the same sentiments are shared by the Panhellenic Union of Professional Women, of which Mrs Gontikas, the wife of our MEP colleague, Mr Gontikas, is the President.

(Applause)

Mr O'Mahony (S). — Madam President, may I thank my Socialist colleagues on the Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women in Europe for sharing some of their valuable speaking time with me. Their gesture gives me the opportunity, on behalf of the Irish Socialist movement — and I believe, on behalf of Irish women generally — to express solidarity with the work of the committee and with the hopes and aspirations which are expressed in this report.

I think there is an interesting lesson to be learned from the committee's work. I have watched its progress over recent months from a distance with interest. As we know, it comprised women from all political groupings in the Parliament right across the political spectrum. They came together and, after due deliberation, they came forward with a set of proposals which, while progressive, can by no means be described as revolutionary. Yet when these women Members brought these proposals back to their political groupings for consideration and adoption, those from the Conservative and right-wing groups of this Parliament met with opposition and in some cases were defeated on key proposals. There is, therefore, a lesson here which will not be lost on the women of Europe, and that is that the struggle for equality which women are engaged in is linked fundamentally to the struggle for socialism generally.

The truth of the matter is that full equality between men and women in all aspects of their lives can only

be achieved by transforming the social, economic and cultural systems which we have at present. Given the present balance of power in the political system of Europe, we know that this is not likely to happen in the short to medium term. What Socialists are engaged in, therefore, is a struggle to get to the frontier of what is acceptable within the present political order as rapidly as possible. In the process, we expect to learn together that more fundamental changes will be required.

Finally, Madam President, may I disassociate myself entirely from the amendments tabled by the Irish Members of the EPD Group. I think the notion of attempting to impose Irish contraceptive legislation on Europe is a sick joke. At all events, it is a joke which is not shared by most of the women in my country.

Mrs Weber. — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I have tabled an oral question on this subject with a view to ascertaining whether the new 'Law on Educational Grants' enacted by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany does not constitute a serious violation of the 'Community Directive on Equal Treatment of Men and Women' of 1976.

Such concern is apparently well-founded, for the latest available statistics covering 1983 confirm in striking fashion an obvious and drastic deterioration in the situation of the young girls in question. By way of example I would like to quote some figures from the region of Tübingen which confirm a reduction in the number of youths in receipt of grants from 1500 to 600 in the period from 1982 to 1983. Such figures understate the gravity of the situation in that the new law only came into operation on 1 August 1983.

Sums earmarked for educational grants in this area have fallen from DM 3.7 million to DM 2.9 million. Here, too, one can anticipate the figures for 1984 to reveal a drastic deterioration. Some 65 % of the youths currently receiving grants will most probably see their grants withdrawn next year. Over 60 % of these will, once again, be girls. Particularly hard hit are those girls from disadvantaged families, that is, who come from families in which the parents are either unemployed or manual workers. They have invariably followed courses at State-run vocational schools and, as such, no longer fulfil many of the conditions contained in the amended Federal Law on Educational Grants. They will be the first to see their grants withdrawn. Wherever such restrictions oblige the parents to decide whether the boy or the girl should be the recipient of such a grant they will — especially in rural areas, where the situation of young girls calls for particular attention — invariably decide in favour of the boy, thereby sealing the fate of the girl's career prospects!

Weber

For these reasons I believe that such restrictions, without being accompanied by simultaneous measures guaranteeing equal accession to training courses for boys and girls contravenes the Community Directive on Equal Treatment of Men and Women. Article 2 of the Directive forbids any direct or indirect discrimination with regard to accession to training courses and enjoins the Member States to take the requisite dispositions for ensuring compliance therewith. In the light of the foregoing I believe that the Commission must be urged to ensure compliance by the Federal Republic with this Directive and that victims of the new Federal law should bring an action before the Court of Justice of the European Communities against the Federal Government's measures.

(Applause)

Mrs Spaak (NI). — *(FR)* Madam President, I would like to mention briefly paragraph 66 of the report concerning work at home. It is the first time Parliament has tackled these problems. Let us specify first of all that the absolute principle must be the freedom to choose between working at home or going out to work; even if the entry of women into the employment market has brought about a definite change of attitudes, work at home still appears to us as an essentially feminine task. The policies pursued by several Member States Governments seek, indirectly, to send women back home and in doing so, to save, for example on unemployment benefits.

On the other hand, it is necessary to avoid any form of discrimination between those, men or women, who have chosen to work at home and other workers. Work at home is part and parcel of the way our society functions both from a family and educational point of view. This was mentioned in Mrs Cassanmagnago-Cerretti's report on the Community family policy which Parliament adopted.

If we wish to set up a new social organization, particularly by reorganizing working time, the economical, society, juridical dimension of work at home must be studied and recognized.

The European Community must gather the data on this problem and make the appropriate proposals.

President. — That closes the list of speakers in this debate. Now this debate has gone on for five hours today, and during all that time we have had the benefit of the presence of Commissioner Richard listening to this debate. I think we are extremely grateful to him. As a result of many speakers having exceeded their legitimate time, he technically has no time at all to answer this debate. However, I know that Members will wish to hear what he has to say, and so the vote is being postponed for at least ten minutes in order to give Commissioner Richard the chance to make at least a short reply. Thank you very much, Commissioner.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — May I start off by saying how much I welcome this debate. I think it has been far reaching, it has been useful, it has been comprehensive and, indeed, a number of the contributions that have been made in the course of this debate have been, in terms of the analysis they contained, extremely good and, in terms of the suggestions they have made, ones which the Commission would clearly wish to consider.

Can I deal with two or three specific factual points that I was specifically asked before going onto the main points that I want to make? Mrs van den Heuvel asked me a number of points specifically addressed to the implementation of the social security directive. The interim report was adopted by the Commission on 6 January; it was transmitted to the Parliament officially on 11 January. I think that that interim report would, in fact, answer all the questions that Mrs van den Heuvel raised but, so that there should be no misunderstanding, let me just answer them very briefly myself.

In answer to her first question on the head of household, the answer is yes, the notion of the head of household is considered by the Commission to be a form of indirect discrimination and, indeed, we have already taken up this point with one Member State, namely Belgium.

Secondly, with regard to the question of regression from the situation obtaining in Member States when the Directive was adopted in 1978, perhaps I should quote what we say in the communication: 'The Commission has to ensure that during the transitional period measures are taken with a view to the progressive implementation of the Directive, and that any measures which are likely to jeopardize the principle of equal treatment are avoided.' I add that the Commission has, and will continue to initiate, infringement procedures against governments which have taken measures having such an effect. At the moment, for example, proceedings have begun against Belgium and are being studied as far as the Netherlands are concerned.

On the third question that she asked me, the Commission's position on the question of increases in social security benefits for dependants, including dependant's spouses, is also made clear in the interim report. Again I quote from it: 'The Commission feels that such increases can be justified only in the case of social benefits guaranteeing a minimum income. Increases which are proportional to remuneration, however, are regarded by the Commission as indirectly discriminatory within the terms of the Directive and should in time be restricted or abolished.'

As far as prospects for 1985 are concerned, the Commission is not too optimistic that all Member States will succeed in adjusting their legislation suffi-

Richard

ciently and in time. We will have to examine progress achieved on the basis of the texts to be submitted by Member States as from 22 December 1984. But can I assure the Parliament again, as I think I have done in the past, that as far as the Commission is concerned we will use the legislative powers and the enforcement provisions that we have at our disposal, we will continue to use them in the future with the same vigour that we have used them in the past.

May I just answer one specific point raised by Mrs Maij-Weggen? This was on the question of the Social Fund annual report. We will, indeed, consider the inclusion in the annual report of a special section reporting on the use of the Social Fund by Member States to benefit young women.

Madam President, I do not want to repeat what I have already said to Parliament on other occasions in these debates, because we have had a number of them, but I think I do have to start off, I am afraid, by reminding Parliament that in some policy areas, and particularly in the field of health and the field of education, the Commission's competence is indeed severely limited.

Another point I think that I must make with respect to this resolution is that the Parliament is making many demands upon the Commission: it is asking the Commission to act by proposing binding legal instruments. The Parliament knows as well as I do the difficulties involved in the adoption of legal instruments in this particular field. The Commission is, however, committed so far to act in this way in a certain number of fields. For example on social security occupational schemes and on parental leave. In other areas we feel that draft directives are often neither appropriate nor opportune. The possibility, for example, that has been raised in the course of this debate — the possibility of issuing a directive on taxation seems to me to be extremely unlikely. On the subject of taxation, the report reaches the same conclusions as our own study but, as I said a little earlier, we do not feel that the time is right for a directive; we would suggest that our next step should be to draw up a memorandum outlining the facts of the situation to give the subject a better airing. We are asked too, for example, to draw up a directive on equal treatment for self-employed women and women in agriculture. This work, I hope Parliament will be pleased to hear, is nearly completed and I hope to present the draft directive to the Commission later on this month.

The fate of the directives already proposed by the Commission, as Parliament knows, is no longer entirely in our hands. Your interest and your pressure can do much to ensure a successful outcome for these proposals. It was the pressure of the 1981 resolution that did much to inspire the Community's action programme on women, adopted by the Commission at the end of that year. We look to you for continued support. I do not think we will be disappointed by the 1984 resolution.

I was, however, sorry that you felt it necessary to criticize the Commission, in what I thought were somewhat severe terms, on its lack of action after the 1981 resolution. I fully accept that we have not done all that you asked.

We have, however, made considerable progress since 1981. At your request we have drawn up a progress report on the implementation of the new Community Action Programme. As you will see in this report every action of the Action Programme has begun, although they are necessarily at different stages of implementation. Research is still being undertaken, for example, in the areas of legal redress, maternity protection, the impact of office technology on women's employment, vocational training for women in the new technologies and discrimination in laws and administrative practices against women immigrants. We have also recently financed two projects to assess the position of women in television organizations and the image of women in the media. In other areas, research and analyses have been completed, as for instance on the subject of public child care facilities and services, the analysis of women's position in decision-making bodies and the inconsistencies between changing social values and the organization of work. All these items have been requested by Parliament of the Commission in their report and in this debate.

Some people here participated in the seminar held in Athens in September on the initiative of the Greek Government, the Commission and the European Parliament to discuss positive action. Measures already applied in certain Member and non-Member States had already been analysed and were available for comparison. They lead us to the conclusion that the importance of some form of legal framework to encourage the development of positive action should not be underestimated. Following in particular the conclusions drawn up at Athens, the Commission plans to produce a recommendation which seems to us at this stage more likely to stimulate the development of positive actions.

I have been asked oral questions — one on the Social Fund and one on the other issue raised by Mrs Weber. I should like to deal briefly with both of them.

As far as the guidelines for the management of the Fund is concerned, the new ones provide considerably greater opportunities and incentives than hitherto for the improvement of the inequalities experienced by women in the matter of access to vocational training and employment. Priority is accorded without any regional limitation to operations designed especially for women who are unemployed, threatened with unemployment or wishing to return to work to promote a more even mix of the sexes in jobs in

Richard

which they are under-represented. Such operations may, as in the past, consist of vocational training. But they may also in the future include job recruitment schemes which were not provided for outside certain regions under the previous system. The guidelines also afford priority to operations for persons to be employed as instructors, vocational guidance or placement experts in the absolute priority regions. Where such operations which may consist of vocational training or recruitment aid are carried out to further the employment of women and the desegregation of the labour market, priority is not subject to a regional limitation.

Vocational training is of course extremely important in the fight against women's unemployment. The Commission has also taken a positive step in funding the creation of women's cooperatives — a positive action measure we intend to continue and intensify this year. Action is also continuing in pilot sectors such as banks where, following the Commission's initiative, a certain number of banks reported in December on actions they had implemented, some of which had received the Commission's support.

Briefly, in answer to the question put down by Mrs Weber and Mr Glinne on the effect upon women of cuts made under the law on the promotion of vocational training in the Federal Republic of Germany, the Commission is, of course, aware of the German Federal law on the promotion of education of 6 June 1983 to which the honourable Members referred. It is currently undertaking a thorough examination of this law in order to see whether it will be necessary to take appropriate measures as the guardian of the Treaties. Information on details of the legislation concerned has been requested from the government of the Federal Republic.

Coming back now to the resolution and its 18 reports, it is a sad fact that they conclude that between 1981 and 1984 the situation of women in Europe has deteriorated. The reason for this is not far to seek. Economic reverses and unemployment have hit women hard with so many women working in the less-skilled or in the part-time sectors. The idea of women staying at home becomes more attractive to governments as unemployment increases. As I have already said, there is no reason why women should bear more than their proportionate and fair share of the burdens imposed by the economic crisis. The actions and initiatives the Commission is taking at the moment in this field are intended to counteract this tendency which is contrary to the provisions and spirit of Community legislation and commitments on equal treatment.

Three important proposals have been issued recently by the Commission which are already under discussion in Parliament. One is the directive on parental leave and leave for family reasons. Another is the directive on equal treatment in occupational social

security schemes. And the third is the Commission communication to the Standing Committee on employment on the subject of women's unemployment. We feel the implications of the spread of women's unemployment deserve our fullest attention. We are therefore proposing that the Council adopt a resolution on this subject in the coming months. The promotion of equal opportunities does not take place in isolation from other Community policies. Several proposals have been submitted to the Council by the Commission which contribute to this overall aim. These include our recommendation on the reduction and reorganization of working time, the communication on youth unemployment, the communication on the development of local initiatives; the Council resolutions on vocational training, on new technologies and vocational training in the 1980s also include commitments to take positive action on behalf of women. At Community level we are attaching more and more importance to the need for positive measures and to developing research actions to encourage women to train, to develop skills, apply for promotion and compete on an equal basis, particularly for jobs, in traditionally male sectors. We are too encouraging a better sharing of responsibilities in the family and at the workplace, and trying to promote the participation of women in decision-making positions.

In 1980, at Parliament's request, the Commission conducted an inquiry into the discrimination facing women in employment. We are now in the process of conducting a new survey on the same subject, but with additional material, on the effect that the economic crisis is having on employed women. That survey will be available we hope in the spring of this year. It should provide us with important material on the realities of the present situation for women. In this respect I cannot emphasize too greatly the importance of this resolution, not only for the Community institutions and the governments of the Member States to whom it is addressed, but also for the women's associations and groups whose role at grass-roots level cannot be over-emphasized.

For my part, I should like, finally, to stress the importance to the Commission of the work that is being done in the Committee of Inquiry and in Parliament itself. Finally, may I therefore congratulate the rapporteur, Mrs Cinciari Rodano, on the work that she did in guiding this committee to this successful conclusion. It could not have been an easy committee to preside over and, at the same time, I should like to congratulate the 18 rapporteurs on the breadth of their reports, on the amount of detailed work that clearly went into them and on the usefulness and utility of many of the conclusions that they came to.

The Commission for its part, within its limited resources, will continue to direct its energies to meeting the challenge. Faced with this worsening situ-

Richard

ation we should not run away from the issues. We should, rather, intensify the struggle against inequality and against discrimination. I am delighted that Parliament, through this resolution, again demonstrates its determination to be in the vanguard of that struggle.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR : MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at the next voting time.

8. *Votes*¹

PROPOSAL FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL FOR A REGULATION AMENDING REGULATION (EEC) NO 1418/76 ON THE COMMON ORGANIZATION OF THE MARKET IN RICE

President. — I would remind you that yesterday evening the Assembly adopted Amendment No 1 by Mr Sutra and Mr Woltjer, Article 1 of the Commission being replaced by a new article. Subsequently, the Assembly refused to adopt Amendment No 2 by Mr Sutra and Mr Woltjer to delete Article 2 of the Commission proposal. The question has been asked whether these two votes are contradictory; it has been found that there is no contradiction between the decisions taken by the Assembly on Amendments Nos 1 and 2.

Mr Sutra would like to give further clarification.

Mr Sutra (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is now possible to solve the problem which was, quite legitimately, raised in the House yesterday. I can now provide more details on the meaning of the amendment I submitted. This is the exact text I referred to. For products covered by subcategory 10/06B" a) 'semi-milled rice', the subsidy is the same as for that which came under the heading of 'husked rice'. I would like to add that, of course, in my mind, the word 'agreement' which was used in my amendment yesterday was in no way intended to accuse the Council of having reached a total and definite agreement before receiving the Parliament's opinion. We are simply dealing with a text which is sufficiently far advanced to be able to say nevertheless that there will be no further problem if the Parliament adopts it. Moreover, if the Parliament adopts the proposal as a whole, the matter will be settled; if it rejects it, it will be referred to me in the Committee on Agriculture, as rapporteur, and I shall make exactly the

same proposal. Hence, as you have said, Mr President, in the absence of contradiction between the two votes, I am asking Parliament to definitely approve this proposal.

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

President

BARBAGLI REPORT (Doc. 1-114/83 — FRUIT AND VEGETABLES)

Motion for a resolution

After paragraph 3 — Amendment No 20

Mr Gautier (S). — *(DE)* I would like to request a roll-call vote on this amendment.

President. — This is the last time we can authorize this. Since the Rules of Procedure were amended, a request must be made in writing before the vote.

Paragraph 5 — Amendment No 5

Mr Gautier (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, I consider the amendment to be inadmissible, for it calls upon the Commission to withdraw its proposals but the House has just adopted such proposals by virtue of the foregoing vote. Hence I fear that such an amendment is, by virtue of our new rules, no longer conform to the decision the House adopted some ten minutes ago.

President. — You are right — as always. The amendment is inadmissible.

After the adoption of the motion for a resolution

President. — It is now 6.50 p.m. The vote on the Cinciari Rodano report will, if all goes well, take about 1 hour and fifteen minutes. If we proceed now to the vote, the political group meetings will be disrupted. I think it is important to vote now, but I need the agreement of the House before we do so.

Mr Bangemann (L). — *(DE)* Mr President, may I therefore urge you to proceed to the vote-taking. We have a lengthy debate behind us and I feel we owe it to the Committee to take a vote immediately, even if it means postponing the political group meetings.

(Applause)

President. — Nobody dares to contradict you. That is decided.

CINCIARI RODANO REPORT (Doc. 1-1229/83 — SITUATION OF WOMEN IN EUROPE)

Paragraph 31 — Amendment No 133

¹ See Annex II.

Mrs Cinciari Rodano (COM), coordinating rapporteur. — Mr President, I believe that the amendment only concerns the Greek text. At all events, the Committee will follow the wishes of Parliament as regards both Amendments 30 and 133.

Mrs Pantazi (S). — (GR) The alterations are just linguistic ones in order to make the Greek text clearer. The Committee has accepted them and I request the House to endorse them because they do not change the content of the report.

President. — Mrs Pantazi, since you say that they are purely linguistic alterations, we do not need to adopt them. We shall adapt the Greek version of the text to bring it into line with the other languages. This also applies to Amendment No 30 which was stated also as being of solely linguistic importance, and it only remains for us to vote on the first indent of paragraph 31.

Mr Konstantinos Nikolaou (S). — (DE) Mr President, in announcing this amendment you erroneously stated that it had been tabled by the Socialist Group whereas its sponsors were, in fact, the Liberal and Democratic Group. Thus quite a few of my colleagues have cast their votes the wrong way. Would you be kind enough to put the matter to the vote again?

(Protests)

President. — Perhaps the Socialists are also sometimes Liberal!

(Protests)

My mistake, that is what I have in front of me.

Mr Bangemann (L). — (DE) Mr President, this in no way justifies taking a vote again, for if I understand Mr Nikolaou correctly, he is saying, in essence, that, irrespective of the measure under consideration, he would oppose it if its sponsors were the Liberal and Democratic Group. This is ridiculous!

(Laughter)

President. — Exactly, Mr Bangemann, that is why we are not voting again.

After the vote on all amendments

Mr Barbi (PPE). — (IT) Mr President, since a very great many amendments have been introduced, which have quite appreciably changed the resolution, my group needs to meet to decide how it will vote: we therefore request that the sitting be suspended for a quarter of an hour.

President. — The Group of the European People's Party has asked for a suspension of the sitting. I propose that we take ten minutes.

In any event explanations of vote must be made in writing; otherwise we shall not be able to vote this evening and the final vote and explanations of vote will take place on Thursday. There is no other solution. I put the request to the vote.

Mr Bangemann (L). — (DE) I am not quite sure that this conforms to our Rules of Procedure. If you say so, Mr President, then I bow to your wisdom, but I would remind the Socialist Group, which does not appear to welcome a suspension at this juncture, that I once acceded to their request for a suspension at a time when they were the only ones making such a request. When a group requests that proceedings be suspended, that request should be acceded to without recourse to a vote.

President. — I am sorry but Rule 88 of the Rules of Procedure compels me to put this request to the vote.

Mr Bangemann (L). — (DE) Mr President, allow me to make an appeal to the members of the Socialist and Communist and Allies Group. You now have the majority; that was quite apparent. Now show us how you intend to use your majority in view of my reminder as to how we used it when we had it.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr Bangemann's remarks are quite appropriate. My group will not make an issue of this suspension. An adjournment until tomorrow morning would, however, be something quite different. We shall go along with a suspension for fifteen minutes, whereupon the proceedings are to be resumed.

(Parliament agreed to the request for the sitting to be suspended)

President. — The sitting will be suspended for 15 minutes. Explanations of vote will be given after the vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole.

(The sitting was suspended at 8.45 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

Mr Balfe (S). — Mr President, I would like you to clarify what exactly Mr Dankert said with reference to explanations of vote.

President. — Mr Dankert informed the Assembly — and there were no objections — that first the vote would be taken and then explanations of vote would be given.

(After explanations of vote)

Mrs Cinciari Rodano (COM), coordinating rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, I should like — even though I realize that it is perhaps not the best of climates — to thank the rapporteurs and Members of the Committee for the work they have done, today also, and also all those Members who have spoken in the debate; I should like to thank the representatives of the Council and the Commission for their contributions.

I should like also to express my great regret for the fact that some of the groups and some members, who had made an effective contribution to the preparation of the resolution, should then have thought it not worth voting on.

We must appreciate that the individual groups in the Parliament are obviously free to vote as they think fit, and obviously, not all the changes that have been introduced please everyone. Let me simply say, as a member of a small group in this Parliament, that it is necessary sometimes to know how to lose.

I hope that, when they read the text again in cold blood, members will realize that it has not after all been changed very much from the text that we had presented; and that, when the excitement of the moment has passed, we shall succeed in finding once again amongst the women in this Parliament that

collaboration which is indispensable if we want the problems concerning women to be examined in depth, to enable progress to be made towards a solution.

I must finally place on record that, although the resolution was adopted unanimously by the Committee, Mrs von Alemann and Mrs Lenz both voted separately on individual points of the resolution and expressed their reservations. Naturally, Parliament has then decided as it thought fit — on this occasion, in a way that pleased me but pleased our colleagues rather less — but I hope that that does not mean we shall meet with difficulties and obstacles in the future, because we need to continue to work together.

(Applause)

President. — As President in the Chair and a member of the committee, it only remains for me to endorse your remarks and to thank most especially this evening the interpreters and other officials who have been with us for so long. There are a lot of women among them! ¹

(Applause)

(The sitting was closed at 9.35 p.m.)

¹ For agenda of next sitting: see Minutes.

ANNEX I

Votes

The verbatim report sets out the opinion of the rapporteur on the various amendments together with explanations of vote. For details of voting please refer to the Minutes.

PROPOSAL FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL FOR A REGULATION AMENDING REGULATION (EEC) NO 1418/76 ON THE COMMON ORGANIZATION OF THE MARKET IN RICE : ADOPTED

* * *

BARBAGLI REPORT (DOC. 1-1114/83 — FRUIT AND VEGETABLES) : ADOPTED

The rapporteur was :

- FOR Amendments Nos 4, 10, 11 and 17 ;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 1, 2, 5 to 9, 12, 13, 16, 18 to 28, 30 to 34.

Explanations of vote

Mr Sutra (S). — (FR) I support the Barbagli report.

Mr Gautier (S). — (DE) I intend to vote against this report and I am somewhat astonished that a great number of Christian Democratic members adopt a report...

(Interjection by Mr Klepsch)

... and perhaps also members of my group too — I am speaking, therefore, purely on my own behalf — which will ensure a continuation in the fruit and vegetable sector of the state of affairs which has prevailed hitherto. We are all familiar with the present system. It is tantamount to a systematic destruction of fruit and vegetables and a total absence of budgetary restraint in this area, a state of affairs for which we have the Christian Democrats to thank. These are the reasons underlying my vote against.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, just a personal comment. Would you kindly inform Mr Gautier that he has no right to reproach my group for voting against a motion for a resolution, which a majority of his own group also opposed. Why does he single out my group?

President. — Mr Klepsch, this remark comes after the end of a debate at which I was not present the whole time.

Mr Prag (ED). — I shall vote personally against this report because I find that once again this Parliament and particularly groups on my left and right have voted for paragraphs which clearly and obviously to everyone concerned involve increases in farm expenditure. The major problem which we have in the Community is to make the common agricultural policy valid and viable, but once again we have run away from our duty of achieving this objective.

Mrs Pery (S), in writing. — (FR) Community aid for the common organization of the market in the products processed from fruits and vegetables has proved useful and effective. It has helped to increase consumption and exports, limit imports and guarantee producers' incomes. It is useful to recall that this system was set up because the minimum price system at the border did not guarantee respect for Community preference so that producers encountered increasing marketing difficulties. At present, Community processing aids are granted for products based on tomatoes, plums in syrup, dried prunes, pears and cherries in syrup. These aids are paid to processors who contract to pay producers of fresh products a minimum price fixed every year.

The new regulation proposed by the Commission seems to be intended to curtail rather than improve these aids. It aims at reducing expenditure in the light of the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal. We cannot accept these economies when the fruit and vegetable sector only absorbs 4% of the total expenditure of the EAGGF Guarantee Fund.

I shall vote for the Barbagli report which calls on the Commission to modify and define these new proposals. The new regulation should not endanger small producers or processing industries whose economic activity and the employment they provide are important for certain southern regions, like Aquitaine.

CINCIARI RODANO REPORT (DOC. 1-1229/83 — SITUATION OF WOMEN IN EUROPE): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was :

- FOR Amendments Nos 1, 4, 9, 10, 17, 21, 34, 38, 51, 54, 57, 58, 61, 63, 65, 78 to 81, 85, 86, 95, 97/corr., 99 to 103, 107, 109 to 111, 149, 166 and 174 ;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 7, 11 to 15, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29/corr. II, 31, 32, 36, 39, 41, to 47, 60, 66, 67, 69, 71, 73, 75 to 77, 82, 83, 88 to 93, 104, 105, 114, 116 to 119, 121 to 131, 134 to 137, 145 to 148, 150 to 163, 165, 167 to 173, 176 to 178.

Explanations of vote

Mr Glinne (S). — (FR) The Socialist Group supports all the reports drawn up on behalf of the Committee of Inquiry on the Situation of Women in Europe, especially as part-time work inducement has been abandoned and several important socialist amendments to this effect were adopted, including Amendment No 58 by Mrs Vayssade, Mr Enright and others which states, and I quote :

... notes that part-time work is no substitute for a general reduction in working time.

Thus, the Socialist Group has voted for the report of the Committee of Inquiry, even if there are still some grounds for criticism. We regard the report as amended, as a further step towards greater equality, more social and human justice, and more respect for the individual.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Lenz (PPE). — (DE) The group of the European People's Party played an active part in the committee deliberations. They also jointly sponsored substantial parts of the motion for a resolution. They were, furthermore, resolved to vote with all other groups on this.

In the interval, however, amendments have been tabled which have had the effect of distorting our long-held conception of an integral policy for women and the family. As a result my group decided to abstain.

We ought to bear in mind that women carry out an activity within the family as well as in economic life, that they must adjust their working hours to the changed conditions and that new criteria to regulate working hours may not be introduced to the detriment of women, and that health-related issues are of a highly sensitive nature and cannot be solved by supplementary amendments.

Lenz

We support the main substance of this motion for a resolution. We shall continue to strive for an improvement of the situation of women in the Community. We find ourselves, however, unable to subscribe to the manner in which the individual demands have been formulated here, and we have therefore decided to abstain.

Mr Bangemann (L). — *(DE)* On behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group I would like to give an explanation of the reasons underlying our decision to abstain. As you all know our group was an attentive and sympathetic observer of the Committee's deliberations from the outset. We would have welcomed this committee of inquiry being accorded the status of a proper committee and we would have wished to be able to give our assent to the motion for a resolution in its entirety today. Indeed I can assure the House that we would have done as much had there been no more than differences on technicalities. For example, on the matter of a reduction in the working week we tabled a number of amendments which were subsequently rejected. But this would not have shaken our resolve to vote in favour, in the final analysis.

However, the stumbling block is Amendment 165 which was, regrettably, adopted with the votes of the Socialist and Communist and Allies Groups. There is more at stake here than a mere technicality. It makes the issue of emancipation one of party politics. My group deeply regrets this, for we are convinced that one can only serve the cause of emancipation of women by joint non-partisan action. However, Amendment 165, by equating the class struggle with women's emancipation, has ceased to be bi-partisan and we shall have no part of it. Hence my group's abstention during the voting.

However, we wish to reiterate, Mr Fellermaier, that we would have gone along with the Socialist Group on many of the individual items, even where they were not in conformity with our philosophy but no one can force me to adopt — not even on an issue such as this — a communist viewpoint! I am a Liberal and, as such, I cannot approve a global motion for a resolution which would commit me to support a class struggle. That is carrying matters too far! You only have yourselves to blame for this situation. It was you who frittered away my group's support on this crucial issue. You have done women's emancipation a disservice. You will come to rue such a deed!

(Applause from the Centre and from the Right)

Mr Pearce (ED). — I voted against this resolution. It is verbose and pompous in style. It is like a bin into which everything to do with women has been shovelled. It is not about people, it is about political units. It lacks humility, it lacks sympathy, it lacks kindness, it ignores femininity and concern for motherhood and for families. It is about rights, what you take, rather than about responsibilities and what you give. It advocates meddling in people's lives. It treats women as a separate species. It sets men against women; that, as Mr Bangemann has said, is what this debate has done. It tries to rearrange humanity.

There are, I fully accept, lots of cases in some countries where women do not get the rights due to them as people. We should fight for those rights, but this is not the way to do it. This could have been a model of a clear, hard-hitting, practical report that would actually do some good. But it has failed. It is divisive; it is in fact, at bottom, a lot of chatter, a lot of left-wing, pompous chatter. That is why I voted against it.

Ms Clwyd (S). — Much as I am tempted to counter Mr Pearce's claptrap with some pompous remarks of my own, I suggest that he goes home and tries to persuade his fellow-Members of the Conservative Group to read the report, because it is quite obvious, Mr Pearce, that you and your group have not read the report. I suggest you start from basic principles. Read the report that you are criticizing!

I intend to put my explanation of vote in writing, but I suggest that Parliament looks at its own new amended rules, because in the new amended rules we make one fatal mistake. On page 1 we assume that all Members of this Parliament are men. We say: 'Any Member may add his signature to a declaration entered in the register'. So, can we start in Parliament by removing sexist language from our own rules and regulations?

Ms Clwyd (S), *in writing*. — (EN) Millions of pounds have been lost to the United Kingdom and thousands of women are being denied training opportunities, because the Government is breaking the sex discrimination laws. It is further evidence of the UK Government's disregard of women's needs and rights.

58 % of money for the training of women from the European Social Fund, goes to West Germany, while only 3 % goes to UK.

The only people one can blame is the British Government. The fact that the highest proportion of the £ 16 million, in this section goes to West Germany, is a measure of the importance given to the training of women in that country, as opposed to Britain.

Training programmes which have received financial backing from the ESF have taught women a wide variety of skills. They have been trained as mechanical engineers, tool makers, mechanics and fitters. And in manual skills such as painters, joiners, and in electronics as fitters and engineers.

There seems to be a deliberate policy on the part of the UK Government to conceal the existence of this section of the Fund. I recently wrote to the Department of Employment asking what publicity is given in the UK to this section of the budget and for various other details. The reply was totally unsatisfactory. It argues that women should not have separate access to training facilities. This despite the fact that the Sex Discrimination Act allows for positive discrimination in favour of women, in areas where they were previously discriminated against.

The Equal Opportunities Commission is very concerned about the Department of Employment's attitude. I believe it should have the courage of its convictions and take the UK Government to the European Court of Justice yet again. It is particularly ironic that the UK which is so concerned about its budget contribution should be ignoring EEC money because of its head-in-the sand attitude towards training opportunities for women.

Along with the cut-backs in public spending and measures to force local authorities to cap their rates the UK Governments policies are forcing women's living conditions back to the dark ages.

Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul (S). — (DE) In conformity with its voting at the committee stage the Socialist Group approves of the results attained by this Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women. To tell the truth, Mr Bangemann — as one who, unlike you, participated in the hearings of the Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women — the extent of the changes made to this report is minimal, in part as a result of amendments tabled by your own Group and accepted by us. The Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women voted in favour of adopting the final text, including the call for a 35-hour working week! Now Mr Bangemann and his Group are seeking a new pretext to force their way into the issue of the Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women and that of the 35-hour week.

That is cowardly, extraordinarily cowardly! You will have to explain that to women in the Federal Republic. At the committee stage you voted for the package proposed by the Committee of Inquiry. The text that we are now discussing is the same one! The criticism you levelled against Amendment 165 is inaccurate; we are not speaking here of class struggle. It states, emphatically, that 'one of the principal impairments to the dignity of women lies in the fact that they are exploited by their employers'.

(Protest from Mr Bangemann)

Mr Bangemann, is not the fact that women in the Federal Republic are still being classified two salary levels lower than men an impairment of a woman's dignity?

(Applause)

Wieczorek-Zeul

I reiterate my contention that you are using the pretext of Amendment 165 as a let-out on this issue. Women will have to judge for themselves the fact that the Christian Democratic Group has abstained on an issue affecting women, and an ideological issue at that, and another group could not be relied on.

Mrs Lizin (S). — *(FR)* As Socialists, all of us who participated closely in this work are pleased with the result.

All the same, I would like to stress the extent to which we regret the attitude adopted by the right wing parties and by the women members of these parties. In fact, this shows that, in these parties, women serve primarily as an alibi and that when they want to raise fundamental problems, they have no right to do so; it is the men who take the floor. Mr Bangemann used the word 'detail' three or four times, which means that in these parties, the women are only permitted to deal with the details. As soon as the fundamental questions concerning the labour market come up they lose their right to speak and are compelled to vote and to abstain as they have done; this is really regrettable. Since Mr Richard has left us — and one cannot blame him — I wish it to be noted that in my explanation of vote I want to remind my colleagues in this House of the fact that where positive action is concerned we have taken today, both in what Mr Richard said and also in a press conference, a somewhat dangerous step. It now seems that on the matter of positive action we are merely making a recommendation. So, on this question, I cry: danger! We shall only be effective where positive action programmes are concerned if we can impose them and back them up with a directive. I say this to prevent Mr Richard's statement from going unnoticed in this Parliament. A recommendation is not at all what we are asking for on this matter.

Mrs Dury (S). — *(FR)* Of course, I am pleased with the outcome of this vote. Nevertheless, I wish to express my disappointment on one point, namely that introduced by Mr Kyrkos on voluntary termination of pregnancy. It must be said that there is a great disparity in European legislations. Furthermore, certain countries, like Belgium, are still living in the age of obscurantism and intolerance where this problem is concerned. Voluntary termination of pregnancy is still prohibited and doctors and women were still being convicted in 1983.

Liability to prosecution and the distress caused by the application of an out-of-date law, are an insult to women today. This does not mean that I am in favour of abortion in itself. The economic and social causes of abortion, as well as the delay in providing information and contraception have been well known for a long time. Liability to prosecution adds all the risks involved in an illegal act to the anxiety which a woman facing an unwanted pregnancy already experiences. I would like to point out that my female colleagues in right-wing groups did not see fit to adopt Mr Kyrkos' amendment, which was rejected by just two votes. I would have thought that all European women would have stood together on a problem which is still a bastion of intolerance and injustice in several Community countries.

Mr Balfe (S). — Parliament has tonight set itself a precedent that it will live to regret. We are giving our explanations of vote, which Rule 80 clearly says may be given before the final vote, after the final vote. We are giving them after the final vote because of intolerance within this House, on all sides of the House. And I must say to my own colleagues that when I stood up to make a point of order, there was considerable pressure on me not to make it. We often lose votes on the Socialist side of this House, and I would put it seriously to my colleagues that they have actually weakened their own impact on this House by the intolerance which they showed tonight. They have also, however, fairly and clearly demonstrated how they view the matter of women's rights. It is significant that the first time we have had out-of-order explanations of vote, they have actually been on the subject of women's rights.

Balfe

And so I wish to put to this House the quite serious proposition that it should cease to break its own Rules. If it is going to break its own Rules, if it is going to be intolerant in these matters, it is then a short step to the complete breakdown of the rights of ordinary Members of this House — the Members who do not get on the group's speaking list and who do not get the opportunities. As far as the vote itself goes if you look round this Chamber to see the interest there is not a single Tory here. There is one Christian-Democrat that I can see, and there is of course my good friend, Mr Bangemann. Mr Bangemann is savouring the last few days of his political life before he is despatched under the 5% rule of his country. I am always extremely pleased to see him in this Chamber. I am also pleased to see him adopting British parliamentary habits by having a slanging match with Heidi Wieczorek-Zeul. This is a good step forward. Finally, on the report itself, it is of course welcome to us. I only welcome the report. I welcome it all, but I do reiterate and finish by saying that we will regret the precedent that we have set.

Mr Halligan (S). — I, like other Members of the House, regret that a very historic day in the life of this Parliament should be ending as such a damp squib. I think, nonetheless, that it should be marked as a very historic day. I recall that the founder of my party, the Irish Labour Party, once said that working class women were the slaves of slaves. More than a century has passed since he said that, and it has been marked by the emancipation of ordinary people from economic and social injustice. The conditions which now prevail are very different from the world which he addressed.

But the fact is that most women still regard this world, irrespective of their own social status, as being an unjust world in which they are discriminated against simply because they are women. The very fact that this debate has had to take place and, in fact, the circumstances inside which it took place is proof enough of that. So, to the dubious and doubting — and they are obviously here — I would suggest that the sheer volume of this report and its many annexes must support the idea that women are really and truly discriminated against and that it is not likely in the immediate future that they are going in any way to achieve equality with men.

I think the basic reason for that is that men are not yet prepared to accept the fact that women are discriminated against, or even that discrimination exists. Most men, I think, lack the imagination to see the world through the eyes of a woman. I regret that we have had sufficient example of that here in the last half an hour's barracking. The world is structured by men for men, and it is a male dominated world which does not take into account the special position of women. I think that the ignorance by men of the real status of women is the cause this continuing discrimination.

This report is imperfect and does not contain all that we would wish to see, but at least it contains some elements that might help to overcome that ignorance. For that reason it should have been supported by the entire House and men should not have scurried to the safety of an abstention and they should not have voted against this report.

Mr Irmer (L). — *(DE)* I would like to congratulate Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul and the other Socialist ladies for this freak majority which they have managed to muster tonight. I must, on the other hand, convey my profound sympathy to the women of Europe with regard to the inability of the European Parliament to strike a blow tonight for the liberation of women with a view to ensuring equal treatment of both sexes in the future.

Tonight's proceedings had nothing to do with improving the lot of women, nor was the approach adopted by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul and associates motivated by a liberation and improvement of the position of women in the Community; their approach was characterized by Socialist ideologies and the class struggle which they were intent on projecting into the public limelight in this electoral year and we intend to make that clear to the Community electorate in the course of the electoral campaign.

Europe's women have not been done a service today. The promising beginnings contained in the report and on which our female colleagues had devoted months and years of endeavour have tonight fallen victim to an ideological stroke of the pen. We have

Irmer

not gone along with this! Hence our decision to abstain. We shall make this clear in the course of the electoral campaign. The Socialist Group will have to account for this before those women, and men too, in the Community who passionately support equal treatment of both sexes.

Mr Vankerkhoven (PPE). — *(FR)* When a woman actively participates, whether by vocation or by necessity, in any form of economic activity, she should receive the same pay as a man. The report submitted to us did in fact put forward this point of view and insisted, moreover, that the right of women to vocational training and real access to all forms of employment should be recognized.

But providing equality of opportunity between men and women, does not mean subscribing to the theory that it is necessary to transform their respective roles. Equal opportunity does not necessarily involve dismissing the areas where men and women obviously complement each other as many invalid 'sexist stereotypes'.

Here, as elsewhere, I am in favour of the right to differ. I believe that if woman's dignity requires that all doors should be opened to her, it does not necessarily have to encourage her or force her to pass through them all. Also, I maintain that the work of those women who choose to devote all their time to their family is, at least as noble, dignified and productive as that of those women who prefer to engage in the economic activities.

Even if the report only mentions work at home and its juridical status in three lines out of a total of thirty pages, the report we are considering is very unsatisfactory on this point and fails to offer any solution. I could not approve it because its proposals are, as a result, unrealistic but because I wish to pay homage to the many women who are willing and happy, on a full-time basis to fulfil their irreplaceable role of wife and mother and who would be horrified if they were obliged, because of the psychological and moral pressure of a distorted egalitarian stereotype, to abandon it or feel guilty about it.

Mrs Nielsen (L). — *(DA)* We in the Liberal Group are agreed that life's responsibilities are discharged best if the women are involved in work on an equal footing with the men. This applies not only to the employment market, but also in politics, and therefore in my explanation of voting intentions I should like to begin with something quite concrete, which precisely demonstrates how we Liberals work in practice to get a much better deal for women. In Denmark we have just had an election in the Danish Parliament. The Venstre Party, Denmark's Liberal Party, raised the women's share of our group from 4.8% to 22.7%. Thus 'Venstre', the Liberal Party, is showing how important we think it is to include more women than we had earlier. That is why, among other things, Mrs von Alemann was able to deliver that brilliant speech today on behalf of the Liberals and speak honestly and truthfully of women's participation. Mr Bangemann has explained on behalf of the group why we have had to act as we have and I am totally in agreement. The best that can be said, if one wants to be kind, is that the Socialists, the Communists, have unintentionally done women a disservice. People outside this Parliament will know that the report which was all set to be a really serious report — and which has involved really hard work from many people and to which we have tabled many good amendments — this report has been made into something ridiculous by the Socialists and Communists, and that is not what the report or women deserve!

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* I should like to emphasize with satisfaction our vote in favour, because we are fully satisfied with this resolution. It represents, in fact, a good level of defence against any retreat.

(Interruption by Mr Bangemann)

Certainly, Mr Bangemann, we all see things differently. You have expressed your opinion, and now I should like to express my satisfaction.

Squarcialupi

This report, which has been adopted by a considerable majority of this Parliament, shows the determination not to make women pay for the present crisis, but to solve it in another way, without making the weakest pay. The report also shows, from the work that has led to this resolution, that women in Europe are an emergent element of our society. It is the most European movement that we have been able to contact in recent years, because the women have understood the importance of Europe, and have understood that they need Europe.

Apart from the divergencies that became apparent at voting time, we must emphasize the common working basis that runs through all the groups, because whilst we may have been at loggerheads on some issues, we saw eye-to-eye on many others. We wish to continue working on this joint basis. So as to find points of greater convergence, and so as to avoid having to listen to explanations of vote such as that given by Mr Pearce who, obviously, finds it somewhat difficult to distinguish between rubbish and what is good. I should never like to be invited home by Mr Pearce, for fear he might make the same mistakes there.

At all events we have understood, and we have shown it with this resolution — that women are an element for the transformation of society — transformation, and improvement. Our aim, the aim of our work, is therefore to transform and improve society through the improvement and transformation of the situation of women.

Allow me to thank the Chairman, Marisa Rodano, who conducted our work with extreme civility; and extreme civility should be the keynote of the conclusion of this debate, which has seen a great deal of animosity but, as we are all aware, has been conducted in full observance of all the rules of democracy.

Mrs von Alemann (L). — *(DE)* I have always thought that this would be a Parliament in which women, at least would remain sincere. The fact that Heidi Wieczorek-Zeul has, wittingly or unwittingly, just told an untruth, hurts me deeply. Heidi Wieczorek-Zeul has managed to pull it off simply because she wanted to make a cheap polemical point at the expense of my group's president, by maintaining, among others, that having given our blessing to the entire motion for a resolution, our group was now, so to speak, stabbing her in the back.

Those members who are still present in the House — I can only see the chairman of the committee, Marie-Claude Vayssade, together with Marlene Lenz and Mrs Spaak who collaborated on the report — know quite well why I was not present at the final vote. Consult the attendance list before making such statements to the House!

I always thought women would be able to tell the truth. Frankly I feel ashamed for you. Cheap polemic — that is all we have witnessed. You know full well that I have always stated that the Liberal and Democratic Group could not and would not give its blessing to any motions seeking to introduce a 35-hour working week. I went along as far as my own personal conviction would allow. Such was the arrangement with my group. It was no secret that I had, on certain points, an opinion which differed from that held by my group, which gave me free rein, for they know that I speak for the interests of such a liberal women's policy and they trusted me. However, I cannot tolerate statements made by a colleague which cannot be substantiated. I expect a rectification. I would refer you to the minutes.

Secondly, I had always thought that women would avoid the pitfall of considering cheap polemic as exercising a decisive influence on the electoral process in the final analysis. I have to admit that here, too, I was deluding myself. I am sorry to have witnessed that tonight. For the record I may say that I abstained during the final vote on the motion for a resolution. But even this was unable by then to make any difference to the outcome.

Mrs Lenz (PPE). — *(DE)* To continue from where Mrs von Alemann left off I would like to make a personal declaration for I have already spoken on behalf of my Group.

The approach adopted by Heidi Wieczorek-Zeul and Anne-Marie Lizin is one of contempt for the good cooperation we had. We had hoped for a more sensible motion for a resolution tonight but those hopes have been dashed by numerous amendments.

I would particularly like to reject the accusation of 'token women' which was levelled at us. To both female colleagues who made this accusation I would point out that we are all elected representatives, that we represent large organizations and that we are fully aware of our position. We know perhaps one thing even better: if we wish to make real progress for women within our political parties then it will have to be achieved in collaboration with the men, neither as token women nor as model women but rather as politicians ready to join forces with all the others.

Mr Brok (PPE), in writing. — *(DE)* Voting on many of the points of the Cinciari-Rodano report is based on a freak majority which, in crucial areas — the reduction in working hours and the reorganization of working time — lacks the majority support which has been consistently accorded to opposite viewpoints and which are enshrined in House resolutions.

Under the guise of the situation of women, the socialists and communists have slipped in ideological viewpoints having little or nothing to do with the subject. Realizing that these views would never obtain the assent of the House if treated individually, they have opted for this approach under the cloak of the report on the situation of women — without, in fact, having any consideration for such interests.

For these reasons some of the decisions on the Cinciari-Rodano report do not reflect a majority view of this Parliament. I refer, in particular, to my contribution to the debate and to the amendments tabled by me and subsequently rejected. I am, reluctantly, voting against the motion in full awareness that the discrimination against women in professional and family life calls for an urgent solution.

Mr Chambeiron (COM), in writing. — *(FR)* The motion for a resolution presented by our colleague, Mrs Cinciari Rodano, and the 18 studies produced by the Commission provide us with a yardstick with which to measure the ground covered in the last ten years by women's claim to equality. We have come a long way from the battle of the sexes!

The motion for a resolution before us raises a whole range of economic, social, legal and ideological problems which give an idea of what a complex question the condition of women really is and enable us to gauge the various measures that will have to be taken if we wish to make any progress towards genuine equality.

One particularly interesting point about the motion for a resolution is that it does not tackle the problem of equality only from the point of view of social policy, though this is, of course, important. It calls for a new approach in all areas, particularly that of economic policy. The Committee of Inquiry insists on the need for a policy of economic recovery, an end to austerity policies, a substantial reduction in working hours leading to the 35-hour working week and a serious peace policy.

While we would like to express our warm appreciation of the serious work done by the *ad hoc* committee, we also note the ineptness of the European institutions on this matter ever since the European direct elections and more particularly since the adoption of the Maij-Weggen resolution. No project of any importance has been carried out and, what is still worse, the situation in regard to employment, equal pay and social rights has deteriorated. We hope that under the French Presidency significant progress will be made.

Chambeiron

In the hope that the overriding problem of women's work will be faced more squarely, the Communist and Allies group will vote for the motion for a resolution which highlights the glaring shortcomings of the Community institutions and sets out serious and wide-ranging proposals for making concrete progress on the problem of the condition of women in the member countries of the European Community.

Mr Di Bartolomei (L), in writing. — (IT) No-one can deny that the situation of women in Europe is still very far from one of effective equality with men. Real equality — even in countries where there is currently advanced legislation — will only come when obscurantism and prejudice are eliminated. However, no-one is free to speculate on that in order to turn the just claims of women into political battles on ideological or party lines.

For this reason both the Communists and the Socialists in the European Parliament were wrong to insist on amendments to the report that gave rise to suspicions of party-manoeuving on a subject on which there can be no division amongst those with a concern for ideals of progress. I refer in particular to Amendment No 165, which was intentionally worded in a provocative manner, in terms more suited to the 19th century.

This behaviour is the reason for the majority decision of the Liberal and Democratic Group, not to vote.

Personally, I agreed with the spirit of the group's protest. However, I proposed voting all the same, and I should have voted in favour, to emphasize the importance of the political event which a vote in favour, on this subject, constitutes for women in Europe.

Mr Kallias (PPE), in writing. — (GR) I had intended to vote for the motion for a resolution in the Cinciari Rodano report because in its original form it looked like helping to bring about and consolidate equality between the sexes in many fields.

It has always been my case that a democracy which excluded half the population from public life and which failed to acknowledge the complete equality of the two sexes within the community and in private life would be most irrational. However because of the fundamental alterations which Parliament has approved, and which have changed the nature of the resolution, the group of the European People's Party has come to the view that it should abstain from voting.

I feel that I ought to say a few things and make a few reminders as far as Greece is concerned because, right through from 1946 to 1976, when I was at the centre of the fight for equality, I was involved in specific fundamental initiatives such as seeking to get a provision on equality included in the 1952 Constitution, the consolidation of equal voting rights in council elections (1951) and in parliamentary elections (1952), the nomination and election of the first Greek woman MP (1953) in drafting those articles in the 1975 Constitution which deal with the subject and in the drawing up of legislation (September 1975), by a committee over which I presided, when the New Democracy Party embarked on putting them into effect.

It is a verifiable fact that the major steps towards equality in Greece were made before the PASOK Government came into office. The Gazi and Nouarou committees had concluded their work and the relevant bill had been laid before Parliament, and this paved the way for all the measures which have been taken since then.

The role played by the earlier Greek women's organizations, such as the Greek Women's Lykeion (which organized the first national conference of women in 1921), the National Council of Greek Women, the Association for Women's Rights, the Union of Professional Women and the Young Women's Christian Association, needs to be highlighted, as does the fact that the women's groups which were set up in Greece after the 1975 Constitution — which was supported as it happens only by the New Democracy Party — found the main and important aspects of the problem of equality already solved.

In Greece there remain the problems of increasing the number of women in political life and in the higher echelons of leadership and of giving effective application to measures base on paragraphs 2 and 22 of Article 4 of the 1975 Constitution.

Mr Lomas (S), in writing. — I shall vote for the motion because it goes some way towards highlighting the discrimination against women which exists in all member States.

The main discrimination is economic and parts of the overall economic suppression which prevails in our present societies.

Societies which are divided between the owners of capital who live off their profits and those who have to work for their living.

The one oppresses the other and until we change the whole system of society we shall not end this discrimination and exploitation.

We can, however, make some progress and this resolution outlines some of the ways in which we can do this.

Of course, finally, it will be up to Member Governments and I doubt whether the British Government will accept these quite modest proposals, since their aim is to strengthen the power of those who carry out this exploitation of women rather than help those who suffer.

A government which has been found guilty by the European Court on the fairly basic question of equal pay for women is not likely to support these proposals.

My view is that any real progress in Britain will be made only when we have a Labour Government committed to ending discrimination against women.

Mr Paisley (NI), in writing. — While supporting wholeheartedly the basic principles of the resolution, I regret I had to abstain on the final vote.

Parts of the resolution tell against the sanctity of marriage and the safeguarding of society from permissiveness and I cannot go along with that. The family must be preserved. I am glad the amendment for abortion was defeated. I am also opposed to European Union, therefore on that issue I could do nothing less than abstain.

Mrs Pery (S), in writing. — (FR) First of all, I am delighted to see the great number of colleagues, both men and women, present this evening in the Chamber to vote on the report by the Committee of Inquiry on the situation of women in Europe. This shows a recognition of the legitimacy of this debate which has been too long ignored and then pushed to one side.

This very interesting report tackles several aspects of women's lives: family, social, economic and political life. Many of us hope that during the six months of the French Presidency these proposals will be taken up again and defended by Mrs Yvette Roudy, Minister for Women's Rights in the French Government. In her speech this morning she assured us that she would do so and placed particular emphasis on employment and vocational training for women, the subject of the meeting of the Council of Ministers which she will chair on 8 March, International Women's Day. Defending equal opportunity and giving women freedom and responsibility is an *idée force*, the need for which becomes strikingly evident when we see the various hardships suffered by women living alone. We see them all around us every day.

Mr President, at present women Members constitute 15 % of this Parliament. It is to be hoped that this encouraging percentage will be increased in the next Assembly, which will have the task of following up the work by the Committee of Inquiry during the lifetime of this Parliament. Women must be present in the decision-making centres to defend their own rights, as well as to take their part in all sectors and at all levels of public life.

Mr Seal (S), in writing. — There is no doubt about the way women are treated in the countries of the Common Market. They are discriminated against and treated as second class citizens.

We must change this situation but unfortunately legislation is not enough and harmonization will certainly not work. What we need to change is ideas, to change methods of teaching and to change the ingrained ways of life.

I find it ironic that some of the Tories should be speaking so passionately in favour of this report. Gloria Hooper, for example, should use her rhetoric on her own Tory Government who have been condemned by the European Court for their lack of action on equal pay for women.

Whilst I shall be voting for this report, there are certain parts and amendments which I cannot accept. I cannot, for example, support the paragraphs and amendments which concern health care, as health care is not and should not be any part of the Treaty of Rome. Neither can I support Amendment 124 which I voted against, not because I am against abortion, but there is no way I can give support to an amendment calling for harmonization and supporting private insurance in health.

Mr Tuckman (ED), in writing. — I shall vote for, although much of this report is nonsense. To suggest that we must have regional equality to allow women to have equal rights with men makes no sense. You cannot have equality between regions. To want equal pensions for men and women at the same cost is actuarially wrong; women live five years longer on average.

But I vote for because I have never understood the prejudice which suggests women are less able than men. How this conspiracy has come about I don't know. It is deeply rooted; it is shared by women. But it is wrong.

ANNEX II

Commission action on European Parliament opinions on Commission proposals delivered at November and December 1983 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 November and December 1983 part-sessions in the framework of parliamentary consultation, and of disaster aid granted.

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

1. Second report by Mrs Rabbethge on the proposal (COM(83) 354 final) for a decision on the adoption of a development aid programme for indigenous scientific and technical research capacity in developing countries (1984-87)

The Commission is in the process of preparing an amendment to its proposal to the Council.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 15/16 December 1983, pp 372-3.

Text of proposal adopted by EP : Minutes of 16 December 1983 pp 71-78.

2. Report by Mr Delau on the proposal (COM(83) 241 final) for a decision authorizing the Commission to assist in the financing of innovation in the Community

The Commission will be presenting an amendment proposal in the next few days.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 13 December 1983, pp 145-6.

Text of proposal adopted by EP : Minutes of 14 December 1983, pp 21-27.

3. Report by Mr Baudis on the proposal (COM(83) 474 final) for a regulation on the granting of financial support under a multiannual transport infrastructure programme

The Commission will have incorporated the amendments adopted in an amended proposal by the end of February.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 14 December 1983, pp 168-9.

Text of proposal adopted by EP : Minutes of 15 December 1983, pp 81-89.

4. Report by Mr Buttafuoco on the proposals (COM(83) 266 final) for :

- (i) a directive on the use of hired vehicles in road haulage
- (ii) an amendment to the proposal for a directive on road haulage on own account between Member States (COM(78) 772, 21 January 1979)
- (iii) a regulation amending Regulation No 11 concerning the abolition of discrimination in transport rates and conditions, in implementation of Article 79(3) of the Treaty establishing the EEC

An amended proposal (Article 149) is under preparation.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 14 December 1983, pp 174-5.

Text of proposal adopted by EP : Minutes of 15 December 1983, pp 99-101.

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

1. Report by Mrs Lentz-Cornette on the proposal (COM(82) 838 final) for a directive on limit values and quality objectives for mercury discharges by sectors other than the chlor-alkali electrolysis industry

The amendments requested by Parliament and accepted by the Commission were presented by the Commission at the Council meeting on 16 December 1983. The Council of Ministers for the Environment approved the directive.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 15/16 December 1983, pp 368-9.

Text of proposal adopted by EP : Minutes of 16 December 1983, pp 64-68.

2. Report by Mr Delorozoy on the Commission proposals for :

- (i) a sixth directive amending Directive 69/169/EEC on the harmonization of provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action relating to exemption from turnover tax and excise duty on imports in international travel (COM(83) 117 final)
- (ii) a seventh directive amending Directive 69/169/EEC on the harmonization of provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action relating to exemption from turnover tax and excise duty on imports in international travel (COM(83) 166 final)

An amended proposal incorporating the amendments accepted is under preparation. Parliament will be informed in due course.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 13 December 1983, pp 153-5.

Text of proposal adopted by EP : Minutes of 14 December 1983, pp 30-37.

3. Report by Mr Pasquale on the Commission communication to the Council and the European Parliament on the conciliation procedure (COM(81) 816 final)

The Commission is preparing a letter for the Council of Ministers to the effect that discussions between the three Institutions could, in its view, be based on the common statement as amended by Parliament (except for paragraph 8(e)). Parliament will be sent a copy of the letter.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 13 December 1983, pp 141-2.

Text of proposal adopted by EP : Minutes of 14 December 1983, pp 14-19.

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

Report by Mr Rogalla on the proposal (COM)(83) 634 final) for a 15th directive on the harmonization of the laws of the Member States on turnover taxes — Extension of the time limit for implementation by the Hellenic Republic of the common VAT arrangements

The text of the directive adopted by the Council at its meeting on 19 December 1983 corresponds to that of the Commission proposal.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 15/16 December 1983, p. 366.

Text of proposal adopted by EP : Minutes of 16 December 1983, pp 58-61.

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

None

D. Disaster aid supplied since last part-session

Emergency aid within the Community

Country	Sum	Reason	Distributed by	Date of decision
Sardinia	100 000 ECU	forest fires	gvt	23. 12. 1983

Emergency aid for third countries

Financial aid :

Uganda	100 000 ECU	present situation	gvt	21. 12. 1983
	200 000 ECU	present situation	ICRS	21. 12. 1983
Mauritius	15 000 ECU	hurricane Andry	gvt	21. 12. 1983
	30 000 ECU	drought	gvt	23. 12. 1983
Ghana	500 000 ECU	yellow fever epidemic	WHO	23. 12. 1983
Guinea	100 000 ECU	earthquake	UNDRO	24. 12. 1983
Portugal	100 000 ECU	torrential rain	LICROSS	8. 12. 1983
Brazil	750 000 ECU	drought & epidemics		
	500 000 ECU		LICROSS	
	= 150 000 ECU		Deutsche Welthungerhilfe	} 12. 12. 1983
	100 000 ECU		Médecins du Monde	
Mozambique	225 000 ECU	drought	Commission	14. 12. 1983
	1 400 000 ECU	drought	Commission	6. 1. 1984

Food aid

Country	Quantity/product	Reason	Distributed by	Date of decision
Syria	712 t cereals	hunger	World Food Programme (International Emergency Reserve)	1. 12. 1983
Gambia	600 t rice	hunger	World Food Programme (International Emergency Reserve)	1. 12. 1983
Mozambique	20 000 t maize	hunger	World Food Programme (International Emergency Reserve)	13. 12. 1983
Brazil	250 t powdered milk	drought	LICROSS	16. 12. 1983
* African countries	29 000 t cereals 800 t powdered milk 550 t butteroil + equivalent of 1 m ECU in other products	hunger	directly or through other channels**	16. 12. 1983

* Countries : Chad
Malta
Mauritania
Senegal
Upper Volta
Ghana
Guinea (Conakry)
Guinea-Bissau
Central African Republic
Tanzania
Angola
Botswana
Lesotho
Mozambique

** Channels : NGOs
LICROSS
WFP
UNWCR

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 18 JANUARY 1984

Contents

1. *Approval of the Minutes*
*Mr Rogalla; Mr Kallias; Mr Tuckman; Sir Fred Warner; Mr Balfe; Mr Bange-
mann; Mr Howell; Mr Prout* 107
2. *Farm prices — Statement by the Commission*
Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Woltjer; Mr Dalsass; Mr Provan; Mr M. Martin; Mr Delatte; Mr Davern; Mr Paisley; Mrs Castle; Mr M. Früh; Sir Fred Warner; Mr Maher; Mr Vié; Mr Thareau; Mr Tolman; Mr Howell; Mrs S. Martin; Mr Kallias; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Goerens; Mr McCartin; Mr Curry; Mr Dalsager . . . 108
3. *Radioactive waste — Report (Doc. 1-1129/83) by Mrs Walz*
Mrs Walz; Mr Schmid; Mr K. Fuchs; Mr Schmid; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Veronesi; Mr Pintat; Mrs Ewing; Mr Eisma; Mr Howell; Mr Petronio; Mr Turner; Mr Narjes (Commission) 117
4. *Solid fuels — Report (Doc. 1-1162/83) by Mr Rogalla*
Mr Rogalla; Mr Van Rompuy; Mr Adam; Mr Rinsche; Mr Moreland; Mr Veronesi; Mr De Gucht; Mr Gauthier; Mrs Pblis; Mr M. Martin; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Rogalla; Mr Purvis; Mrs Walz; Mr Rogalla; Mr Purvis 125
5. *Energy research — Report (Doc. 1-1172/83) by Mr Seligman*
Mr Seligman; Mr Bernard; Mr K. Fuchs; Mr Purvis; Mr Veronesi; Mr Pintat; Mr Pisani (Commission); Mr Seligman; Mr Pisani; Mr Cottrell; Lady Elles; Mr Howell; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Irmer 133
6. *French Presidency (Council statement)*
Mr Cheysson (Council); Mr Glinne; Mr Pflimlin; Sir Henry Plumb; Mrs De March; Mrs Veil; Mr Israël; Mr Bøgh; Mr Romualdi; Mr Jaquet; Mr Notenboom; Mr Møller; Mr Segre; Mr Nyborg; Mr Blaney; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mr Arndt; Mr Habsburg; Lord Douro; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Antoniozzi; Mr Paisley; Mr Antoniozzi; Mr Kyrkos; Mr von Bismarck; Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti; Mr Cheysson . . . 140
7. *Question Time (continuation)*
 - *Questions to the Council*
 - *Question No 46 by Mr Rogalla: Controls at internal frontiers:*
Mr Cheysson (Council); Mr Rogalla; Mr Cheysson; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Cheysson; Lord O'Hagan; Mr Cheysson 171
 - *Question No 48 by Mr Seligman: Measures to mitigate unemployment:*
Mr Cheysson; Mr Seligman; Mr Cheysson; Mr Patterson; Mr Cheysson; Mr Maher; Mr Cheysson 172
 - *Question No 49 by Mr Normanton: Opinions of the European Parliament:*
Mr Cheysson; Mr Normanton; Mr Cheysson; Mr Simpson; Mr Cheysson; Mr Kallias; Mr Cheysson; Mrs Ewing; Mr Cheysson 173
 - *Question No 50 by Mr Papaefstratiou: Harmonization of social legislation in the Member States of the EEC:*
Mr Cheysson; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Cheysson; Mr Lomas; Mr Cheysson; Mr Patterson; Mr Cheysson; Mr Estgen; Mr Cheysson 174
 - *Question No 52 by Mr Hutton: Report on Council's activities:*
Mr Cheysson; Mr Hutton; Mr Cheysson; Mr Croux; Mr Cheysson . . . 175

— Question No 53 by Mr Cousté; American special steel imports: Mr Cheysson; Mr Cousté; Mr Cheysson; Mr Rieger; Mr Cheysson	176	Mr Cheysson (Foreign Ministers): Mr Moreland; Mr Cheysson; Mr Marshall; Mr Herman	179
— Question No 54 by Mr Pearce: New advisory and management committees: Mr Cheysson; Mr Pearce; Mr Cheysson; Mrs Boserup; Mr Cheysson; Mr More- land; Mr Cheysson	177	— Question No 70 by Mrs Ewing: Assassi- nations of Croats in Member States: Mr Cheysson; Mrs Ewing; Mr Cheysson	180
— Question No 55 by Mr Galland: Conver- gence of economic and social policies: Mr Cheysson; Mr Galland; Mr Cheysson; Mr Patterson; Mr Cheysson; Mr Herman; Mr Cheysson; Mr Adamou; Mr Cheysson; Mr Van Miert; Mr Cheysson; Mr Nordmann; Mr Cheysson	177	— Question No 71 by Mr Seligman: Cooper- ation in foreign policy by Member States: Mr Cheysson; Mr Seligman; Mr Cheysson; Mr Kallias; Mr Cheysson; Mr Adamou	180
— Questions to the Foreign Ministers: — Question No 69 by Mr Moreland: Piracy off Lagos:		— Question No 72 by Mr Israël: Libyan Government policy: Mr Cheysson; Mr Israël; Mr Cheysson	181
		— Question No 73 by Mr Rieger: Euro- pean disarmament conference: Mr Cheysson; Mr Rieger; Mr Cheysson; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Cheysson	181
		Annex	183

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

Vice-President

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

1. Approval of the Minutes

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

Are there any comments?

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) Mr President, I would like to comment on a point on page 75 of the annex to these minutes concerning Commission action in response to Parliament's opinion. I would like to point out that there is a case under item (b), page 4 of the minutes where the Council decision of 19 December deviates from Parliament's opinion. A list of such cases should be drawn up so that at the end of the legislative period we can see how often the Council took account of Parliament's views.

President. — Your comments have been noted. We shall see whether we can comply with your wish at the end of the legislative period.

Mr Kallias (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, I was present when the vote on the overall resolution on the situation of women in Europe was being taken, but my voting machine was not working. I also made a

statement of how I intended to vote. I would like it recorded that I was there at the vote and that I wished to record an abstention.

President. — We shall see that the Minutes are corrected.

Mr Tuckman (ED). — Mr President, may I enquire why the written explanation I handed in has apparently not been published. I say 'apparently', but I do not see myself listed as one of those who gave an explanation of vote on the women's thing. I thought a written explanation counts as a spoken one and that, in fact, it benefits the House by saving time.

President. — The explanation of vote which you cannot find is recorded in the verbatim Report of Proceedings. The Minutes only contain a short resumé of what took place in the sitting.

Sir Fred Warner (ED). — Mr President, my voting machine was also not working yesterday. I would like that recorded, as I would not wish to be thought guilty of lack of courtesy towards women.

President. — It will be recorded in the Minutes.
(The Minutes were approved)

Mr Balfe (S). — Mr President, the Rules of this Parliament are quite clear on some matters and Rule 80 (1) states in relation to explanations of vote:

'Once the general debate and consideration of the texts have been concluded, explanations of vote may be given before the final vote, provided that a request to do so has been submitted to the President before the beginning of this vote.'

Balfe

Now I know that democracy is sometimes extremely inconvenient, but when rules are written down, until they are changed, they are actually there to be followed. If this House can under the pressure of, say, its own dynamisms suspend the rules of this House, it is actually attacking the rights of ordinary Members of this House. Last night when I rose to make this point, there was considerable pressure from my own side of the House and from elsewhere to the effect that I was making an illegitimate point. That was not the case. We may not like the rules of this Assembly, but it does so happen that the rules are quite clear.

Now, after the vote had been taken, explanations of vote were given before an empty Chamber. Indeed, at the end of the evening only Mr Bangemann and I with one or two followers remained. The point I would make is that this matter should be referred to the appropriate committee for a ruling. I believe we set a very dangerous precedent last night in accepting that explanations of vote should be given outside the time laid down by the Rules of Procedure. I believe we also set an extremely dangerous precedent in that we allowed the President of this Parliament — not a Vice-President, but the President of this Parliament — to put before this Parliament something which was clearly in breach of those rules. So for those reasons I would ask that you refer this matter to the appropriate committee and ask them to look at it; but also ask them to give a ruling that it shall not be admissible for the rules of this House to be arbitrarily suspended to suit the dining arrangements of certain Members, or the desires of certain others who think they have got a majority to enable them to put something through for a change.

Mr Bangemann (L). — *(DE)* Mr President, my respect for both Mr Balfe and the President obliges me to speak: yesterday evening was an exception. We were seriously behind schedule because of the length of time spent voting, and the House wanted to take the final vote as well, so we agreed that explanations, whether they were explanations of vote or not is irrelevant, could also be given after the vote. For example, I gave an explanation on behalf of my group even though we abstained.

I would also like to record that my voting machine was working; I abstained because I did not want to vote.

We might therefore equally well say, Mr Balfe, that they were not explanations of vote but explanations given at the conclusion of the debate. It is true that we were both still present at the end — a pleasant memory for both of us, I am sure, even if you cannot say with Shakespeare: *We few, we happy few, we band of brothers!*

(Laughter)

President. — I should like to say to Mr Balfe that his literal interpretation of the Rules of Procedure is

undoubtedly correct. However, in the first place yesterday's sitting went on very late and secondly, we wished to spare the interpreters. Finally, it was Parliament itself which decided to suspend the sitting. I propose that we refer the matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

Mr Howell (ED). — Mr President, I am grateful to you, and I accept your ruling that this matter should be referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. However, may I just suggest to Mr Balfe that an explanation of vote should refer not to a vote that you might cast in the future but to a vote which you have already cast. If it is that Mr Balfe is seeking to use the explanation of vote in order to continue the debate then that should take place in the debate. I fully believe that last night's precedent was a good precedent and I hope that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure will support it in any ruling that it makes.

Mr Prout (ED). — Mr President I think Mr Balfe's interpretation of the rule is quite correct. Indeed, I think the rule is so clear that there is no need to refer it to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. It is an absolute rule of the House. It can only be changed by an appropriate majority of the House, according to the Rules of Procedure. I would submit, with great respect, to the President of this Parliament that he was quite wrong to do what he did last night. The House can decide to rise, to sit or to extend its hours by a simple vote. That is something we can do with relative ease. What it can not and must not do — because we do so to the detriment of the individual rights of every Member of this House — is change the rules arbitrarily.

There is no need to refer the matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. I am afraid it is the end of the matter because the vote has already been taken, but Mr Balfe deserves the House's sympathy.

President. — I think that the right thing to do is to refer the matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure for its opinion.¹

2. Farm prices

President. — The next item is the statement by the Commission of the European Communities on farm prices.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — *(DA)* Mr President, last week the Commission adopted its

¹ Documents received — Referral to committee — Request to waive a Member's immunity: see Minutes.

Dalsager

proposals on farm prices for the coming year. Before I go into the details of the final package the Commission has decided on, I would remind you that this package is part of a larger plan and hence an addition to the overall plan for the development of European agriculture. We have already put forward other parts of this plan, and everyone here no doubt remembers Commission proposal 500 of 1983. All the arrangements for updating the common agricultural policy are thus now on the table. The Council must shoulder its responsibility and take the decision which needs to be taken. Let me make it clear that this is not a catalogue of economic measures; it is a comprehensive package put together in order, first and foremost, to adjust the common agricultural policy and place it in a position to meet the challenges of the future and, in a general way, to enable it — and hence also the Community — to survive.

I realize that farm incomes have been falling in recent years — a drop last year of about 6% in real terms, after the increase during the preceding years of about 11%. Nevertheless it has to be said that the common agricultural policy has helped to protect farmers against the worst effects of the economic crisis. Farm incomes in the United States, Canada and other agricultural nations fell by about a third in 1982. I do not need to tell you today how difficult the market situation is for many of the Community's farm products. To begin with, the rises in milk deliveries are way above what the market can bear. At the moment we have over half a million tonnes more of butter and half a million tonnes more of skimmed milk powder in stores than we had at the same time last year. There are also problems in a number of other products for which the trend in production outstrips demand. It cannot be expected that the authorities will dispose of all these products, for which there is no market. We cannot continue to run the common agricultural policy on such a basis, which is neither economically sound nor financially acceptable. This is the reason why in the last two years we have proposed that the production guarantee be limited to a reasonable level by means of guarantee thresholds — a policy which we continue in the present package. We must also pursue a restrictive price policy. Quite apart from the budget situation, which is very difficult as you know, the market problems are such that we must exercise great moderation in the matter of prices.

Five years ago the Commission proposed a general freezing of the common prices. This happened at a time when market problems were not as serious as they are now. We have become convinced that such a procedure would not be the best one this year. We have decided to present a modulated price proposal for each individual product based on the market situation. This means that some prices will be raised while others are frozen and finally that some will be lowered. The resultant increase in the common prices, expressed in ECU for the Community as a whole, is a little under 1%.

Let me first say a little about the prices in general and then review them in detail. For the following products, for which the market situation is particularly difficult, we propose to maintain prices at their present levels in the coming production year: cereals, milk, wine and tomatoes. For most of the other products we propose modest increases, for example 1% for sugar and durum wheat, 1.5% for meat (beef, sheepmeat and pigmeat), 2.5% for support and the target price for olive oil. This 2.5% increase will also be applied to most protein-containing crops and spinning fibres. From 0% to 3% for fruit and vegetables, 3.5% for rice; for some other products we propose a price reduction: 1% for rape, where the guarantee threshold is exceeded, and between minus 2% and plus 3% for tobacco, depending on the variety in question.

Mr President, I hope to have the opportunity of talking to Parliament's Committee on Agriculture when it next meets in order to present and explain the proposals in more detail. In the meantime I shall restrict my review to two products, cereals and milk. On cereals the aim of the Commission's policy is to reduce the difference between our prices and those of competitor countries, such as the United States. We think that we can find an expanding market for our grain, provided we make it more competitive. At the same time as reducing the price of grain in relation to other products, we wish to stabilize rising imports of cereal substitutes, such as maize gluten feed, and we have already worked out a proposal for a negotiating brief on this point. For milk, as we explained in COM(83) 500, the only alternative to a heavy reduction in prices is a quota system and a restrictive policy on prices. This is the reason why we have proposed a quota system for milk on the basis of deliveries in 1981 plus 1%. This system should have taken effect on 1 January, according to the proposal. We maintain our proposal and insist that a decision be taken before the start of the dairy year on 1 April. It is proposed that the existing co-responsibility levy for milk be continued unchanged.

Mr President, with regard to butter, I know that Parliament is very concerned at the size of the stockpiles, and it has good reason to be. You have asked for more effective measures to reduce these stocks, and the Commission is sympathetic to these requests. We still think, however, that general consumer subsidies or special Christmas butter campaigns regardless of the high costs they incur are not effective and are not the best way of making use of our limited budget resources. We therefore propose that the intervention price for butter be cut by 11%. This will be done by adjusting the milk price ratio between fat content and content of other constituents, such as protein. It will help to promote butter sales and reduce stocks. It will make butter cheaper, not just at Christmas time but the whole year round, and we propose at the same time that the costly consumer subsidies be discontinued.

Dalsager

Finally, there is the harmonization of the support and premiums for beef and sheepmeat which we already announced last year. Along with the prices, we propose a reduction in the monetary compensatory amounts as a stage in the gradual return to market unity. We propose that the currency difference be reduced by half for both negative and positive monetary compensatory amounts. At the same time the Commission proposes facilities to attenuate the negative effect of these proposals on incomes by means of an interim compensation to the farmers concerned.

With these agrimonetary adjustments, which will balance out the rises in prices expressed in ECU for the Community as a whole, it can be said that the average effect of the price package on consumer food prices will be practically nil. The package as a whole, together with the proposals for the reform of the common agricultural policy which have already been presented, will in 1984 represent a saving for the Community budget of nearly 900 million ECU. On the other hand, the increases in 1984 resulting from trends on the markets and the carrying forward of payments from last year will also amount to some 900 million ECU. This means that, if the Council and Parliament adopt our proposals, we can hope to keep agricultural expenditure in 1984 within the budget appropriations of 16 500 million ECU. There are no grounds for rejoicing at this. We shall still have considerable stocks on our hands at the end of the year, the disposal of which will also have to be financed if we are to be able to return to a more normal market situation.

These price proposals and associated measures constitute a comprehensive package for the reform of the common agricultural policy. They form an extension to our memorandum of July last year, COM(83) 500. The proposals should be seen in conjunction with other proposals already put forward and awaiting a decision of Parliament. The imbalance on the agricultural markets and the Community's difficult budget situation make it necessary to take decisions now. Parliament stated in its resolution on the common agricultural policy of 18 November last year that :

the reform of the common agricultural policy cannot be postponed any longer, with regard to either the financing of that policy or the implementation of the overall aims contained in Article 39 of the EEC Treaty.

In the resolution on the 1984 budget which was adopted on 15 December 1983, Parliament again called on the Council to reach a decision by 31 March 1984 at the latest on the improvement of the common agricultural policy with a view to eliminating the expenditure arising from the production of structural surpluses, since the Community budget could no longer support this expenditure.

I therefore join with you in urging the Council to take a decision by 31 March. In this way the Commission

shares Parliament's objective, namely to maintain the common agricultural policy on a sound economic and financial basis. There have been many delays. It is now up to the Council to show that it is able to fulfil this objective.

Mr President, I have already said that this package is very hard on the farmers who will not receive it gladly, but the weaknesses of the past have unfortunately made it inevitable. The farmers must understand that we already proposed changes three years ago. Time has gone by without any decisions being taken. The market situation continues to deteriorate, and we are forced, for example for milk, to propose quotas and a tight price policy. The farmers must understand that it makes no sense to produce products for which there is no market. Neither the Community nor the Member States are rich enough to pay for unlimited production of this kind. I hope therefore that Parliament will sympathize with the approach embodied in these proposals. I hope that Parliament, especially the Committee on Agriculture, will make its contribution in dealing constructively with these matters.

President. — Under Rule 40(2) of the Rules of Procedure Members may avail themselves of a period of 30 minutes to put brief and concise questions with a view to clarifying specific points in the statement.

Mr Woltjer (S). — (NL) Mr President, this is not the time for me to comment as rapporteur. I should simply like to ask a few questions, as the procedure prescribes, and one of my first questions is this: can the Commission say why it has only now come forward with its proposals rather than at the end of December? This is important, because this has resulted, among other things, in a month being wasted. Parliament will do its best to deliver its opinion as quickly as possible, but we shall now be pressed for time.

The second brief question I have to ask, Mr President, concerns the fact that the Commission explicitly refers to a package. My question is specifically, what does this mean? The proposals for reforms, the proposals in Document No 500, are already before the Council, and these price proposals are perhaps a supplement, but I find it hard to imagine how the Ministers are going to discuss the proposals for reforms and these proposals at the same time because, if the proposals for reforms reveal that the Council does not want to reduce the milk quotas as much as the Commission has proposed, the question will then be what the Commission intends to do with its prices.

To conclude, Mr President, a brief question, if you will allow me, and a very important one. If we consider the whole package, one of the major constraints is the abandonment of monetary compensatory amounts, because this will result in price increases having a very adverse effect on a number of Member States. You also refer to interim measures

Woltjer

which might be taken. I consider it very important for the Commission to explain this once again. I cannot find any actual proposals anywhere. Everyone is talking about them, but is this to be seen as small change for the Council? We of this Parliament at any rate would like some more information before we state our views on these interim measures, especially as I am very concerned about all kinds of national contributions and the renationalization of the agricultural policy. Where these interim measures are concerned, I fear the worst.

Mr Dalsass (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, one brief point: the European Parliament is well aware that corrections must be made to agricultural policy and has made concrete proposals. The Council alone is at fault for failing to act.

I would therefore like to put a number of questions to the Commissioner. In my view these proposals took the form they did because of the difficult financial position; they would have been different if there had been more money available. Is this not so, Commissioner?

For milk, a concrete proposal has been made. The year 1981 plus one has been taken as the base year. The Committee on Agriculture has discussed this at length and agrees that there may be cases of hardship and that milk production was actively encouraged by EC subsidies to farmers who are now to be penalized. Has account been taken of these cases of hardship?

The European Parliament has called for special aid for the poorer agricultural regions, for example hill farming areas. Does the Commission intend to help these mountain areas or not? If not, then there is a real risk that these will become depopulated.

Finally: there are fears that the Commission also intends to reduce funds for structural measures. Is this true or not?

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, every week that decisions are put off the situation can get more difficult, and the market situation, I believe, demands firm, even rigorous, discipline at the present time.

Having said that, can the Commissioner tell us that he honestly believes that the proposals that he has made on the question of monetary compensatory amounts will be acceptable to all the governments in the Member States of this Community? I believe quite firmly that there are certain Member States who will find what he has proposed totally unacceptable at the present time.

In regard to the livestock sector, can he give us any further indication as to what he really intends regarding the beef premium scheme in the United Kingdom?

Also regarding the United Kingdom, can he give us any indication as to what will happen to the actual

butter price that the consumer will have to pay in the shops? We welcome the proposal that he has brought forward to reduce the intervention price of butter by 11.4% which should make butter cheaper to the housewife and therefore increase consumption. That can only do good by reducing the butter stocks that are at present available in the Community.

The Commission has come forward with some rigorous proposals. Let us hope that it can modify them to make them acceptable to the Community at large.

Mr M. Martin (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, Mr Dalsager has just confirmed that the Commission is taking an axe to the budget for agriculture. Let us be clear: the proposals put to us are a provocation, an affront to small farmers, who, I am sure, will not fail to take up the challenge. You say, Mr Commissioner, that there is no alternative, that we have our backs to the wall. This is not true. We for our part want to denounce yet again the orchestrated campaign to exaggerate the seriousness of the situation that has been mounted for the purpose of coating the pill. We believe that a fair increase in farm prices can be financed. It can be done by adjusting the balance of agricultural expenditure and gathering new revenues, and in this connection I should just like to ask one question: the sum of 850 million ECU intended for the purpose of alleviating the United Kingdom contribution has been placed in reserve by the European Parliament. Would you care to tell us, Mr Commissioner, what increase in farm prices could be financed with these 850 million ECU now in reserve?

Mr Delatte (L). — *(FR)* Mr Dalsager has told us that the proposals made on price fixing make up a package. I should like to ask Mr Dalsager whether he thinks that it is reasonable to be considering adjustment of the common agricultural policy at the time of the annual fixing of prices. I think that document (COM) 83/500 final proposed by the Commission and the report debated and adopted by the European Parliament separated price fixing from adjustment of the common agricultural policy, and in my opinion a link should not be re-established between them.

The Commission notes that farm incomes fell by 6.3% in 1983. This has serious implications for the future of the industry, since farmers are going to suffer very substantial losses of earnings and incur further indebtedness. Has the Commission given consideration to the effects that this will have on the future of European farming and also to the impact on the employment situation? For budgetary reasons, an average increase of 0.8% has been fixed. This is an absolute negation of Article 39 of the Treaty of Rome, which states that farmers must be afforded a decent standard of living. Why does not the Commission take more expeditious action to reduce the charge on

Delatte

the budget by working towards closer adherence to the rules of the Treaty, and in particular by upholding Community preference since, as the Court of Auditors report of 13 October 1983 points out, stricter application of this principle could save between 2 and 4 billion ECU, so that we have plenty of scope for making savings which could be used to increase farm prices.

Mr Davern (DEP). — Mr President, could I ask the Commissioner first of all why there is no distinction in the Commission's proposal between intensive factory farms and the family farm? Some of my British colleagues here are asking what the difference is. I do not think they realize that family farmers are smaller farmers — they do not exist as far as the Conservatives generally are concerned.

Why is there no policy on oils and fats? Are there to be no restrictions on imports of many dairy products into the Community? How can the Commission guarantee that withdrawing its subsidy from butter will increase consumption in any fashion? In fact, it should be the other way around — the subsidy should be increased. Indeed, would the Commission not agree that, rather than reconstructing the CAP, it is the destruction of the CAP which our colleagues here in front have so ably been looking for over the past few years?

Mr Paisley (NI). — I would like to put two questions to the Commissioner. Firstly, does he realize that to take 1981 as the base year for the super-levy would be disastrous for the dairy farmers of Northern Ireland, and can he give us an assurance that, in those parts of the Community where there would be real hardship and disaster for agriculture in the dairy sector, that will be taken into account in the final agreement?

With regard to hill farmers, he is aware that the hill livestock compensatory allowance is not now being paid. The non-payment of the hill livestock compensatory allowance to hill farmers in Northern Ireland — amounting to £ 9 million to the end of March — puts a question-mark over this whole hill farming community. Can he tell us whether this will be paid retrospectively if agreement is not reached before the end of March?

Mrs Castle (S). — Mr President, while welcoming the price freeze as far as it goes and the long overdue cut in the intervention price of butter, may I ask the Commissioner whether he does not agree that his package offers no real solution to the crisis facing the common agricultural policy and indeed the Community as a whole? Is it not, for example, absurd to talk about the need to bring price levels down and then to put forward a package proposing any increases at all in products like sugar with which we already have marketing difficulties? Is it not ridiculous to propose, as the Commission has, a levy on vegetable oils and fats and to cut the butter subsidy thereby pushing up

the price of butter to the British housewife by 14p a pound; although I recognize, that this will be offset to some extent, by the cut in price, but will still leave that price beyond her means to afford? Has the time not come, therefore, to review the whole basis of the common agricultural policy and to change it from one based on high prices making the consumer carry the support through high prices to one of direct aids, directed where they are most needed, and will the Commission now produce a five-year plan for the progressive reduction of European farm prices to world levels and the progressive phasing-in of direct help financed both by the Community and by national governments — directed to the farmers and to the regions where it is really needed?

Mr Früh (PPE). — (DE) Mr President! I would like to put two short questions to the Commission. Firstly; do you think, Commissioner, that an 11% reduction in the intervention price of butter will really reduce butter stocks, now you have once again firmly rejected the special promotion of cheap butter?

My second question: the proposed system for monetary compensatory amounts represents a complete break with previous Commission assurances and also disregards Parliament's wish that cuts should not lead to a reduction in farmers' earnings. Today, if the interpretation was correct, I understood you to say that there was provision for compensation in the medium term. Can you tell me how much finance is available and how long this medium-term compensation is to be paid from Community funds?

Sir Fred Warner (ED). — Mr President, may I ask the Commissioner to be a little more precise on the milk quotas? Has there been any development in the thinking of the Commission on whether this should be purely a Community quota or whether it should be applied nationally or at the farm-gate? Is it the intention to leave this to national governments and national industries?

Mr Maher (L). — The Commissioner has told us what the savings will be to the budget of the European Communities. Would it not be reasonable for the Commissioner also to tell us what the cost will be country by country of the implementation of these proposals? In other words, what will the effect be on each economy as a result of the implementation of these proposals?

Secondly, the Commissioner said that farmers must understand that these measures must be taken. How does a farmer convince his bank manager that he must also understand that the farmer will not be able to pay back his debts if, in fact, his income has been reduced? Because the net effect of these proposals is to reduce farm income — there is no doubt about that, that cannot be questioned — even if you maintain prices, inflation in the member countries is going to have the effect of reducing the farm income.

Maher

My next question is: what alternative does the Commission offer to farmers in other lines of production if they have to reduce their production? What is the alternative? What do they do? What effect do these proposals have on employment on the farm and in the agri-industries and what is the cost of that unemployment? I think we are entitled to know what the cost is just as we are entitled to know what the savings are going to be.

Mr Vié (DEP). — (FR) I should like to put four questions to the Commission.

First, can the Commission confirm that it asserted throughout the budget debate that the budget being proposed to us was a balanced budget and that it covered current expenditure under the common agricultural policy and the annual price fixing.

Secondly, we are now told of a deficit of 1.6 billion ECU. What accounts for this deficit? Is it an error of calculation on the Commission's part? We can accept errors stemming from price fluctuations associated with the international economic situation, but if it is an error of calculation, we should be told.

Thirdly, is not this desire to propose a balanced budget — even if there has been an error — prompted above all by the Commission's concern to dispose of the problem of compensating the United Kingdom?

My fourth question is this: can the Commission justify the fact that its absolutely unacceptable price proposals prejudice a future Council of Ministers decision on reform of the common agricultural policy?

There you have my four questions, Mr President, and I look forward to receiving four answers.

Mr Thareau (S). — (FR) The logic of its proposals makes for accentuation of negative measures, and yet the Commission dares to refer to employment and earnings in the introduction to its document, when all the measures proposed are tougher than in previous years and militate against jobs and earnings. How can the Commissioner explain to us that with these same fundamental proposals he can achieve different results in 1984? A second question: in view of Europe's difficulties and the understanding among the States, would it not be the Commission's aim to unite the 10 States against itself?

Mr Tolman (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, I have two questions. The first concerns the policy on cereals. The Commissioner has said that there would be a reduction in the import of substitute cereals. Is this an expression of hope, or does he have an actual plan for a percentage reduction, and can he give us some information on this plan?

My second question concerns the policy on dairy products. If the price proposals and the quota arrangement are accepted, can I assume that intervention will not be suspended in the case of butter and skimmed milk powder?

Mr Howell (ED). — Mr President, I have three questions. The first relates to colza aid. Could the Commissioner give us a summary of precisely what he is trying to do with the colza section and how the 1% fall in the intervention price relates to the aid already given to the colza merchants?

My second question relates to milk. Is the Commissioner aware of the depth of feeling in the United Kingdom on taking 1981 as the reference year for the threshold, and would he not regard a joint consideration of 1981, 1982 and 1983 as a fairer basis for the threshold arrangements which are being applied?

My third question relates to MCAs. Can the Commissioner give us an idea of the real price increases or decreases in each country as a result of his proposal to halve the positive and negative MCAs? If my calculations are right, that proposal will mean a substantial increase in prices in France and substantial decreases in Germany and Great Britain. I think we ought to know exactly how each nation stands on this matter.

Mrs S. Martin (L). — (FR) If I have understood correctly, the Commissioner has measured the full effects of his proposals on the market situation and the budget. Has he also measured, with equal accuracy, the effects of the falls in farmers' incomes? More specifically, how does he intend to deal with the problems of producers who have responded to encouragement from the Community by investing — heavily in many cases — under plans to develop milk production and are now in an impasse, unable to go back on their decisions and unable to recoup their investments?

Mr Kallias (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, without getting involved in detail about each separate farm product I want to ask the Commissioner these questions.

Firstly, is it a fact, perhaps, that economies are being made — as, for example, in the dairy sector which eats up huge resources — simply in order to provide greater support for other policies which, whatever the case, are of less importance than the agricultural policy?

Secondly, does the Commission fully realize that the common agricultural policy continues to be the mainstay of the Community, especially as regards the protection of products, including those from the Mediterranean regions, which are purely agricultural?

Mr Newton Dunn (ED). — Mr President, after the Athens Summit failure last month, the President of the Commission said that it was time to return to the procedures laid down in the Treaty.

May we have an assurance from the Commission now that they will not withdraw their proposals in favour of some last minute compromise cobbled together by the Ministers for Agriculture?

Mr Goerens (L). — (*FR*) Mr President, in its document (COM) 83/500 final, on which the European Parliament has already had the opportunity to state its position, the Commission refers to three possible options: the introduction of quotas, a price reduction of about 12%, or suspension of the intervention system for a few months.

These three proposals, taken separately, would lead to loss of earnings for milk producers. I should like to know whether the Commission, in proposing a reduction in the intervention price for butter, is basing itself on the assumption that quotas will be applied or on the assumption that the reform which it has proposed will not yet have been adopted.

Mr McCartin (PPE). — Mr President, I hope the Commissioner will answer carefully Mr Paisley's and Mr Maher's question, since this was the question I originally intended to put.

However, I would like to ask the Commissioner — since he mentioned that he expected farming incomes to drop by 6% in real terms and he compared the situation with that of farmers in the United States of America — whether he is aware that in the United States of America not only farmers' incomes but all incomes are dropping in real terms while in Europe we expect farmers' incomes to drop while all other wage-earners improve their conditions in real terms. Is he, as the agriculture Commissioner, concerned about the fact that the farmers alone in this Community are expected to bear the brunt of the economic recession?

Would he also care to comment on the fact that, if he wants to compare our situation with that of the United States of America, the budget of 16 billion units of account he has spoken about is only one-third of what it is estimated the United States spends on subsidizing their agriculture, and they have only one-third of the number of people involved in the industry?

I would further like to say to the Commissioner that because agriculture is the only common policy which is developed in this Community, it seems that through our common policy we have imposed a discipline on farmers' incomes and expectations that has not been imposed on other sectors. Is he concerned that the farmers of this Community will see the common agricultural policy becoming a disadvantage and a burden on them instead of being an advantage?

I would ask him one specific question in relation to the pig-meat industry. Has he noticed the state of the pig-meat industry in Britain and Ireland? For the first time in years, losses are being sustained both at the processing and at the farming stage. It is a situation which cannot continue without total destruction not only of the pig-farmers but also of the processing and the supplies sectors of this industry.

President. — I have to close the list of speakers since the 30 minutes are up. However, I believe that there

will be no objection if I call the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to reply to the Commissioner.

Mr Curry (ED), chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. — Mr President, would the Commissioner confirm that although the restraint of institutional prices is part of his package, it is equally part of his package to depress market prices by the measures which have been taken recently to delay payments? Would he state to what extent his proposals have been governed by the budgetary situation and to what extent even without the budgetary crisis these proposals would have been very much the same because of the market situation?

Would he state what assumptions he has made about world price-levels and the rate of the dollar in relation to European currencies in the remarks he made on the budgetary costs?

Would he confirm that the cut he proposes in the intervention price for butter, if taken in conjunction with the changes in the green rates he proposes, would mean a cut in the price of butter for housewives across Europe, including the British housewife?

Would he state the gain or loss in farming incomes per country in relation to the increase in costs per country in order to give an accurate comparison of the different effects of these proposals throughout the Member States?

Would the Commissioner note my very strong protest that in the whole of his speech he made not one reference to women, to women farmers or to farmers' wives? In the light of yesterday's debate, I hope that all future price proposals will contain a specific chapter on the impact of this on female farmers.

(Laughter and applause)

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (*DA*) Mr President, I think that everyone will understand that, if I were to give detailed answers to this series of questions, it would take up the rest of the morning. I rather think that the President would not allow that. But I will try as briefly as possible to answer the most important questions, if not all of them.

Mr Woltjer put a very intelligent question: why were these proposals not put forward in December, but only now in January? Mr Woltjer knows as well as the rest of us that there was a meeting in Athens at which the Ministers were expected to take decisions on a large number of proposals, which had already been put forward and had been under discussion by the Council for six months. Clearly, since nothing whatsoever had been achieved in Athens in the way of adopting the Commission's proposals, the Commission was obliged to look again at the price proposals, and obviously we needed time to work out these proposals and discuss them in the Commission. That is why they have come in January rather than December.

Dalsager

Mr Woltjer also asks how the Council is to deal with both proposals. The Council asked for the proposals itself. The European Council in Stuttgart asked for a number of proposals for the review of the common agricultural policy. These proposals have already been under discussion for six months, and the price proposals had to be presented now so that we can have a decision on prices before the end of the production year. Moreover the two proposals, the price proposal and COM(83) 500, are complementary, and it is therefore necessary for the Council to take a decision on both packages. In fact it is a combined package, for the proposals complement one another.

The question of interim compensation in the event of a fall in national exchange rates following the phasing out of monetary compensatory amounts is not a new one. It has been asked before. The Commission has not put forward precise proposals. We are keeping the situation under review and shall await developments in the discussions on this problem before we take a decision on what concrete proposal to present.

Mr Dalsass and others pointed out that the budget situation was difficult, and that is the reason why we have put forward a price proposal such as this one. I would indeed say that the budget situation alone is reason enough for us to present such a price proposal. It is not true that it was said during the budget debate that the 16 500 million ECU provided the means to increase prices. The Commission expressly drew attention to the fact that the 16 500 million ECU budget adopted did not contain any money for price increases. I will also say that the trend on the markets in recent months has shown that the savings we proposed in COM(83) 500 are absolutely necessary, for the situation on the world market has not improved. On the contrary, it has deteriorated to the extent that we have extra expenditure in a number of areas.

On the subject of aid to poor holdings in hill-farming areas, I must say to Mr Dalsass that no one thinks we can do that via the price policy. What we can do, as we have proposed, is to improve the structural policy and increase the resources available to it, especially for the benefit of small farmers, that is farmers in disadvantaged areas, in hill-farming and elsewhere.

Mr Provan asks whether I believe that the proposal on monetary compensatory amounts can be adopted. I have no firm beliefs in the matter at the present time, but I will say that of course the Commission has put forward the proposals we think are the right ones, and we urge the Council to accept and adopt them. We propose the removal of the beef subsidy in the UK, also the butter subsidy. On the other hand, I would point out on the subject of butter, which has been raised by a number of speakers here today, that the price of butter in the UK will remain stable owing to the distinction we make in the payment arrangements

between butter fat and butter constituents other than fat. In other countries, where there has been no direct butter subsidy, the price of butter will fall. There are also still some countries which give national subsidies and, if they continue them, this will also make for a lower butter price.

Mr Martin thinks that the proposal is a provocation and that the 850 million to be repaid to the UK could be used for price increases. Mathematically speaking, of course, Mr Martin is right, but I think that Mr Martin's proposal is just as likely to be seen as a provocation as the Commission's price proposals and has no chance of being adopted. I do not state an official view but merely try to gauge how such a proposal would be received.

Mr Delatte asks whether it is reasonable now to take prices and COM(83) 500 both together. I think so. It is necessary. I think that the future of European agriculture depends to a large extent on our ability to get this policy adjusted to the modern age, to the development which has taken place. I think that the only way we can save the common agricultural policy will be to adopt the controls and adjustments which we in the Commission consider necessary.

Mr Davern says that we have done nothing to deal with intensive factory farming. That is not correct. If Mr Davern studies COM(83) 500, he will see that an additional levy on intensive milk production is contained in the Commission's proposals. We have also proposed a limitation on butter imports from New Zealand. Mr Davern knows that it forms part of the Commission's proposals.

Mr Paisley thinks that the co-responsibility levy will be a disaster for Northern Ireland. I am well aware that Ireland will have special problems with our milk proposal. It has been discussed in the Council and in the Commission, though no solution has been found as yet. I regret that the Council has not adopted the extension to the disadvantaged areas in Northern Ireland and other countries which the Commission has proposed and which has been on the table at the Council for 3-4 months now. It is necessary for the Council to adopt these proposals so that they can have the effect desired by Mr Paisley.

Mrs Castle does not think that, for example, an increase in the price of sugar by 1% is a real step in the direction of a solution to the problems. I will say, however, that on the question of sugar we are perhaps closer to a solution than we are for many other products. Sugar production has indeed been in decline for two harvest years because of our quota system and the co-responsibility levy which the sugar producers pay and which means that in effect they pay all the costs arising from sugar production. There is therefore rather more reason than appears at first sight to increase the price of sugar by that one per cent.

Dalsager

When the butter subsidies are withdrawn, we shall get a price reduction for butter in their place. I think that it is better to increase the consumption of butter throughout the Community and throughout the year instead of giving subsidies, as has happened in some countries. It is very costly and has not given rise to the increase in consumption we had expected. On the basis of world market prices, we have already mapped out our policy for grain, as Mrs Castle knows. As far as other products are concerned, we can argue about what the world market price is. For dairy products at all events, prices in a number of countries are higher than in the Community. The policy we are now preparing for dairy products will, we believe, have such a decisive effect that production will fall to a level which will be more in line with both internal and external markets.

Mr Früh asks whether this 11% reduction will enable us to get rid of the butter stocks. I doubt very much whether this will be the result. What will be effective in removing the stocks is a reduction in production, and that is the intention of the Commission's second proposal in the dairy sector. Mr Früh also thinks that the Commission had said that it would not propose a reduction in the monetary compensatory amounts if it was going to mean a fall in incomes. This is not something that the Commission has endorsed. It is something contained in the so-called gentleman's agreement, which the governments entered into at an earlier date but which unfortunately did not lead to the reduction in the monetary compensatory amounts we consider necessary.

Sir Fred Warner asks whether the Commission will amend its proposal on milk quotas so that it is the governments to which quotas are allocated and not the dairies. I may say that the Commission has not changed a jot in the proposal contained in COM(83) 500. We have debated whether it should be applied in a manner technically different to that proposed by the Commission, but no decision was taken. The Commission has a definite aim, namely to get milk production brought down to this 97 million tonne level. Levies must be paid for anything in excess of that quantity. Whether this is to be achieved in one way or in another way is of course open to discussion, but it is the Commission's intention to stick firmly to its proposal, until it is convinced that a different proposal would be better.

The costs from one country to another can be looked up in the proposal which has been distributed; there is no need for me to stand here and read out tables, — neither is there time for that. The document details the effects the proposal may be expected to have in the individual countries in respect of the monetary compensatory amounts and the other matters covered by it.

Mr Vié says that the budget allows scope for price increases. On the contrary, that is incorrect. It is the Commission's view that the budget can only remain intact if the Commission's proposals for the regulation

of the common agricultural policy are adopted. The British contribution, for which provision has been made, cannot of course be put back in — I cannot see that happening, and the Commission will not present proposals to that effect.

Mr Thareau thinks that the Commission will have 10 countries lined up against it. That would of course be a rather unpleasant situation, but in such an event the 10 countries would be obliged to come up with alternative proposals which would have the same effect, which would ensure that we remain within the budget and within the market system which everyone has agreed on.

Mr Tolman asks for a precise plan for cereal substitutes. We have proposed a negotiating brief this week or last week in the Council. At all events, it is in the pipeline. Mr Tolman will very soon receive the finalized proposal, which covers the stabilization of imports of these substitute products.

On the subject of colza, Mr Howell asks how the 1% reduction relates to the other proposals. I would point out that the rape quota was exceeded this year which, as has already been stated, gives rise to a reduction in the price. This is how the 1% reduction came about. Production in 1983 exceeded the threshold by 66 000 tonnes, and that meant that the price had to be reduced by 1% in the following year. Concerning 1981 as the threshold reference year for dairy products. 1981 is not in itself the important issue here. What is important is that we get down to 97 million tonnes. Whether we say 82 or 83 minus one or two is of secondary importance. Just as long as we get down to 97 million tonnes, the technique applied is not the main problem.

Mrs Martin refers to those who have invested in milk production. The Commission has said — and I think everyone is agreed on this — that special consideration must of course be given to those who have applied an investment plan which has received Community support, so that we do not then wreck their chances of bringing to fruition plans which we ourselves have supported.

Mr Kallias asks whether we shall be making use of the savings gained on milk in other sectors. That indeed will depend on the overall budget, and I think that the expenditure on milk is so large that of itself it justifies a saving on the milk policy as such. If savings cannot be made on the milk policy, we shall see it absorbing ever greater proportions of the Community's overall budget. I do not think we are prepared to accept that against the background of the present market situation. Under the policy the Community has given undertakings to the milk producers that it will stockpile these large quantities for which, at least for the moment, we cannot see that any markets exist. Thus the overall market situation for milk of itself justifies a reduction in expenditure on milk production and hence also an attempt to improve the market situation.

Dalsager

Mr Newton Dunn wants a guarantee that the Commission will not enter into compromises. The Commission has stated in its proposal that, if the Council makes such extensive changes in the proposal that it loses its coherence economically or from a market point of view, we reserve the right to withdraw our proposal. But to say in advance that we cannot enter into any compromise would be a bad policy. I think that all politicians know that it is necessary to compromise in practical politics. That could perhaps also be the case here but, whatever happens, the Commission intends to stand by its proposals and we also intend to insist on the economic and market-related effect of our proposals.

We are also aware in the Commission of the pigmeat situation, not just in the United Kingdom and in Ireland, but in the Community as a whole. Last week therefore we introduced private storage in the pigmeat sector, and we hope to achieve a significant improvement in the pigmeat situation over the next few months.

Mr Curry put a large number of questions. I should like to say with regard to market management that, while we have made certain changes in the management of the agricultural policy, this is because the world market has developed in such a way that we may have difficulties with the economy in 1984. It is therefore necessary for the Commission always to review the management of its policy in such a way that all possible and reasonable savings can be achieved. World market prices are proving unfavourable to our budgetary situation, whereas the high dollar rate is having a favourable effect on our budgetary situation, since certain products are sold for dollars. A sudden fall in the dollar rate could bring about a deterioration in our budgetary situation. Thus many imponderables are built into our budgetary situation, and they will always be present at the start of a financial year. We must try to keep a very close watch on this in the coming year. There will be a fall in the butter price. In Great Britain there will rather be a slight increase, with the removal of the butter support. In other countries, in which there has been no special support for butter, there will be a fall in the butter price, and the table for each country is already contained in the proposal.

On the question of women the Commission in its new proposals has, as far as structural policy is concerned, gone to great pains to present proposals which cover persons not of one particular sex but of one particular occupation. Whether it is women or men who engage in farming, they are covered by this policy. We have been very attentive to this situation, and the Commission will continue to be so in future agricultural policy.

(Several Members sought to put further questions. The President refused the requests)

Mr President, I must first make one thing clear, since I have been told by my staff that there was a mistake

in the English interpretation of what I said on butter prices. Butter prices will fall generally by about 11%, but in those countries in which special butter subsidies have been applied, for example the UK, the fall will of course not be 11%, for in that instance we are at the same time removing the subsidy which has been paid in the past. The result will therefore be largely neutral in the United Kingdom, while prices will fall by 11% in those countries which have not had a special butter subsidy.

With regard to the remaining questions, Mr President, I would point out that it is after all Parliament itself which decided on the half-hour limit, and I have endeavoured to answer briefly those questions which were put in that time — I think it was around 100 questions. I am naturally willing to answer all questions, if Parliament has a mind to put more, but I would point out that it is difficult to answer so many questions unprepared in the short time available.

IN THE CHAIR : MR FRIEDRICH*Vice-President***3. Radioactive waste**

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-1129/83) by Mrs Walz, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the need for Community measures for the final storage of radioactive waste and the reprocessing of irradiated nuclear fuel.

Mrs Walz (PPE), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! The start of a new year is always a good time for taking stock and making plans for the future. 1983 was a successful year for nuclear energy. Compared to 1982, the figures for which are given in my report, nuclear energy now accounts for a greater share of Community electricity production. In two Member States — France and Belgium — it rose above 40% during the first six months of 1983. In the United Kingdom over the same period, it rose from 2% to 17%. The figures for the Federal Republic of Germany to the end of November 1983 show that a 4% increase in output from nuclear power stations has increased their share of total electricity production to 23%.

It is not so easy to measure progress in disposing of radioactive waste which is produced not only by power stations, but also by industry, research and medicine. I shall show later, however, that there has also been substantial progress in this very complex field.

The German word 'Entsorgung' (disposal) covers all the stages involved in the collection, handling, containment and final storage of radioactive waste. The fact that this word is in common technical usage in other countries proves that it fills a gap. Disposal

Walz

includes all types of radioactive waste, i.e. low, medium and high level radioactive waste. I emphasize this point, because present public discussion is only concerned with the high level radioactive waste produced by reprocessing. Although this represents 95% i.e. the majority in terms of the level of radioactivity, the volume of waste is very small — after reprocessing, 3 cubic metres per 1 000 megawatt power station. It is relatively simple to place such amounts into interim storage, where their radioactivity and after heat output decline.

It is mainly the large quantities of low level waste which are already creating problems in some countries. This problem will increasingly cause public concern if the disposal of nuclear waste with a high alpha activity at sea is brought to an end. We must therefore urge that this problem should be tackled and solutions found to ensure the high level of public safety we are accustomed to in the field of nuclear energy.

My report concludes that there are two alternative methods for the disposal of high level waste, namely reprocessing of spent fuel elements followed by vitrification of the waste and final storage of the glass blocks, or containment of the spent fuel elements for direct final storage. The amount of practical experience with the two methods varies — the conditioning needed for direct final storage has not yet been tested, whereas experience with reprocessing and vitrification has been gained in both experimental and industrial plants in several Member States. Nevertheless, all previous studies conclude that there are no cogent grounds for rejecting either of the two methods. This also applies as regards the relative costs of reprocessing compared with direct final disposal — despite the many articles written, particularly in my country, which seek to cast doubt on this fact. It is not so much a question of the cost effectiveness of reprocessing as such — the prices of the French plant in Cap La Hague are well known — as the cost effectiveness of German reprocessing. And this in turn is a question of technique. The method used in Kalkar cannot be economically viable. But if one looks at our new power stations where the precise details are specified before building starts, during the authorization procedure and which are then built without delay and operated to achieve the maximum availability, i.e. with a high level of processed fuel, then their cost effectiveness is considerably improved. It would be even better if plant capacity were increased annually from the initial 350 tonnes to approx. 700 tonnes which is the volume of fuel which is likely to be produced in Germany by the year 2000.

Finally, we must consider which method of final disposal is the most cost effective, assuming both methods are equally safe. The higher cost of reprocessing, minus the profits for recycled fuels, must be set against the extra costs of direct final disposal in a suitable final store and all these calculations depend

heavily on trends in the price of natural uranium. An end to reprocessing would certainly encourage uranium producers to raise their prices accordingly. As long as neither of the methods offers a clear advantage, we should continue to use and develop both to a level of industrial feasibility. Existing interim storage facilities provide the flexibility and time we need. Radioactivity and after-heat diminish during interim storage thus simplifying the later stages. As long as the time is used to build and operate industrial plant, we are not shelving the problem.

I would like to give a few examples to show that progress has been made during 1983, i.e. that this time has been well used. In view of the time at my disposal I shall confine myself to developments in two Member States, without in any way wishing to make value judgments. The United Kingdom has designated a former anhydrite mine near Billingham and a site near Bedford as final stores for medium and low level radioactive waste. The Federal Republic of Germany has granted a number of important licences, in particular for interim storage in Gorleben and to study the Gorleben salt mines.

Unfortunately, there is a widespread impression in the Community that the problem of final disposal of radioactive waste is still unsolved. It is our task, not just during the coming months of the election campaign, to make it clear that this is not so and that, on the contrary, the problem of radioactive waste has been recognised at an early stage and that extensive research and development, much of it on a Community basis, has achieved, in principle, a solution. The application of experimental results on an appropriate industrial scale is progressing on schedule.

We must not allow ourselves to be put on the defensive as far as final disposal and the use of nuclear energy in general are concerned. Compared to all other sources of energy, nuclear energy is very safe and non-polluting. Radioactive waste forms only a very small part of the overall waste produced by our industrial society.

I am indebted to the French Secretary of State, Mr Auroux, for the figure of one kilogram of radioactive waste per head of French population out of an annual total of 5 t of waste per inhabitant. Many other waste products, i.e. dioxins and other organic chlorine compounds, present the same or even greater risks for humanity and the environment, but as we read almost daily in the newspapers are not handled or stored nearly as carefully as radioactive waste. Other sections of industry have a lot of catching up to do.

Sound proposals exist for a permanent solution to the problem of the final disposal of radioactive waste. Wherever practicable, these solutions should be applied on a Community basis. The motion for a resolution before you, which was adopted in committee with only one vote against, shows ways of achieving this.

(Applause)

Mr Schmid (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! After the discussions in committee I expected an objective debate in the house. Mrs Walz's speech has made this impossible. To say that 5 t of waste per head of French population is comparable with a kilo of radioactive waste is nothing less than an attempt to pull the wool over our eyes. The dangers involved, not the quantity are what matters! You did not, of course, measure dioxins in kilograms! This is no way to discuss matters. You will not promote the cause of nuclear energy by defending it with weak arguments.

Let us return to the real problem: something has to be done with the waste from nuclear power stations. I am saying this because there are people who oppose nuclear energy and are therefore unwilling to face this problem. But even those who oppose nuclear energy must accept the fact that there are nuclear power stations in operation in the European Community and that a solution must be found to the problem of final disposal. Whether it was particularly clever to build the power stations before considering the question of disposal is another matter, which does not alter the present position. One positive aspect of your report, Mrs Walz — I do not only wish to criticize — is that you point out that disposal involves more than reprocessing, it includes safe final storage. It is sometimes assumed in public debates that reprocessing plant have solved the problems of disposal. This is not so. The safe final storage of high level radioactive waste is the nub of the problem. To date, there is no solution to this problem, with all due respect, Mrs Walz, and because there is no solution, no one can stand up and say that in principle the problem is solved. To my great regret, no solution has been found.

There are two methods of disposal: reprocessing spent fuel elements or direct final storage. The majority of spent fuel elements from light water reactors in the Community are reprocessed. There is currently a large-scale plant in operation in La Hague. Everybody will be aware that there have been problems with this plant, and that several times a criticality accident has been imminent. However, considerable experience has been gained with this technology, which is not the case with direct final disposal where all there have been so far are preliminary investigations. I take the view that given our present level of knowledge the two methods cannot be seriously compared, either in terms of cost effectiveness, safety or the degree of pollution. We therefore particularly welcome the suggestion in Mrs Walz's report for a large-scale feasibility project to develop direct final disposal and support this proposal.

Similarly, there are matters we do not agree on. As I have just pointed out: at our present state of knowledge, a well-founded, serious choice between these two methods is not possible. Mrs Walz's report comes

down in favour of reprocessing for a certain type of radioactive waste. I simply do not see what serious basis there is for this, except blind acceptance of the wishes of the nuclear industry. If we consider not only the question of recycling fuels, but also safety and pollution, we cannot at the present time commit ourselves to one method. We have proposed an alternative formulation in the form of an amendment. If Parliament does not adopt this amendment, we shall have to vote against the report, despite the positive aspects I have mentioned and which we support. Cost effectiveness cannot be the only yardstick. The hazards involved with radioactive waste mean that we must take account of safety considerations and the impact on the environment.

Moreover, Mrs Walz, it is not the press — because you referred to articles to this effect — inventing doubts as to the economic feasibility of reprocessing; the company that wants to build the reprocessing plant is saying itself that reprocessing should not be carried out on economic but on other grounds.

(Interjection)

Yes, the DWK says that, Mr Fuchs, you only have to look it up. A final point — on which again we do not agree with the rapporteur. Your report states that the establishment of reprocessing plants in sparsely populated and therefore structurally weak areas would create jobs. In my view, this method is too expensive. On the one hand the staff of reprocessing plant consists of highly qualified technicians, who are not likely to be available in structurally weak areas. They would have to be recruited in industrial areas and encouraged to move, which would not solve employment problems in weak areas. Secondly, the investment costs of a reprocessing plant are very high. The jobs created by this investment are extremely expensive. Since public funds are involved, a serious argument in terms of regional policy would be to ask how many different jobs could be created with the same money — and the answer is: far more!

There may be any number of reasons for favouring reprocessing, but to use regional and employment policies is a specious argument that has no place in a serious discussion.

(Applause)

Mr K. Fuchs (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! I cannot understand why Mr Schmid complained of a lack of objectivity in the presentation of this report. Surely there is no harm in quoting a French Socialist or Communist Secretary of State!

Moreover, your arguments were not entirely convincing. The Group of the European People's Party accepts this report and I would like to congratulate Mrs Walz. The report is responsible, critical, balanced and concentrates on essentials. It offers a real basis for future action at the European level on storage

Fuchs

and reprocessing. We therefore reject those amendments which are based on illusions, on irrational fear or are directed against Community projects.

I would like to justify briefly why we support this report. First of all, the problem cannot be ignored. It must, and can, be solved technically. What we want is a safe solution.

Secondly, for this reason, as Mrs Walz points out, safety is the main priority. Common safety standards certainly serve this purpose, but are also necessary for reasons of competition. I would like to emphasize this point.

Thirdly: there will always be some slight risk. But we have the opportunity, before final storage, to check all the safety aspects critically. Industrial development to date has mostly been the other way round. We have a technical risk, which can be overcome by technical means. The *supply* of energy presents political risks and these are difficult, and in some cases impossible, to control or eliminate.

Fourthly, the problem of final storage must be solved if we are to continue using nuclear energy. Fears for the future have been voiced. I would like to quote Professor Carl Friedrich von Weizsäcker, who is known to be critical of nuclear energy: 'In my opinion, our descendants will inherit far more dangerous things than carefully stored radioactivity!'

Fifthly, I support both methods of disposal, for the sake of future generations. It may be that reprocessing will become much more important than it is today, since it provides reserves of energy for the future. It would be fatal to abandon this option and it is self-deception to pretend otherwise.

Sixthly, I feel it is important to encourage joint ventures on a Community basis. Precise guidelines have been given as to the areas where this is necessary: safety standards, research and also storage and reprocessing facilities for those Member States which, for whatever reason, are unable to provide them.

(Mr Schmid asked to speak)

Seventhly, and here I disagree with you, Mr Schmid, I fully support the regional and job market policy aspects. It is not a question of buying off the poorer regions cheaply. The two thousand jobs, which would be created by a medium-sized plant, represent a great gain; many local people would find jobs and influx of highly qualified personnel would certainly also be seen as an asset.

My last point is that we should guard against reacting emotionally to a problem, which must be solved rationally. Fear has always been a poor counsellor and always will be. We must be guided by reason.

Mr Schmid (S). — *(DE)* Under the Rules of Procedure, it is permissible to put questions. Now, of course, it is too late.

President. — Unlike in the British Parliament one cannot ask to speak while someone else is speaking. At least it is not usual to interrupt the speaker. However, you can invoke Rule 67 of the Rules of Procedure. I think I have made myself clear.

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED). — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I rise to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group in support of this excellent and so well-researched report by Mrs Walz. Of course, all industrial activity results in some production of waste, and the provision of electrical energy is no exception. Fossil fuels, when burnt to generate steam for electricity production, give us ash residues. Millions of tonnes of coal are burned, millions of tonnes of fly ash have to be disposed of, and both from coal and oil generate sulphur dioxide resulting in acid rain and other pollution in the atmosphere, so devastating in its effects when it falls back to earth.

However fissile fuels have their own particular problems. The vitally important nuclear energy programmes, existing over the last 25 years and projected for the foreseeable future, add a new dimension to the whole question of waste disposal — that of not merely inconvenience but danger. Until the research and development of fusion techniques makes this technique feasible we shall become increasingly dependent — and quite rightly so — on the generation of nuclear electric power. We have got to face squarely our responsibilities in dealing with the dangerous waste products which ensue.

This report, with its background information in the explanatory statement, shows clearly the Community involvement in making sure that the citizenry of Europe are absolutely safe from the radiological dangers involved. We call for speedy advancement of the frontiers of knowledge in this field. We call for regulations or directives to be developed at Community level, in cooperation with international organizations, to cover all the conditioning and disposal of radioactive waste. There is not only the problem of ultimate disposal to be researched, but also the problem of intermediate storage to be kept under review.

Already, of course, we have spent fuel and other radioactive elements that we are safely harbouring pending solution to the many final disposal problems. We have, as I understand it, time on our side and the firm conviction that before that time is used up we shall have evolved totally satisfactory methods for final disposal.

Nevertheless, the public at large are concerned. It is so much easier to alarm people than to reassure them. In Billingham, in my constituency of Cleveland, where there is merely an intention to explore the prac-

Vanneck

ticability of storing radioactive waste underground — not allocation, Mrs Walz, as I understand it — there has been immediate strong and justifiable public reaction. There must, whatever the safeguards, be no intention in any Member State — and I particularly think of my country and my constituency — to put at risk, however small a risk, urban centres of population where tens of thousands of people live and work. We must not allow nuclear by-products to be stored even hundreds of feet underground in such sensitive areas, when research can find other suitable geological strata in relatively unpopulated areas for the final storage of such radioactive waste.

I would make a further point. While paragraph 16 calls for the establishment of final storage facilities for the waste from those Member States which, for geological or other reasons, lack their own facilities, this worthy enough aim is totally unrealistic in practice. It is highly unlikely that any Member State would willingly allow its territory to be used for the disposal of other countries' waste, and I would suggest to my colleagues that, from their own political experience in each of their own countries, they would appreciate that such a suggestion is likely to prove quite ridiculous.

What we shall achieve if this report is adopted — as I sincerely hope it will be — is a new initiative in the field of pooling individual countries' research endeavours to back up the existing Community research programmes. It will allow national requirements to be met and promote a general and welcome increase in technical expertise in meeting these Community-wide and indeed worldwide problems which arise from our absolute dependence on electric light, heat and power.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Veronesi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the resolution, and the observations on it made by Mrs Walz, touches on an important question to do with nuclear energy — the final stage in the fuel's cycle.

As we know, there are two basic strategies where spent fuel elements are concerned — the one, direct final storage, and the other, reprocessing. The choice between the two is very heavily dependent on certain factors, first of all geographical and demographical questions, and secondly, the question of the availability of fissile material resources.

Where Europe is concerned we are of the view that reprocessing is the correct choice. This is not only because it reduces very considerably the amount of waste to be disposed of, but because, through reprocessing, not only is a large quantity of unused fissile material recovered, but also new material produced in the internal processes of the reactor is obtained. Moreover — in our view — Europe cannot reject the use of breeder reactors, in the technology of which —

amongst other things — she leads the world. Europe is thus willy-nilly faced with the question of reprocessing.

Mrs Walz has outlined this problem very clearly, and calls for a research commitment for solving the complex questions connected with it. We are not starting from scratch, as Mrs Walz observes, and as can be seen from all the scientific material published for the benefit of public opinion on this question. One need only read the Bulletin of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna.

Very important results have also been announced which show that the final storage of nuclear waste by compaction is a method which certainly promises to be successful.

For these reasons we will support the motion for a resolution, and we will support Community action along these lines. This will also have a calming effect on the legitimate concern of public opinion, which sees this stage in the fuel's cycle as one of the thorniest questions for the safety of future generations.

Mr Pintat (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the need for Community research on the storage of radioactive waste is self-evident. This is a field in which the Commission can provide not only moral support for national or multinational ventures in the form of an international institution's endorsement, but also practical support from its specialists and financial backing. We therefore congratulate Mrs Walz on having produced this excellent report, which should in time facilitate the establishment of Europe's first final storage centres.

Irrespective of whether the method adopted for dealing with irradiated fuels is reprocessing or direct storage without reprocessing, the need for storage facilities remains. As of now, encapsulation in glass blocks affords a safe means of storing highly radioactive waste and in France, where I am conversant with the situation, reprocessing of irradiated fuels has been developed to the stage of industrial viability. At La Hague, which is operating very successfully, contrary to what Mr Schmid has said, some 221 tonnes of light-water fuels were reprocessed during 1983; the ordinary-water PWR and BWR reactors there are the most advanced in the world and the bulk of future development will be based on them. The quantities of fuels from this type of reactor are therefore substantial, so that reprocessing is the best solution in this case.

Given the quantities to be reprocessed, the establishment of industrial facilities is justified; moreover, appreciable savings of fuel can be achieved through reprocessing. Of 100 kilos of fuel used in an ordinary-water reactor, reprocessing can recover 1 kilo of uranium 235, 1 kilo of plutonium and 95 kilos of uranium 238 which can be used in fast-breeder reactors, making a total of 97% of usable material which would otherwise be lost.

Pintat

On the other hand, immediate storage without reprocessing could be an economically attractive solution in the case of all the research and test reactors, which use a very wide variety of fuels, and we therefore approve the retention of this option for certain categories of fuel.

The problem of radioactive waste is primarily a problem of public opinion, as the polls amply demonstrate. Attention must therefore be given to promoting wider awareness of the safety standards achieved by methods already available, and the temptation to introduce new regulations which would not enhance safety is to be avoided. The existing regulations are already as strict as in any field. They cover the whole range of applications of this new form of energy and the results are there for all to see: full provision is made for the protection of public health. Bringing in new regulations and changing existing ones is not the way to gain wider public acceptance for the establishment of a final storage centre.

What is needed is an information campaign to bring home to the general public that even highly radioactive waste can be stored in solid, insoluble form in complete safety and without threatening the environment. Would that the same precautions were taken and the same guarantees were given in respect of all conventional forms of waste, as Mrs Walz has rightly reminded us. We shall therefore be voting for this report.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Mr President, there is no doubt that the nuclear energy industry is one of the most safety-conscious in the world, and I have a nuclear energy plant in the faraway part of the North of Scotland. There is no doubt about this. But there is also no doubt that there is real public concern, and there is no point in scoffing at the fears of what now looks like being a majority of public opinion. The fears are real; they are based on realities such as the recent pollution in the Irish Sea, the readings on beaches in the North-West of England and recent concerns about health in the area of Windscale in the North of England.

I would like to make three points. The first is that there has been quite a lot of talk about the use of thinly populated areas. Well, let us not delude ourselves that we are doing these areas any benefit or good turn by making these proposals. That is not their point of view. These areas — and I represent probably the last great wilderness left in the European Community — do not see it that way.

They do not see this as a creation of jobs. They have heard all this before. They know that the best source of jobs is their own indigenous industries and that small is beautiful is the principle that works for them. Everything else has been shown in my type of area, with multinationals coming and going, to be a total fiasco. So when you are talking about waste disposal

and thinly populated areas, you are creating bitter resentment. It is shared by all churchmen in my area who say they will not accept waste unless it is produced there.

I now come to the point made by Sir Peter Vanneck. I agree with it. It is perfectly moral and clear that if you produce waste you must dispose of it. We accept that. But we will not as a wilderness accept other people's waste. If their wishes are not heeded, those thinly-populated areas will make such a public protest the like of which you have never seen. There is a very deeply-held principle here, and I think it has to be said that this is not a sensible instrument of regional policy. One speaker has already made this point today.

That is really all I want to say. We do accept the realities of life, but there must not be this feeling that because there are not many people, action can be taken without their wishes being seriously consulted.

Mr Eisma (NI). — (NL) Mr President, I shall begin with a quotation from the explanatory statement: 'The use of nuclear energy inevitably involves the production of radioactive waste. All the stages in the elimination of this waste in a manner which is permanently harmless for man and his natural environment can be summed up in the term "disposal"; disposal is thus a prerequisite for the responsible use of this source of energy.'

I quote this because we could not agree more. But according to the report, and specifically paragraph 14 of the motion for a resolution, and I again quote: '... already demonstrate that the problem can be solved within the requisite period.' Assuming that this quotation reflects the truth, the conclusion to be drawn is that the condition laid down by the Committee on Energy and Research itself has not, for the moment at least, been satisfied. What is worse is that the quotation will be true only if the present — commendable, but very complicated — research is successful, and that is by no means certain.

In short, the resolution demonstrates what we consider to be unjustified optimism for the time being. Paragraph D of the preamble, for example, says that at each of the stages of which the complex disposal process consists different technical solutions exist. But they do not yet exist. Research is still being done to find them. The same is true of the simplification of the subsequent stages as a result of the postponement of earlier stages of waste disposal, as paragraph 11 says. Here again, this will be true only if the experiments prove successful.

Mrs Walz is also optimistic when it comes to figures. In paragraph 3 of the explanatory statement she says that 0.44 m³ of treated highly radioactive waste occurs per thousand million kWh of generated electricity. According to my information, the figure is in fact twice as high.

Eisma

What I believe this report also lacks is the general statement that all dangerous wastes, including radioactive waste, should be stored in such a way that they remain accessible for inspection so that supplementary measures can, if necessary, be taken and the occurrence of irreparable damage can be avoided. This would mean, for example, that the dumping of any radioactive material at sea is inadmissible. And that is something this Parliament decided as long ago as September 1982.

Mr President, a great deal of attention has been paid to the advantages and disadvantages of reprocessing as against immediate final storage. The preliminary conclusion drawn is that reprocessing is principally a possibility in the case of used fuel elements removed from large reactors. But there appear to be objections to this, although they are not mentioned in the report. These objections are evidently so serious that reprocessing has been banned in the United States since 1977. Could the rapporteur or the Commission tell us why this ban has been imposed in America? And why is it that we in Europe dare to take risks which have long been considered unacceptable in the United States?

Mr President, to conclude, I regard this report, despite its many qualities, as so excessively optimistic that we shall not be able to give it our approval unless our amendments are adopted.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS CASSANMAGNAGO
CERRETTI

Vice-President

Mr Howell (ED). — Madam President, I am very grateful indeed that I have the opportunity, albeit a very modest one, to register my own opinion as a Member who represents another coastal area of the United Kingdom. You will realize that I am extremely concerned at what I consider the irresponsibility of many Member States in the present disposal of nuclear waste at sea. I therefore fully support the document which we are debating today, recognizing that nuclear power has a very important part to play in our society and in each and every one of our lives and can be used very much for the good of every one of us. But it also carries great dangers with it, and those dangers are very often underestimated, under-researched, inadequately understood and that I believe is an extremely dangerous position.

I would therefore support the complete abandonment of disposal of all nuclear waste at sea, be it at a high level, a low level, a medium level or any other level, because of the great difficulty in determining its impact on our food chains and within our oceans. I understand Mrs Ewing's problem but I would ask her to allow us to put nuclear waste in convenient sites on

shore where at least it could always be got at in the future as technology progresses to the stage where we can find a final and rather better method of storing this nuclear waste. I therefore support the motion.

Mr Petronio (NI). — *(IT)* Madame President, in his speech earlier Mr Pintat gave us an extremely interesting, very practical piece of information. He told us that by processing — which is one of the two procedures in question — 97% of the fuel elements can be recovered, thus reducing to only 3% the quantity of waste for final disposal by burying.

This is a path that we, of the Italian Political Right, consider should be pursued, and absolutely not abandoned, not only for economic considerations — reasons of cost — even if this aspect is undoubtedly important, seeing that the recovery of such a high percentage of fissile material subsequently reduces other costs in the production process. And, of course, there is also the fact that the disposal of only 3%, instead of 100%, is a very much less difficult problem, or at least one that can be more readily got to grips with.

I recently read the report of an interview with the scientist Hans Bethe, winner of the Nobel Prize for Physics, during the course of which he stated, with regard to low-level radioactive waste — that is, waste that does not emit alpha rays — that the quantity so far accumulated is around 8 000 tons, which will obviously increase as time goes on.

The problem, therefore, is one that requires very careful attention. There can be no hoping to get rid of it by burying it under water — by putting into water the 8 000 tons we have today, and then the 10, or 12, or 20 000 and more that we shall have tomorrow. Nor by attempting only to bury it as deep as possible — just as it is useless to hope to bury a nightmare at any depth whatever, not even a thousand or ten thousand kilometers under ground. The problem must be tackled in all its gravity, with the utmost sense of responsibility, and taking account of the fact that this research — whether geological or of whatever kind — will represent a further cost factor to be charged to the cost of a kilowatt-hour of electrical energy.

But everything has to be paid for, you don't get anything for nothing. This research sector, moreover, is one that is employing and will employ laboratories, joint centres, young scientists — a whole intellectual and technical world — as well as tens of thousands of workers throughout our common market and over the whole of Europe.

This is what, in our view, has to be done, without idly wondering how it comes about that the power stations came first, and only afterwards was any thought given to the disposal of their waste. In life, history, science, everywhere, in fact, we do something first and only afterwards become aware of the effects. Inevitably what we do causes effects that, subsequently, in prac-

Petronio

tice, we learn to correct. The difficulties inherent in a system become evident as you go along. And so we would suggest reasoned optimism and a Community commitment on these lines, and for these reasons we shall support Mrs Walz's resolution, which seems to us admirably balanced, and which calls for a Community directive for this sector through which it will also be possible to take advantage of the assistance and aid of special bodies such as the Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna.

Mr Turner (ED). — Madam President, I wish to support the Walz report and raise two specific points with Mr Narjes, the Commissioner. First, I welcome the provision for a double check on the safety of nuclear waste disposal through the EEC in conjunction with the national authorities. But can I take it that this proposal will include provisions not only for the intermediate and final disposal of nuclear waste, but also for its safe transport from the sites where it is produced to where it is disposed of and also safe storage in interim storage tanks at the site of the nuclear power station? This is covered by paragraph 10 of the resolution. I am very concerned about this because in my constituency of Suffolk and Harwich we have the power station at Sizewell and we are planning to have another one there — a pressurized water reactor.

My second point is this. In October 1983 Parliament, in the Linkohr report on the research programme at Ispra on nuclear power, called for the speeding up of the completion of the data bank at Ispra which would include full details of all components in pressurized water reactors and all incidents concerning any of the components, so that every pressurized water reactor in future could be run with a knowledge of all previous incidents involving all other pressurized water reactors. We call for the speeding up of this data bank and for the systematic analysis of the information to be contained in it. May I ask that in this data bank we also include nuclear waste storage and transport factors as well as components of power stations and the incidents taking place in the power stations themselves.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Madam President, may I begin by thanking the rapporteur for her report and her comments and all the speakers for their suggestions and contributions, insofar as these were mainly addressed to the Commission.

The reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel and disposal of radioactive waste has been under discussion in the Commission ever since the creation of Euratom. For the last ten years, research and development work on the disposal of radioactive waste has been a permanent feature of the Community's nuclear programme. We read, therefore, Mrs Walz's report with great

interest. It provides not only an excellent, well-researched and clear introduction to this complicated subject, but also describes what action is possible under the present circumstances. The technical and economic parameters are presented succinctly and clearly and the views discussed which led to this motion for a resolution.

The main idea behind the report is that disposal must be tackled at Community level, if only because not all Member States, whether for geological or other reasons, are not able to set up or extend their own disposal and final storage facilities. Here as in all fields, the concept of Community solidarity is of major importance to the Commission. And solidarity means that those problems which cannot be solved, or not solved adequately, at the national level, should be transferred to the Community.

However, national prejudices all too frequently prevent this happening and I hope this will not always be so. This is not least the case in the field of nuclear waste disposal. A further central point in the report is an assessment of the two possible methods of disposal, direct final storage of spent fuel elements or the reprocessing of fuel elements, followed by final storage of the residual waste. The rapporteur wishes to keep both options open, but takes the view that reprocessing is likely to be the most suitable method for dealing with the large quantities of fuel elements from power reactors.

As far as the European Community is concerned, reprocessing with final storage of residual waste would seem to be the favoured option in the long term, partly because reprocessing is important for the whole field of breeder technology, and also because it reduces our dependence on uranium imports. This is the long-term view.

The Commission is aware that doubts are being cast on the cost-effectiveness of reprocessing, but this in no way means that the development of this complicated technology should be halted. This is particularly true of the conditioning and disposal of radioactive waste from reprocessing. Here there is room for further research and improvement. Nevertheless, in the long term this form of nuclear waste disposal is obviously technically feasible and also relative non-polluting. A number of recent studies corroborate this.

As far as the direct final storage of spent fuel elements is concerned, it is not possible with our present level of knowledge to draw the same conclusions. We are therefore planning in the third Community research programme into radioactive waste which is to be submitted shortly, to pay due attention to this problem.

Before I come to my third topic, I would like to reply to a question by Mr Eisma, namely why reprocessing was discontinued in the United States in 1977. I do

Narjes

not wish to pre-empt a thorough discussion in committee, but I would just like to point out that in the United States reprocessing is carried out by private industry and that as far as we can tell, it could not operate profitably. The economic conditions necessary for building a new plant did not exist, the government felt there was sufficient time to wait and see whether incentives should be given to reprocessing in future, i.e. whether it should be subsidized or not.

Non-proliferation considerations may have played a part, but I believe we should leave more detailed discussions to the appropriate committee.

I now come to the third aspect of the report, Community research. In recent years, Community research has increasingly become a vehicle for integration. The more national research projects are coordinated via Community research, and the more transfrontier cooperation on research is developed, the more likely it is that common solutions will be found and legislation developed at Community level. Community research not only encourages political and legal integration, it is also essential if we are to master a difficult technology, which we must, if only for the sake of the environment and health.

The pioneering role that European research can play is demonstrated by the following: the new research programme for 1985-89 on the disposal of radioactive waste will include for the first time, in addition to the research and development section proper, a second section providing support for realistic experiments in subterranean caves to demonstrate the final storage of radioactive waste. The national delegations have recently proposed three different, geologically suitable sites in Germany, Belgium and France. We are able to concentrate on the research aspect of the disposal of nuclear waste partly because we are not pressed for time and do not have to find a permanent solution to the problem of the disposal of nuclear waste as soon as it is produced. On the contrary: the longer the period of safe interim storage, the easier and safer it is to dispose of the radioactive waste because, unlike conventional waste, Nature helps us by a rapid initial decrease in radioactivity. This applies particularly to longer-term interim storage of spent fuel elements, given that short-term fuel recycling is presently not cost-effective, although in the long term it offers an additional source of energy.

It must be emphasized that this initial fall in high level radioactivity must not mislead us into adopting a wait-and-see policy. We cannot postpone the development of safe, economical disposal technologies and leave future generations to solve the problem. We must use the breathing space Nature gives us to achieve a satisfactory solution, to prepare the way for large-scale implementation and to convince the public that the disposal of nuclear waste is technically feasible and that therefore nuclear energy is acceptable.

Mrs Walz's report makes this clear. It encourages us and will have a considerable influence on our future work in the field of disposal. This also applies to the motion for a resolution, which the Commission largely accept. Particularly as far as research is concerned the Commission is hopeful that it will be able to satisfy the expectations in the resolution and it will take account in its work of the various other objectives.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

4. *Solid fuels*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-1162/83) by Mr Rogalla, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-647/83 — COM(83) 447 final) for a regulation concerning financial support of the Community in favour of industries producing solid fuels and on the proposals for a balanced solid fuels policy (COM(83) 309 final).

Mr Rogalla (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen! This directly elected Parliament last considered the question of coal two years ago, in relation to the motions for resolutions submitted by Mr Moreland and Mr Rinsche on energy strategy and energy policy. The rapporteurs in question represented different political viewpoints in this House even on the minor issues such as coking coal and lower Community subsidies. Nevertheless, I, as the rapporteur today, feel very uneasy. A good deal has been written and a great deal said, including this Commission proposal about a balanced policy on solid fuels, i.e. coal, lignite, peat, etc.

But now there is a difference: for the first time concrete financial proposals have been made which relate to more than coking coal. Community funds are to be made available to support coal as a source of energy, to subsidize economically viable mines and to encourage new, rational methods of coal-mining. We welcomed this and approached this task in committee with some pleasure.

But we are building on sand. This Community has nothing that deserves the name of an 'energy policy', no coordination of guidelines and proposals. As rapporteur I try to exercise restraint, but the European Parliament should protest energetically at the lack of a Community energy policy, which is just as essential as an agricultural policy, a regional policy or a transport policy. Each small European nation State muddles through on its own: Great Britain produces oil (without giving preferential treatment to its partners), Great Britain and West Germany, and to a lesser extent France and Belgium, produce coal, investing

Rogalla

millions; of the 241 million tonnes currently being produced in the Community, Great Britain alone produces 121 million, i.e. more than half. We cannot carry on like this unless we wish to fall behind the major industrial nations and trade partners, Japan and the USA. Hundreds of thousands of jobs would again be at risk.

This is the point my report takes up. In Germany alone — the Member State I know best — the number of coal mines has fallen to half over the last ten years from 73 to 36. The average daily output is 10 000 tonnes, compared with 3 000 tonnes ten or fifteen years ago. This has been achieved by considerable investment in mining technology and safety. At the end of 1983 there were 321 400 miners working below ground in the Community. A year ago this figure was 10 000 higher. Technical progress requires sacrifices here as in other fields. This major industry which is continually modernizing represents a very valuable asset, not only in our economy, but also from the point of view of energy and employment policies. We are grateful to the Commission for its proposal to modernize existing plant and to establish new capacity on an economically viable basis. But we must beware: those proposals are in great danger, at least as far as can be judged from the initial statements by the Council of Ministers of the petty nation States. The egoism of the Member States has so far obstructed the solidarity we need between the countries that produce coal — the four I have mentioned — and those, for example Italy and Denmark, which only consume coal. And this is what calls for protest! Parliament must give its full backing to the Commission and the funds which are being held in reserve as it were in a token entry must be utilized by appropriate Commission proposals.

This sums up my report. A number of special topics are also dealt with: coal research, coal beneficiation, the promotion of district heating schemes by subsidies and loans from the European Investment Bank, general suggestions and development of the heating market, particularly in the public sector, and the recognition that environmental criteria in this sphere can certainly be met and are in no way counter-productive because they create jobs.

I think in the light of 30 amendments that have been tabled, and the fact that if we are to stand any chance of convincing the Council of Ministers we shall all have to pull together, we should reconsider this matter in detail. I therefore intend to suggest how this might be done at the end of the debate.

Mr Van Rompuy (PPE), draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. — (NL) Madam President, no one will deny that the coal industry in the European Community has serious structural difficulties to contend with. This is partly due to the general recession and to the crisis

in the iron and steel industry, but also to the fact that the European coal industry is less competitive than its rivals in third countries. Figures show that the cost price of European coal is four to five times higher than that of non-European coal. The Commission predicts that in the year 2000 imports will account for three times more of total consumption than they do now. There is consequently an urgent need for the production apparatus to be modernized and adapted. The Rogalla report and the Commission's study show that about one quarter of Community production is really profitable, 60 to 65% marginally profitable and 15% very unprofitable. As with the steel industry and other traditional sectors, we obviously cannot close our eyes to certain economic facts. It is with this in mind that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs says in its opinion that the European coal industry will have some hard decisions to take in the years to come.

And yet the picture for this industry is not completely black. A study by *World Coal*, which is confirmed by the International Energy Agency, states that coal's share of total energy consumption in the OECD countries could rise to about 30% in the year 2000 compared with the present level of around 18%. The coal industry clearly still has a future, and particularly where the generation of electricity is concerned, new methods of processing coal could have a major role to play. I therefore welcome the appeal in the Rogalla report for the financial aid the Commission allocates for investment subsidies to be extended to include electricity generating installations.

I should also like to point out, Madam President, that the coal policy must also take account of certain regional imperatives, certain implications for the regions of a given policy. The criteria which it is thought should govern the granting of aid take too little account of this, however: There is a danger here that the criterion set out in Article 6; that only existing mines whose annual underground output averages a minimum of 380 kg per man/hour are eligible for investments, is too strict. For example, in a region like Flemish Limburg, it would mean that not a single mine would be eligible since the highest underground output there, in Zolder, for instance, is 315 kg per man/hour. If the whole of the coal industry closed down in a region like Limburg, unemployment would rise to 35% from the already high level of 25%. This is socially unacceptable, particularly as a region like this cannot expect a suitable reconversion policy for the time being. I shall therefore support the proposals which seek to establish criteria that take account not only of underground output but also of the total cost price per ton and reflect all operating costs, both underground and at the surface.

The Commission should also consider the possibility of making production fairly profitable by improving output and making adequate investments in new coal-fired power stations, for example. This amendment

Van Rompuy

to the Commission's proposal for a regulation does not, however, alter the fact that, as I have just said, this industry will have some hard decisions to take in the coming years. But let us not forget the regional effect possible measures may have, the major implications they may have for certain regions, or the Community's global energy strategy, of which — as Mr Rogalla has said — there is no sign in this proposal for a regulation.

Mr Adam (S). — Madam President, the Rogalla report sets out very clearly the failure of the Community to translate firm declarations in favour of a strengthened solid fuel industry into practical measures. The present situation in the coal industry is extremely serious. Unless present policies are changed, the coal industries face continued decline and eventual extinction. I think some of the aspects of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs' report are far too optimistic in the longer term.

The crisis is illustrated by rising coal stocks. They are 10% up on the past year: 50 million tonnes held by producers and an equivalent quantity by the users. Imports into the Community too are rising. They are up 50% since 1973 and are now running at 70 million tonnes a year. The coal business has been handed over to our competitors. Indeed, some aspects of the infrastructure schemes proposed in the Commission's document to increase coal use would actually encourage imports. By contrast, the Esprit programme has been devised in an effort to protect markets in videos and computers. The same approach is needed to defend our coal markets. The only current policy is to close pits. The Socialist Group demands a new strategy based on a firm commitment not to increase the proportion of imports.

Two other main elements are required. Firstly, there must be an increase in investment to improve productivity. Sixty per cent of current production which is only marginally unprofitable can thus be made competitive. The group wants more flexible criteria for this investment aid.

There must also be investment in new production. There is considerable potential for the development of new mines which would be fully competitive with imported coal at current prices. There are no technical reasons why an additional capacity of at least 120 million tonnes a year could not be brought into production given the will to invest. This investment would also allow a period of transition and protection for pits under threat of closure. The social implications must be taken into account as well as the implications for regional economies. In addition, financial aid for coal stocks should be provided in this transitional period.

The second main element needed is to secure markets for the coal that is produced. We need investment in

favour of coal to eliminate oil and gas fired electricity generation. Twenty-four per cent of electricity is still generated from oil and gas. A similar effort is needed in the industrial sector and we need to encourage the development of coal fired district heating and combined heat and power schemes. It is also important that research into the use of coal, combustion, pollution control, liquefaction and gasification should be stepped up in order to develop future markets.

So far I have only mentioned coal, but there are other solid fuels. It is a pleasure to note that the proposals would improve the position for the poorest countries of the Community, Greece and Ireland, by assisting the production of brown coal and peat.

Although the Socialist Group generally welcomes the Commission's proposals, they do not go far enough. The action so far taken by the Council is woefully inadequate. The opportunity for commitments was present during the 1984 budget procedure. It must be noted that the Council failed miserably to take up the challenge.

Finally, I want to point out — and this is supported by the Albert and Ball report on European economic recovery — that the problems of employment and economic recovery in Europe depend very heavily on investment in the energy sector.

Mr Rinsche (PPE). — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen! The Rogalla report deals with the Commission proposal to subsidize the solid fuel industry with the aim of helping it to help itself. The solid fuel industry in the Community is faced with the major problems arising from a period of change, growth, the need for cost effectiveness and competitiveness, and cannot solve these problems on its own.

Community aid to self-help in this industry is justified if, in order to ensure supplies, the Community wishes to maintain the coal-mining industry. In our opinion, Community aid is necessary, justified and also promises to be effective, but we must accept that there are limits to our financial possibilities; money must not be poured into a bottomless pit. The rules of sound financial management apply equally to the production of solid fuels and cannot be set aside even by the best of intentions.

The concentration of production on the most profitable mines and ongoing rationalization in the coal-mining industry often require unpopular decisions. Our first priority must therefore be to help workers affected by closures.

As regards promoting the consumption of solid fuels, I would like to point out that there is still a close correlation between economic growth and an increased market for solid fuels. The Federal Republic of Germany is experiencing economic growth, from which our coal-mining industry is benefiting. For example, the sale of coking coal increased in the last

Rinsche

third of 1983 by 25 % compared with the previous year. The sale of coal to power stations rose from 36.4 m t in 1982 to 39.6 m t in 1983. An effective economic policy remains essential for our industry, including coal-mining.

We support the Commission proposal and the Rogalla report. In the voting on amendments, however, some problems have arisen, as not all the demands can be reconciled with each other. We must not endanger what is feasible for the sake of what might be desirable. We must try to make the necessary possible, but must also have the courage to abandon illusions, which are always dispelled by reality. We need a rational, realistic energy policy, free from illusions and ideologies, for the benefit of all Community citizens.

Mr Moreland (ED). — Madam President, perhaps I could start on a personal note. Some of the clauses in the resolution that we are dealing with came from amendments by Mr Sassano. I know that my group and, I am sure, other members of the Committee on Energy would wish you to say to his family that we feel that his death is a loss, not only to Parliament but in particular to the Committee on Energy.

Madam President, I think when one is dealing with the subject of coal one has to be realistic. The main fact that faces us is that coal is available from outside the Community — from Australia, South Africa and the United States — at prices well below the cost of production within the Community. That is likely to continue for a long time into the future. Secondly, we have a large number of pits in all the four Member States that are producers which are uneconomic. Thirdly, we have a very high level of stocks at the present, and if people complain about the butter mountain, they should equally complain about the coal mountain in the Community. Finally, of course, we have the growing difficulty and growing pressures relating from the complaints about the effects on the environment, particularly acid rain.

On the other hand I think it is important to remember that although coal from outside the Community is cheap, there are uncertainties. We have witnessed in the past occasions when difficulties in Australia — strikes, lack of transport infrastructure — have actually restricted the flow of coal into the Community. In general, it is important for us to maintain a coal industry in the Community, certainly in the interests of security of supply.

I support the Commission's proposals that are before us. I believe that they are very welcome indeed. In particular, I support provisions for increased investment in the industry, particularly in pits like, for example, those in the Midlands of the United Kingdom, where coal can be produced economically. I also agree that we have to face up to closures. I would support increased aid to cover the social costs. This is something important.

On closures I have to say that I am not happy about the first part of the amendment from the committee to Article 3, which seeks to delete a reference to closures. Also, I believe it is important to give aid to stocks, although again I am not happy about the committee's reference in paragraph 17 to stocks. I think that it is more important to deal with the temporary fluctuations that occur. The phrase in the committee's report is, I think, misleading. I would prefer to lean towards the Commission's views on this.

One issue that I do think the Commission is going to have to face is the revision of the ECSC budget. We are now actually raiding, so to speak, the general budget of the EEC for the ECSC budget. This is, of course, largely because the levies from the coal and steel industry are not bringing in the money. But I think that we have to fund that budget properly in the future so that we can give increased aid to coal research and to finance the social costs in the future so that we can give increased aid to coal research and to finance the social costs in the future from that budget.

I would also remind the House that in 1975 the Council expressed and in the Venice Declaration of a few years ago reiterated its commitment to coal. That seems to be waning and I am sorry that the Copenhagen special meeting of the Energy Council of 18 months ago on coal does not seem to have borne any fruit for the future. Equally, the industry, I think, has to bear some responsibility. I regret some of the industrial disputes that we have at present which I do not think enhance the industry's name. If we are to have a viable coal industry it is not just the responsibility of this Parliament, the Commission or the Council, it is also the responsibility of management and unions.

In general we support the Commission's proposals and we wish them success, because it is a long time since we started this Community which, I would remind this House, was originally a coal and steel community. It is about time coal was given the priority it deserves.

Mr Veronesi (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we are once again considering a subject that has already been discussed with so much passion on many occasions in this Parliament. This means that the problem is a real one, that is knocking continuously at the door of our Assembly. We Italian Communists also recognize its importance in the European energy context. We have never, therefore, avoided confrontation with the other political parties, where this subject is concerned.

However, it does seem to us that the Commission has not made much progress with proposals. True, it is not easy to find a solution that will be satisfactory for

Veronesi

every country in the Community — the conditions vary too much from one country to another. It is obvious, however, that we cannot employ in this sector financial solutions such as have been applied to other sectors of production, and which have today shown not only their limitations but also their harmful effects.

Having said that, we wish to acknowledge that we have seen for the first time a basic principle that is valid for the entire sectoral policy. I refer to the explicit statement that every measure must, immediately or in a very short time, satisfy the requirements of productivity and competitiveness — in other words, they must be economically valid. We do not exclude measures for dealing with a critical transitional stage, particularly social measures. It seems to us, however, that from this standpoint very little is proposed, and what is proposed we are unable to support. Further research is desirable into the various concrete cases related to productivity problems, and to the needs of both producer and consumer countries. That might make it easier to reach common agreement.

In conclusion, therefore, the Italian members of the Communist Group will not support the body of proposals as presented.

Mr De Gucht (L). — *(NL)* Madam President, if production is to continue for any length of time, it must above all else be economically worthwhile. We do not think that enough emphasis has been placed on this in the Rogalla report. Quite the contrary, in fact. In his explanatory statement — fortunately the same tone is not adopted in the resolution — the rapporteur says that it is better to keep loss-making mines alive artificially than to abandon them and that there must be improvements and adequate investment to make them profitable.

We have very serious doubts about this. The so-called profitability of an industry that is kept alive to sugar the social pill has been giving us considerable headaches since Cockerill Sambre, and despite the price we have paid, the pill has still not been sugared.

According to the Commission's proposal coal mines that are producing at a loss will not be entitled to support for modernization. The importance of this for Belgium and, more specifically, the Limburg mines is obvious. In Limburg coal mining is unprofitable for structural reasons, and its mines are therefore not entitled to the 25% non-reimbursable investment subsidies. Consequently, the financial burden will eventually have to be borne by Belgium or, to be more precise, Flanders. When the 30 000 m is exhausted, in mid-1985 at the latest, Flanders will have to accept joint financial responsibility, just as Wallonia is now having to do in the case of steel. This also raises the very important question of whether

Flanders will make the same mistake as Wallonia made and continue to pump money into lost causes.

The positions the various political families have adopted on this are not very encouraging and bode far from well. It is obviously rather more difficult to keep one's own house in order. The CVP, SP and VU Members who represent Limburg are threatening to make the coal industry into a life-or-death issue, and according to some, national solidarity must be involved. Quite incredible! Their short-term objective is to increase their popularity and win votes, but they are ignoring the long-term viability of the Limburg region. We take a different view, and we have the courage to speak the truth on this issue. Coal mining in Limburg is a lost cause, and we must dismantle the industry. Coal mining is one of the basic components of the industrial and social infrastructure in Limburg. KS still employs 20 000 people, and many others are indirectly affected. In other words, we cannot simply close the industry down: there must be a long-term plan, with provision for suitable redevelopment. The money we would have lost by pumping it into KS must be used with an eye to the future to pull Limburg out of the industrial mess it has got into, despite the thousands of millions of francs that have gone to the coal industry in aid.

Madam President, the ECSC Treaty and now the EEC budget itself make provision for temporary incomes support and support for retraining measures. Interest-rate subsidies can be obtained for loans to create replacement jobs. This, I believe, is the solution for Limburg: making the best possible use of Community instruments to convert the coal industry in a sensible way rather than keeping it alive at all costs.

Mr Gauthier (DEP). — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Rogalla's report has served the useful purpose of focusing attention on the serious economic crisis besetting the coal industry in the Community.

Some countries — and I am thinking of France in particular — have cut back output substantially, having promised to increase it, and many jobs are also being lost. This is going to have further damaging effects on the coal budget in the Community and it will worsen the crisis in the industry. We are told that there are alternatives. In fact, Mr Rogalla's report mentions a number of alternatives to oil, since oil has hitherto been the only or rather the most extensively used source of energy in the Community.

Alternatives are available, and they include gas and nuclear energy, but above all coal. Europe's deposits of coal offer incomparable security; hence the need to maintain the working of the most profitable deposits — which requires aid, admittedly. The first requirement, though, is the development of a European market of industrial users.

Gauthier

It is of course useless to carry on granting aid to producers without being sure that there will be outlets for the product. Witness the large stocks both in the Federal Republic of Germany and in the United Kingdom.

According to this logic, aid towards the reduction of pithead stocks is out of the question, since it could very well be that no new consumption was involved, only a transfer of stocks from mines to power stations. Similarly, it will be possible to develop the demand side of the market only if prices are competitive. The first implication of this is that it is necessary to think in terms of promoting coal in general, Community coal being a strategic source of supply.

The second implication is that if a future is to be secured for Europe's mining undertakings, thus safeguarding the means of maintaining a certain level of production of Community coal, these undertakings must enter the international market, for which all the experts are forecasting major expansion. If we are to have reliable external supplies, which remain essential to the economic health of industry in the Community, there must be involvement at all levels of the international market: exploration, evaluation of new deposits, extraction, preparation for the market, transport and consumption.

Community undertakings can establish their presence in these various fields by sending experts on assignments, selling technology and services, and acquiring shareholdings. Expansion of Community mining undertakings' international operations is the best way to help them to maintain and perhaps develop their activities, which will in turn solve the social problems that have arisen.

Before talking about finding new industries for mining areas, let us begin by organizing the development of their traditional activities.

Mrs Phlix (PPE). — *(NL)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Commissioner, unlike previous statements, mine will concern the European coal policy and not national aspects.

(Applause)

I am sorry to be attacked here by my fellow Flemings and Limburgers, but I see no need to react to these attacks in this forum. This is neither the place nor the time. You will appreciate that, when the proposal for a regulation now before us appeared, it caused quite some unrest and dismay in the regions concerned, among both the policy-makers and the general public. The Commission's energy policy is, of course, constantly evolving to comply with needs, prices, indigenous production, import opportunities and import

conditions and also with a view to reducing the Community's dependence on imported energy supplies.

All the reports on this subject, however, say that coal will have a very important role to play in the future. Continued technological research will undeniably encourage consumption. The Commission is, of course, adjusting its policy. But we must not overlook the effect the proposed regulation we are now considering would have on the economic and social situation in the regions concerned, where coal mines are usually the largest, if not the only, source of industrialization. This matter must therefore be treated with great care, and criteria governing financial aid can be accepted only if they are very clearly motivated.

I am sorry that the oral questions I have put have not been attached to this report, although I should add that some of them have been answered by Commissioner Davignon.

Mr Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, I will not venture to quote any figures, since they vary depending on the source and the purpose. Criteria should, however, take account of all or as many as possible of the factors which affect profitability, and a vague provision, on which there appears to be room for further discussion and negotiation, concerning underground production per man/hour is indeed unacceptable to us. I would refer the House in this connection to the statement on the subject made by the Economic and Social Committee in its opinion of 15 December 1983, which reads: 'The committee considers the criterion of 380 kg per man/hour for mines with an existing underground capacity to be too high and too simplistic. The committee believes that this criterion must be appropriately supplemented by a number of others, for example output in open-cast mining, reserves at pits still in operation, the type and quality of the coal extracted and the degree to which installations are technically obsolete' — and I myself would add: efforts made to achieve constant modernization — and the committee proposes that the output criterion should be reduced in the first instance to 320 kg per man/hour. Now, 320 kg is the fourth suggestion. The original proposal was 380 kg. The rapporteur proposes 300 kg or 350 kg as a compromise. My remarks are all the more appropriate as recent information appears to indicate that the criterion set out in the proposed regulation will not apply in the future.

To conclude, I will simply say that I have not tabled any amendments, because I hope that the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology will be able to reconsider this matter on the basis of the latest information available.

Mr M. Martin (COM). — (FR) Madam President, the French Communists and Allies view the Commission's proposal for a regulation on solid fuels with deep apprehension. The effect on employment in the industry of its encouragement of pit closures would be like that of a firedamp explosion.

Moreover, the claims of this proposal for a regulation to be *communautaire* in character are more than a little doubtful, since France would be particularly severely treated. On the basis of the criteria adopted, France would receive only 4 % of the subsidies envisaged, whereas the United Kingdom would get 50 % and the Federal Republic of Germany 30 %.

This imbalance is in fact a reflection of the intention to use the common energy policy as a means not of pursuing Community aims but of reducing the net contributions of the United Kingdom and, to a lesser extent, the Federal Republic of Germany.

We challenge the notion of profitability used by the Commission to justify its proposals. First of all, it takes no account of the quality of coal produced, whereas a pit with a high output of low-grade coal is certainly not more profitable than one with a lower output of higher quality. Secondly, it overlooks the point that some pits are better able than others to turn their output to account, for instance by using unmarketable by-products in power stations.

I would add that a high level of productivity is not the only measure of the profitability of a business. A business is also profitable as long as it helps to maintain our countries' independent energy supplies and contributes to our trade balances. It is also profitable as long as it has a locomotive effect on a regional economy, giving work to a whole variety of small businesses providing services essential to its operations. On this subject, I could once again talk at length about the Cévennes coalfield, in my region, but my time is restricted. I therefore confine myself to just one important question: has anyone worked out what it means when a pit or a coalfield is abandoned? Well in France, if I may talk figures also, although without forgetting the miners and all the men and women whose livelihoods depend on mining, it means 1 200 francs per tonne imported, not to mention an outflow of 3.5 billion francs in foreign currency, at the present exchange rate against the dollar. 1 200 francs worth of unemployment for a price difference of 100 francs between French coal and imported coal — what a saving!

The Commission refers to the need to be competitive, but its concept of competitiveness is based exclusively on the current state of the world market in coal, which we can rest assured will not remain such a buyer's market indefinitely. It is an unstable market, exposed to fluctuations in a monetary situation skillfully made the more unpredictable, as we know, by the dominance of the dollar.

Allow me to cast doubt on the benefits that we shall derive from our productivity if we are left with only a handful of pits, albeit highly productive ones, but quite incapable of meeting the challenge of the expansion that our economies need, if an increasing proportion of our coal needs is met by imports from outside the Community, if our lack of self-sufficiency is heightened in this way and if unemployment is allowed to reach levels even more intolerable than today's. We believe — and I am coming to my conclusion — that other, far more positive measures should be taken before any thought is given to closing down pits and laying off men. It is possible to maximize the profitability of existing production capacity by using the unmarketable by-products of coal, as is already done at some pits. The potential of gasification and liquefaction offers interesting prospects in this connection.

Another measure would be the application, if only on a modest scale, of Article 72 of the ECSC Treaty, which contains provision for raising customs duties on imported coal.

I would add that this measure should be applied first and foremost to one of our biggest suppliers, a country notorious for its particularly odious régime: I refer to South Africa and its system of apartheid.

In conclusion, while we are aware that it is essential in today's world to modernize and adapt industry to technological change, we do not believe that this challenge can be met by wasting tens of thousands of lives, by unemployment, and by destroying what we have.

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) I would like to begin by thanking the rapporteur for his report and for his speech. The report has, I hope, brought progress in the discussion of this difficult subject.

I am also grateful to the other speakers for their suggestions to the Commission. We regret that the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology was not able to discuss this matter extensively because of its burden of work. Perhaps then some of the points would have been different. We are aware — this is nothing new in energy policy — that the question of a policy for solid fuels — we used to say coal policy — is still controversial. This is firstly because the subject is regarded very differently in different parts of Community depending on whether a country produces solid fuel or not, and secondly because, apart from energy policy and energy supplies, employment and regional policies are involved and, more recently, budgetary considerations.

Narjes

The Commission has been trying to make some headway in this field as part of energy policy since the beginning of 1982. A number of communications and proposals to the Council have, unfortunately, not yet achieved the results anticipated and the Commission shares the disappointment expressed in Mr Rogalla's report and motion for a resolution. It is not possible in the time available to go into details on the whole of the Commission's coal policy, but I would like to make a few comments in the light of this wide-ranging resolution.

As far as the development of markets is concerned — paragraphs 1, 4 and 5 — I should like to say that we are pleased that Parliament generally accepts the Commission's ideas. However, we would counsel against attaching more and more importance to coal for energy supplies on what is in a way an unlimited time-scale, without bearing the economic aspects in mind. We must accept that there have been considerable changes in the thinking on future trends in world energy supplies compared to a few years ago. The recent congress in New Delhi has again made this clear. Quite recent forecasts have been corrected. This inevitably leads to a shift in emphasis between the various sources of energy, which will have to be readjusted. Nevertheless, solid fuels, i.e. coal, together with nuclear energy, represent the main alternative to imported oil and we are already certain that the Community will achieve its goal of producing 70 % to 75 % of its electricity from coal and nuclear energy by 1990.

But this does not mean a policy of unconditional priority for Community coal. Cost-effectiveness must also be considered.

Research and development were also mentioned. We agree with the remarks in paragraph 8 of the motion for a resolution on the importance of technical progress in the field of solid fuels and would like to point out that, firstly, the Commission has supported coal research, in particular mining technology, for years in the ECSC budget, and secondly, since 1979, technological experiments in solid fuel gasification and liquefaction; thirdly, a similar programme was arranged in 1983 for combustion technology and fourthly a multiannual research and development programme of coal utilization is to be launched. In figures: in 1983 19.5 million ECU were spent on ECSC research into coal, 27.7 million ECU on demonstration projects and 19.6 million ECU on experimental programmes and combustion technology.

Although aid to research and development represents a good investment — as I am sure this House agrees — the Commission has grave reservations regarding any suggestion that sales of Community coal should be subsidized, particularly where long-term subsidies are concerned. It is one of our basic tenets that this cannot be done. It is not in the interests of the Community, nor is it necessary to give financial aid to electricity companies, for example, to pay for a change-over from oil to coal. The price of coal compared to

oil is attractive enough to make this worthwhile, as the Danish example shows.

As far as Community preference arrangements in the form of customs duties are concerned, I would first of all like to point out that duty on coal has long been consolidated as a zero rate of duty. Any preference arrangement based on duties leads to an increase in costs and any increase in costs is an obstacle to our declared aim of creating and protecting jobs in the Community. We therefore believe that duties on energy are a very unsatisfactory method of achieving Community preference arrangements; moreover, this matter is still largely the responsibility of the Member States.

Various remarks have also been made on safeguarding supplies. Imports of coal are justifiably subject to critical scrutiny. However, imports amount to only 21 %, and in contrast to oil, imports of coal are much more diversified and come mainly from countries which pose fewer political risks than our sources of oil imports.

It is interesting to compare the situation in the steel industry where 87 % of the iron ore comes from third countries and for reasons of economy European iron mines were closed down long ago. Our main aim should be to increase consumption of coal and other solid fuels. We can only achieve this if coal is marketed as cheaply as possible and is competitively priced compared to other sources of energy. There are enough hindrances to the increased use of coal; let us not add to them. We should concentrate on increasing the competitiveness of our own coal and not hindering imports, which we will continue to need in the long term.

As the largest trading group in the world, we cannot afford a protectionist coal policy. Moreover, in 1979 nine of the ten Member States in the IEA undertook to promote free international trade in coal. Competition for Community coal is in any case necessary to control any tendency towards subsidies.

The aim of the proposed Commission regulation which forms the subject of Mr Rogalla's report is to increase the competitiveness of Community coal. We appreciate the complexity of the various aspects of this proposal. On the one hand, investment subsidies are being proposed for promising investments, i.e. investments to reduce costs. In addition, we believe that a reduction in stockpiles will improve market conditions and help to adjust production to the smaller demand. There has not as yet been any very positive response to our proposal from the Member States. But we must be realistic and accept that unprofitable plant will have to be shut down. Mr Van Rompuy's opinion on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs hits the nail on the head. The Commission and the EEC are aware from years of experience that this is a painful process which affects many people. But we know that to delay matters increases rather than decreases the difficulties.

Narjes

We have proposed to the Council that 180 m ECU should be set aside and transferred to the ECSC budget over the next three years for restructuring and retraining of the workers affected. We trust that a decision will be taken quickly.

Perhaps it will be clear from my remarks that the Commission is more critical, or less than enthusiastic, as regards some of the points in the motion for a resolution than the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, but that in general we fully accept the basic points made in the report and the motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

Mr Rogalla (S), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, I wish to move — as I indicated previously — in accordance with the Rules of Procedure and with the agreement of the groups, that this report should be referred back to the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, pursuant to Rule 85 (1) and (3), with the proviso that a time limit is set in accordance with Rule 85 (4) and that this report should be resubmitted to the House for a vote at the first March part-session, i.e. on 12 or 13 March. The committee would thus be instructed to conclude its work. I assume that the effect of Rule 85 (3) will be to suspend voting on the amendments and the motion for a resolution so that the committee can simply reconsider the amendments tabled rather than begin discussion of the entire matter all over again.

Mr Purvis (ED). — I am just asking the reason for the request. Mr Rogalla quoted Rule 85, but I think his objection really concerns the number of amendments in the light of Mr Nord's report: there are more than 20 amendments to Mr Rogalla's report. We found yesterday that the report on the situation of women in Europe, which came more or less at the same time as this, was not included under these considerations although the Nord report was taken last February or shortly after. Why, therefore, does the Rogalla report come under the new dispensation? Frankly, I am not averse to the proposal if that is the rule, but I can see no reason why we should encumber our agendas in February or March, when our work is going to be terribly hectic. Why not just vote on it now that we have had the debate? Our committees too are going to be impossibly encumbered if we have to go through this report again. I would ask Mr Rogalla if he would not just consider letting this go through and getting it out of the way.

Mrs Walz (PPE), chairman of the Committee on Energy Research and Technology. — *(DE)* I would like to support Mr Rogalla's proposal. We have seen that there are a lot of things wrong with the draft report which was only adopted by 8 votes to 6; the rapporteur had to retract somewhat from his own report; the Commission has also expressed reservations on various points. We think the whole matter

needs to be gone over so that we can reach greater agreement that we have at the moment. I therefore support Mr Rogalla's proposal.

President. — Mr Rogalla has asked that the proposal be sent back to committee and dealt with at the March part-session. We cannot now take any decision concerning the agenda for March, but I shall forward the request to the Bureau. We note Mr Rogalla's request that the matter be dealt with in March.

Mr Rogalla (S), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, I do not wish to contradict you, but if I am reading paragraph 4 correctly, it states that: 'Parliament may set a time limit'. This time limit could be set such that it would be possible to deal with the matter at the first March part-session. If this is not feasible, then the Bureau could decide to fit it into the second March part-session. In any case, I do not see why this should affect our time limit.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, in view of the fact that both the rapporteur and the chairman of the committee feel it is desirable, and apparently the chairman thinks she can deal with it in committee in the next two or three weeks, then I would be prepared to support Mr Rogalla's motion on condition that the time-limit he proposes is adhered to, as required in Rule 85(4), and that the time-limit he sets is the first part-session in March. This would mean that it is taken either at the February part-session or the first part-session of March and that there would be no question of the Bureau having any discretion to decide otherwise.

(Parliament decided in favour of referral to committee)

5. Energy research

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-1172/83) by Mr Seligman, on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology on

the communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council on energy and energy research: a five-year programme of action and its financing.

Mr Seligman (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, this is a very important morning for energy, because we have three important debates, and unfortunately the energy Commissioner, Mr Davignon, is not here. I hope there is nothing wrong with him, and we wish him a quick recovery if there is, but we would much rather have him here.

Future generations will look back on us as the generation which squandered the world's total wealth in precious oil in the short space of 70 years — a very small spot in the passage of time. I do not know whether Members realize that in 34 years' time we shall be entering a world which is short of oil. In 20

Seligman

years' time, North Sea oil, which is one of our main assets, will be running out. In 7 years time, by the end of this decade, we shall be running into a third oil crisis unless we do something about it. The world cannot risk a third oil crisis, but that is what we are going to get if we continue to be deceived by our temporary glut of oil.

The Commission's energy and research action programme plans to step up energy investment in the next 5 years to a level of 2 billion ECU a year. It is a catching-up programme to make the Community independent of imported oil. The Commission is convinced that if the Member States go on as they are, we are not going to achieve the target of 40 % dependence on imported oil. Why? Because it is the easier part of conservation that we have achieved so far, the tougher part remains to be achieved. If we go on as we are, we shall not do so.

The Heads of State fully realize this, and in the European Council at Stuttgart they demanded action. But at the next level down, at the Energy Council and at the Budget Council, absolutely nothing has happened. In 3 years, there has been nothing but stagnation and indecision. This complacency is dangerous and it is irresponsible. Europe is spending only 1.6% of its GDP on energy investment, as against 3% in Japan and 4% in the USA.

No wonder we are falling behind. Do we really want to wait until we run into the third oil crisis before we do anything about it? That is why I have included a draft resolution for the Council in my report in paragraph 19. I think it is a procedure that we should use in all future own-initiative resolutions. It will avoid the Commissioner having to give too much thought to the subject.

I have no doubt that Parliament will strongly support the Commission's five-year energy and research action programme. But it is no good launching such a programme unless we say where the money is going to come from. In its Amendment No 14 to paragraph 15 my group wants a five-year action programme, involving major investments in all Member States, to be financed out of the Community's own resources. If, however, these resources prove to be inadequate or not available, we should know in more detail what the alternative methods of financing are, be it loans or taxes. At present we are steering in the dark. We do not know the facts, we do not know the possible effects. We have never debated it, and I am glad this Parliament now has an opportunity to debate these matters. It is time Parliament took a lead in this matter, demanding an authoritative examination of the whole question of financing energy investment.

To sum up, Mr President, I am confident that Parliament will support the Commission's five-year energy action programme which aims to prevent a third world crisis and prepares for a world without oil in the next century. We must also, as I say, provide the

finance. We owe it to our children, and to generations to come, to take responsible action now to ensure that in the next century the world does not run into an energy famine and literally die of cold.

Mr Bernard (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, Mr Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Seligman's very well-researched report examines a communication from the Commission to the Council which is undoubtedly among the Commission's most important initiatives of recent years in the energy field. This communication enumerates the current and future lines of action which would be more effective if they were transposed onto the Community plane. It clearly represents an effort on the part of the Commission to work towards one of the objectives of Community policy by taking the solemn declarations made at summit meetings in recent years to mean what they say and urging the Council to take the necessary comprehensive steps, taking advantage of the present calm conditions on the energy market, to allocate the funds made available to investments aimed specifically at forearming us against a further oil shock, which would have disastrous consequences for employment in our countries.

Our first reason for our generally favourable assessment of this report is that it is an exemplary initiative on the part of our Parliament, as a demonstration of its members' sense of responsibility towards the peoples whose long-term aspirations — regarding employment in particular — they represent. This sense of responsibility in the House is particularly well illustrated by two key ideas, to which we also subscribe: the idea of a forward-looking strategy and that of European solidarity.

The second motive for our general approval is therefore this clearly expressed concern for a forward-looking strategy which has the potential for bringing about a beneficial revolution in the energy situation and therefore opening up completely new prospects for the economic, social and even political future of our Community.

This strategy comes through in various aspects of the report. First, in the expression of the will to attain the Community objective of reducing the proportion of total primary energy consumption accounted for by petroleum products. Secondly, in its assessment of the risk of a further oil shock triggered by a rise in real prices towards 1990. Thirdly, in its assessment of the prospect for exhaustion of proven deposits towards the year 2020 and the outlook for increased oil consumption in developing countries. Fourthly, this report also stresses the unstable and in some cases explosive situation in certain oil-producing areas, the Community's increasing dependence on non-oil energy imports, and above all the chronic inadequacy of the level of energy investment in the Community which, as Mr Seligman has just reminded us, amounts to only 1.6% of gross domestic product, compared with 3% in Japan and 4% in the United States.

Bernard

On the basis of this review of the outlook, the report makes an appeal for European solidarity which deserves our attention and gives us our third reason for approving the action called for. Solidarity in relation with producers outside the Community, solidarity in consultations on the security of supply lines, in relations with the developing countries through appropriate cooperation agreements, especially on the transfer of technology, solidarity in the application of procedures aimed at achieving economies of scale and securing more favourable borrowing conditions, and finally solidarity in the development of new technology, in connection with which we also wish to draw attention to the determination of the European Council of 19 June 1983 to expand and improve the effectiveness of Community action in the area of research, innovation and technology.

We also wish to lay particular emphasis on the job creation that would be bound to be associated with bold and financially generous application of the measures recommended in the many fields covered by the general heading of rational use of energy.

European solidarity in the financing of these measures, various formulas for which have just been outlined, although it is naturally too early to make a judgement on the relative merits of these formulas or on procedures for compensating the States which had to bear the heaviest costs.

In conclusion, our group intends to play its part in this effort to establish an approach based on lucidity and solidarity, mindful that it will very largely condition our success in solving the problem of employment, present and future, in all the countries of our Community.

Mr K. Fuchs (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen! Despite the present improvement in the position as regards energy supplies we should not forget that there is still a long-term risk of energy shortages. I would like to thank Mr Seligman for his very comprehensive and balanced report on the Commission communication to the Council, and for developing a strategy to combat this risk.

I wish to endorse the proposals without going into details. I should simply like to point out that the Community's major tasks are to achieve greater convergence between the Member States, to develop strategies for dealing with emergencies and to ensure, above all for large-scale projects, the provision of joint financing. The problem of investment is of central importance. As Mr Seligman has indicated, we are lagging far behind Japan and the United States of America. Special emphasis must therefore be given to finance. Of course we must consider every possibility but above all we must tackle this problem via the Community budget and ensure that, compared to other areas, more funds are made available for energy investment.

My group has serious reservations about the suggestion that we commit ourselves to a general import levy on all sources of energy. This is a very difficult problem and I do not think we can handle it in this way. We must consider the reaction in the supplier countries, the additional burden on the economy, the boost to inflation, the bureaucracy this would involve, and above all the difficulty of finding a compromise between those Member States which are self-sufficient in energy and those who are almost totally dependent on imports. I would therefore ask you to delete Article 3 in paragraph 19, as otherwise we will not be able to vote for the report. I see from Mr Seligman's comments on his report that this should be possible. I am sure that this report will have a very positive effect on the overall development of our energy supplies.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, this is a noteworthy day, not just because we are debating energy, which in itself is quite unusual on a Wednesday, but also because for the very first time a rapporteur and a Member of the European Parliament has actually initiated legislation with a draft proposal for a Council decision. I think that Mr Seligman is to be congratulated on this initiative and that he will go down in the history books because of it.

I think I am right in saying, Mr Pisani, that our energy strategy is still very much based on the Venice Declaration and the 1990 objectives. I suppose progress is reasonably satisfactory, but there is a question mark as to whether it is not just as much due to recession as it is to any conscious decisions that we have been making. The problem now, as others have said is that the oil supply and price situation is easing and that there is a risk of complacency and relaxation. In many ways this can be well justified by concern for our competitiveness. If we burden our industry with taxes and with pricing structures which will help to encourage a better use of energy and more investment, then we may well be just hobbling its competitiveness against other groups in a very difficult world market.

So if we are to base our strategy on forecasts of future oil shocks — as Mr Seligman keeps telling us — or even exhaustion of all oil reserves by the year 2020, as mentioned in his report, then we have to be very sure that these forecasts are sustainable and that we are not just tying our hands behind our backs in the present because of imagined or doubtful problems that may arise in the future. As an example, about two or three years ago the Commission was forecasting, in the context of these dire warnings, an enormous expansion in coal demand. Well we have just been debating coal, and it is quite evident, with stocks now twice the size of butter stocks and demand consistently declining, that something went wrong with these forecasts. The logic of them would have meant even more

Purvis

money spent on coal, more protection, more ports, more railways, more everything else. And what would we be doing with them? They would all be in mothballs at the moment and unused. So I ask the Commission to constantly update its forecasts. In fact, I would appreciate if maybe today the Commissioner could update his forecasts and keep them consistently updated in the future.

Presuming, therefore, that these forecasts do indicate that pursuit of the 1990 objectives is still the right way to proceed then we have to decide the means. It is not necessarily the case that a common energy policy, managed and financed at EEC level, is the best means in all cases. Many aspects can be dealt with by concerted action between the Member States and even at commercial level, as is the case at the moment with crisis oil stock levels. But there are undoubtedly cases where an EEC approach is indicated. It gives better value for money, is more effective and avoids duplication. Good examples are the JET project, research into new energy technologies, alternatives and the like. There are also political aspects, which Mr Seligman does mention: the Euro-Arab dialogue, supply lines and security of North Sea oil platforms.

So, where does all the money come from? I do not like unnecessary taxes and hypothecated taxes. But if the forecasts are valid, if the strategy is valid and the means suggested are valid and if Community involvement is justified, then the money has to be found. And we should not tie ourselves or close off any options in our consideration of how these means are to be provided.

Mr Veronesi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I should like first of all to draw attention to the exemplary formal structure of the explanatory statement and resolution presented by Mr Seligman, although I am sorry that he cannot now be present. His report is an admirable example of Cartesian clarity. That does not of course mean that we agree with everything that is proposed. The resolution contains some proposals that we could not approve, whereas — let us be clear on this — we consider the Commission's proposal deserves our support. In this sense it seems to us that the resolution goes beyond the proposals of the Commission. Shortage of time prevents my analysing in detail those questions that the resolution raises on which we cannot agree. We shall ask for a vote to be taken separately on the different components of Article 5; we shall vote against Articles 14, 15, 16 and 17 — in the case of this last, because of the lack of adequate details of the possibilities that are referred to.

In essence, taken as a body, the financial proposals are either too drastic or too timid. Moreover, the arguments suggested by the Commission's communication do not require detailed examination. Anyway, the analysis is one that has been done many times in a general way in the past, even if the developing international scene makes constant updating necessary.

Essentially, we are, as always, in favour of the prospective multiannual programme proposed by the Commission. And anyway, it is hard to see what other strategy could be adopted, apart from this. We should like however to take this opportunity to emphasize once again our reservations regarding the breadth of the measures and the amount of finance devoted to them. The sectors in which the Community proposes operating undoubtedly have justifiable priority, and they are decisions that take account of the realities of the Community. But are the resources provided sufficient? Will the Council and the Commission set to work with due promptness? These are the inevitable questions that always hang over any form of Community initiative.

I should like to mention that the example of Esprit is not very encouraging. We started discussions in the spring of 1982, and we have now reached the spring of 1984, and still nothing has been decided, in a sector where the pace of development and the speed of technological advance are said to be overwhelming.

To come back to our problem, I must say that we cannot conceal our pessimism in this regard. In conclusion, I should like to state once more that, whilst we will support the Commission's initiative, we shall vote against, or at least we shall not vote in favour of, the Seligman resolution. The way we vote will depend on the conclusions reached from our debate.

Mr Pintat (L). — *(FR)* We wish to congratulate Mr Seligman on his courageous efforts to find ways of maintaining settled energy prices and avoiding untimely fluctuations. However, it should be added that this aim, while essential to satisfactory economic development, needs to be pursued in harness with a second: access to energy in abundant supply, immediately available at the lowest possible cost.

Consequently, while the idea of an energy levy is not to be rejected out of hand, this proposal should be examined in all its aspects, in the light of all its implications, before taking a decision whose effects would militate against the objectives envisaged.

It would be particularly inappropriate to impose a levy which raised the cost of OPEC oil. That would be a direct incitement to increase oil prices. Let us not deceive ourselves. Europe depends on external suppliers to meet its energy needs, for oil in particular. Since it is out of the question to apply a levy to these suppliers, it is ultimately the consumer who will have to pay, and high energy costs will not be conducive to an improvement in Europe's industrial competitiveness. The application of an import levy on fuels from third countries would discourage our industrialists from establishing themselves on the world market, in exploration and exploitation of energy products,

Pintat

whether hydrocarbons, uranium or coal. If it is to secure its energy supplies, Europe's first duty is to establish itself in production and sales internationally, so as to ensure that supplies reach the Community at the most economic cost.

When European companies acquire shareholdings abroad, there are concomitant sales of services and know-how. This is therefore a doubly attractive strategy, so that a levy which would diminish or, even worse, cancel out the advantages of such transactions is not an acceptable proposition.

Among the other consequences of a levy on energy imports, the effect on the very substantial long-term supply contracts which have been concluded for gas should not be overlooked. To add a levy on imported gas would in a sense be tantamount to varying the terms of contracts in force, and this to Europe's disadvantage.

I conclude by reminding the House that, if we are to be able to cope with the oil crisis and the prospect of a third oil shock, we must develop all other sources of power, especially nuclear energy and coal.

For these alternatives to oil, we have to obtain fuel from third countries. Let us therefore be realistic and refrain from resorting to covert protectionism which could only exacerbate our problems in the long run.

The idea of an energy levy goes back to Commissioner Guido Brunner, when it was proposed that it should be applied to Community oil as well as that imported from third countries, the aim being to encourage substitution.

North Sea oil has a limited lifespan and, instead of giving it a transitory artificial advantage, we should be making the effort now to find the finance needed to provide against the day when it runs out.

We are therefore unable to support the proposal for a Council Resolution contained in paragraph 19 of the report but, that apart, we shall be voting in favour of Mr Seligman's excellent report.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission — (FR) Mr President, the report presented by Mr Seligman on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology is most timely. It provides an opportunity for taking a closer look at various aspects of the problems raised in the Commission's communication and therefore for improving the solutions proposed.

The first point that I should like to make is that the attention paid during the debate that we have heard on the actual text of the report to the problem of financing seems somewhat excessive — not because it does not arise, but because it does not arise just yet.

I feel that we should get used to the idea, which is borne out consistently by experience, that it is ultimately better to address the problem of financing when one knows exactly what one wants to do, with

whom one wishes to do it, why one wants to do it and how one proposes to go about it. Let us begin by convincing the Member States that there can be no valid energy strategy at national level, let us show them that it is possible to formulate a European energy strategy which will be effective and let us analyse its component parts. When these stages have been completed, and the necessary consensus has been established on a sufficiently sound basis, then it will be time to turn to the problem of financing. It is so much easier to finance a policy when one knows exactly what it contains than to attempt to do so on the basis of no more than a general outline of what is intended.

To take up this very specific point, the Commission wishes to state that for its part, having studied the various aspects of the problems, it would be in favour, when the time came, of a levy on consumption, taking the view that this option would not make for economic distortion or discrimination between the various sources and that it would be an appropriate means of supporting the policy that we need.

This question raises the problem of the general, global nature of the budgetary system, of the unity of the budget and therefore the non-standard practice of levying parafiscal charges earmarked for specific purposes. This, I think, is a political problem with which the European Economic Community will have to come to grips eventually.

If a ceiling has to be applied to the system of own resources, as it seems it must, on the ground that agricultural expenditure must be prevented from getting out of hand, and if at the same time new policies are decided upon by the European Economic Community, by the Member States, by the Parliament and by the Commission, a clash between these two approaches — one maintaining restrictions out of prudence, the other more open out of a concern to provide for future needs — will have to be avoided by devising a financing system which would not be separate from the budget but part of it and would have to be subject to special conditions which would give the Member States, trade interests and consumers the necessary assurances that the revenues which were raised from energy itself — which I am assuming for the sake of argument — would be put back into energy so that Europe's position could be improved in future.

My second point is that a proposal from the Commission for a Council Resolution is unfortunately not the right procedure in my view, since I believe that Parliament would be embarking on a course which could not be held in the long term, a quite indirect approach to defining or proposing texts which are ultimately the province of the Council and the Commission. I see in this an attempt at a subtle shift towards a new distribution of areas of competence, which would be a risky venture from the institutional point of view and, in my opinion, inappropriate on this occasion

Pisani

Having said all that, I should now like to outline for you — without keeping you beyond time — the criteria according to which the Commission aimed to organize the proposals that it has made and which should, in its submission, form the basis of a genuine European energy strategy of the future.

Before going on to analyse two or three points, I should make clear that the Commission is not thinking in terms of a common energy policy along the lines of the common agricultural policy, and I imagine that Parliament is of the same view. I do not think that anyone is promoting the idea of transferring responsibility for administration of the energy sector to the Community institutions, but it is as well to make the position clear. What is being proposed is very much more a matter of Community-wide organization of a system for consultation, consistency of action, joint efforts and exchange, with the various Member States and economic operators retaining the main share of responsibility. It is one thing for everyone to go his own way, another for all parties involved in the energy sector in Europe to work together.

As for the principles underlying the programme, I propose merely to run through them briefly, since this should be sufficient for the purposes of the debate. The first is optimization of the use of resources. Of course, energy conservation is one of the most obvious means of achieving the energy balance towards which we have been working and are still working. Our efforts must therefore begin with optimum use of resources. We must not allow ourselves to be lulled into slackening these efforts by the current relatively calm conditions on the energy market. There is still considerable scope for further savings.

Secondly, a programme, once drawn up, must have a measure of credibility in terms of the financial resources allocated to it and a framework giving continuity over a number of years. If one simply launched a scheme for a programme without any assurance that it would be financed for a given period, without specifying the rules and resources to be applied, it would carry no conviction. And this is essentially what the proposed programme is intended to do: to persuade economic operators to take part in a venture whose purpose is to improve the energy situation in Europe. One does not embark on such a venture without an assurance of support whose scope and duration are both clearly defined.

The third condition is therefore continuity. A one-year programme would have been out of the question. A five-year programme as such would have been barely appropriate, and in fact the Commission would no doubt have presented a programme for a longer period if the future beyond five years hence had appeared completely indefinable. However, this choice of time-scale is meant to be taken as an indication of the need for a permanent commitment in the future.

The Commission's proposal is also designed to establish a new balance in the sharing of expenditure in this field between industry, the Member States and the Community. It is not so much a matter of stepping up the overall effort as of allocating responsibility for effort to the level at which it will be most effective. We are convinced — and this is the bases of the document presented — that a given form of expenditure incurred at a given level is less cost-effective than the same expenditure incurred at another level, and it is this concern to optimize the use of resources that lies at the heart of the Commission's proposal.

Finally, in connection with the document presented by Mr Seligman on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, I should like to take up the very useful points made with regard to improvement of external relations and a substantial improvement in relations with economic groups responsible for energy matters. I believe that these two aspects, although they are not confined to energy policy alone, will play a decisive role in the conduct of the policy for which the Commission hopes that the document presented will serve as a basis.

Mr President, in concluding this statement, which is necessarily imperfect since I am outside my sphere of competence, although convinced of the cause, having been a member of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, I should like to say what a useful contribution Mr Seligman has made in his report.

Mr Seligman (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, firstly I welcome the contributions of Mr Fuchs, Mr Pintat, Mr Veronesi and Mr Bernard. I think they will help us to draw up a report which is acceptable to Parliament. I am very willing to accept certain amendments, particularly the one to Article 3 which Mr Fuchs mentioned. I shall recommend acceptance of that change. There are other clauses which I should be happy to consider if we could get together between now and the vote.

I also welcome Mr Pisani's very erudite and positive contribution. However, he said he thought the initiative we had taken in proposing articles for a Council resolution was not acceptable. I would like to point out to him that Commissioner Davignon and the Director of DG XVIII have both said that this was very helpful to them and that they would accept it. So I should like Mr Pisani to have a word with Commissioner Davignon before he comes to a final decision on this. I think it is an important constitutional point which will help to speed up future legislation.

Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, helpful things can sometimes do damage.

(Smiles)

Pisani

The effort that has gone into the precise drafting of a certain approach to the problem is valuable in itself. The procedure involved, with Parliament in the role of initiator in certain aspects of institutional life, appears to me to present a number of problems. Mr Seligman and I are not entirely at odds, therefore, and I am happy to say so, since I find his report very good.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

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

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

Mr Cottrell (ED). — Mr President, I wish to draw the attention of honourable Members to this document which I received this morning through the official distribution services. It will appear at first sight, especially to our German colleagues, to be an official document and communication from Parliament. It is, in fact, a communication from an organization sometimes known as the Unification Church but also known as the Moon Cult or *Le Secte Moon*. I believe it is improper that the organization should seek to present their views to Parliament as though it were an official communication.

I would seek a ruling from you that it is improper for the Unification Church so to do. I would also say that I defend the right of the Unification Church to put their views before Members of the European Parliament in an approved way. I would hope that you will make a statement to the House supporting that which I have just made.

President. — Mr Cottrell, you would have been right if what you had said was completely true, namely that the document had been distributed to all Members. But, as you kindly informed me, the document was only distributed to the members of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport and had a covering letter to the secretariat of that committee. That must be allowed for. If it had been distributed to all Members, I certainly would have conceded the point. As that was not the case. . . .

Mr Cottrell (ED). — That is not so. I am informed by my colleagues that it has been distributed to Members who are not members of that committee. The point that I made was that this is a very subtle piece of propaganda which attempts to simulate a parliamentary document — no more than that.

President. — Mr Cottrell, if you are right in saying that it has been distributed to Members who do not belong to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport — and as far as I know this is not the case — then an error has been made on the part of our distribution services.

Lady Elles (ED). — I have received a copy and I am not a member of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport. It was distributed to me and I am sure to other Members of this Parliament.

President. — It was only intended for the members of that committee; it should not have been distributed to other Members. We will find out how this has happened in certain cases.

Mr Howell (ED). — Mr President, I am surprised to hear you defending this issue, and I am surprised to hear you defending it on the basis of its only being distributed to one committee. It is being presented in such a way as to look official. That is the point, Mr President, and I think you should take note of it.

President. — Mr Howell, I would dispute the fact that it looks official in the yellow form in which it has been distributed, and I maintain that it should only have been distributed to the members of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport.

(Despite repeated protests from Members seated on the right of the Chamber, a group of cameramen, with their equipment, continued to obstruct Members' view of the Council benches, from which the President-in-Office was to deliver his address)

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — Mr President, I have counted up to seven cameramen, and I thought we had spent a great deal of money on installing our own television services. Could you ask these worthy gentlemen to repair to the galleries and do their job with telephoto-lenses and not clutter up the centre of the hemicycle? I personally cannot see the redoubtable gentleman who is now the President-in-Office.
(Applause)

President. — I would ask the television, film and photographic crews to take up their positions in such a way as not to create difficulties for the Members.

Mr Irmer (L). — *(DE)* Mr President, I do not understand how it was possible for a private organization to make use of our distribution service. As I understand it, this sect extracts so much money from people that it ought to be in a position to pay its own postage.

President. — This body approached the secretariat of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport with a written request that the members of the committee indicate what the committee has achieved.

¹ Membership of Parliament: see Minutes.

President

Having heard what Lady Elles said I unfortunately have to conclude that distribution was not confined to members of the committee but was also made to other Members. That was a mistake which should not be repeated.

6. French Presidency (Council statement)

President. — The next item is the declaration by the President-in-Office of the Council on the programme of the French Presidency.

I welcome the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Cheysson.

(Applause)

I am particularly happy to welcome Mr Cheysson in that for years he was known to us in this House in another capacity and we often debated with him.

Mr Cheysson, I know that you are well acquainted with Parliament and I feel that, for a President-in-Office of the Council, this is something very important.

I also welcome the new European Affairs Minister, Mr Dumas, who is sitting beside Mr Cheysson. I think that we shall have many problems to deal with during the months to come. Therefore, to you too, Mr Dumas, a cordial welcome from the European Parliament.

(Applause)

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like first of all to thank you for your words of welcome and to express to Parliament my pleasure at being back in this fine chamber where I so often sat as a Commissioner — on the other side to be sure. I would also like to state how honoured I am to assume, in the name of France, the Presidency of the Council of Ministers of the Community and with it to open in that capacity, in accordance with a now firmly established tradition, a dialogue on the work programme for the first six months of 1984.

France is taking over the Presidency at a critical time for Europe. My European Affairs colleague, Mr Roland Dumas, and I are fully aware of the difficulty of the task and the extent of the responsibilities with which our country is faced.

Would anybody dream of denying that Europe is in crisis? This crisis is not new. It is of long standing: many of this Parliament's members have often said so and the Commission sounded the alarm at a very early stage. But it was only brought home to public opinion after the Athens Summit. Admittedly, that event was striking enough to make an impression: for the first time, and despite the efforts of the Greek Presidency at Athens — to which I wish to pay the homage it deserves — and of all the Member States throughout the previous six months, the European Council broke up after two and a half days' discus-

sions without even being able to announce the smallest decision.

Let us not minimize the importance of this crisis. It is of long standing, as I said, and derives from the failure of measures and practices decided on in other times to adapt to present conditions. Let us squarely face the fact that it is dangerous, because if it continues the consequences might prove fatal for the Community.

However, let us not dramatize matters either: what appeared clearly in Athens was that all the Member States wanted Europe and needed the Community. There may have been insufficient political will, but the Ten reaffirmed their European commitment.

Nor should it be forgotten that there already existed at the end of the European Council broad areas of agreement. In fact — and this is important — the arguments were not about the future, about new policies; there is agreement that the European dimension should be used to face up to the present industrial revolution, to try and improve the economic and monetary order, and to define a social area.

It was on the long-standing and well-known problems that agreement could not be reached, on subjects which the Commission, the Council and Parliament have been discussing and rediscussing for months, for years even, the 'rubble of the past' as President Mitterrand said when leaving the Zappeion.

Should we then regard the present crisis as merely a slightly more serious form of the classic crises so often experienced in the past? The similarities which could easily be found to support such a notion would be misleading, because on this occasion it had been decided — in Stuttgart — to tackle all the main problems, and they are all interconnected. The Community found itself unable for the time being to find solutions in Athens to the problems raised, as if there were disillusion and doubts about the future of our institutions if not of the European idea.

Let us recognize with realism and humility that Europe has fallen far short of the most ambitious of objectives. In the minds of its founders, Europe was not only to contribute to the required reconciliation of the European people, which it has done, but it was also to confer on the countries of which it is composed the economic strength and political influence deriving from its size, its past and its potential. But we are now compelled to accept that Europe does not today occupy either at the political or economic level the place which could and should belong to it.

Worse still, in the last few years, we have lost ground. Between 1973 and 1981 our industrial production increased by 8%, that of the United States by 16%, and Japan's by 26%. Expenditure on research in the Ten is twice as high as in Japan (500 million dollars for micro-processors, for example, in the EEC, compared with 250 in Japan) and yet the European

Cheysson

micro-processor industry represents only 10% of the world market and accounts for only 40% of its own market. Between 1973 and 1983 employment fell by 3 million in the Community whereas it increased by 15 million in the United States. Later on I shall speak of the weakening of the voice of the Europeans in the face of the major political problems.

During this time, as the years went by in the Communities, we were, as you know, bogged down in sometimes subsidiary and often Byzantine internal disputes. We devoted all our energies to them; we created the technocrats' Europe and these technocrats neutralized each other. We created the tradesmen's Europe and these tradesmen quarrelled amongst themselves. Where then, during this time, were the workers, the young, the people? The common market itself did not succeed in justifying its title, as so many obstacles to the free movement of goods, people and services remained or actually grew; listen to the Commission; its arguments are persuasive. The harmonization of laws and rules constantly came up against the difficulties which administrations, jealous of their prerogatives and prisoners of their habits, continued to connive at, whilst our enterprises had a legitimate need for a common legal and economic environment.

The Community's external identity had difficulty in asserting itself in economics and trade and the Community turned to the free trade area; lacking the desired cohesion and solidarity, it was unable to defend its interests against its major trading partners in the world with the necessary vigour.

The disappointment of well informed people and the loss of interest of others can thus be understood, but it is also clear, as was agreed in Stuttgart, that the main problems of the past, indeed all the problems should be tackled so that the future could be faced with resolution. And this is the point at which we have arrived.

Let us then be ambitious. But let us be realistic also. Let us beware of seductive constructions and rigid adherence to a system. Today, like yesterday, let us remember the past successes represented both initially and to a certain extent now by the Coal and Steel Community, or the common agricultural policy. We must harness to our political will concrete objectives, based on converging or joint interests, as the President of the European Parliament rightly said in a recent interview with a Belgian newspaper and yesterday in a French newspaper.

We must nevertheless remain faithful to the Treaty, the qualities and countless resources of which have been proved by experience, and open up new paths. Settling present disputes and giving Europe its second wind must go hand in hand, as the one is required for the other and vice versa.

This is the task to which the French Presidency is going to devote itself, as did the one which preceded

it, strengthened by the advice and experience of the Commission and its ability to come up with proposals and assured, I am convinced, of the support of you, the elected representatives of the peoples of Europe.

What I should like to call 'the legacy of Athens' must be examined in the light of the general remarks I have just made.

Firstly, there was discussion of problems inherited from the past, including, of course, the common agricultural policy. This policy, let it never be forgotten, was defined in an earlier period; it has produced remarkable results and is an essential element in the future of European society. However, it must be adjusted to take account of the changes that have occurred since its adoption. Such is the case, for example, where the very success of the CAP has resulted in surpluses which internal and external markets are unable to absorb. Naturally, milk must be mentioned at this point. However, the measures adopted to bring production under control must attack the real causes of the surpluses and take account of social realities, whilst fully respecting the firmly established principles of the CAP and the provisions of the Treaty.

Also, the unity of the market, again put at risk by the continuing existence of sizeable monetary compensatory amounts, must be restored and the Community preference, which has taken a battering from the incredible growth in imports of substitute products must be protected and strengthened. Finally, the potentially pre-eminent position of the Community in international trade in agricultural products needs to be established at world level and defended. It is clear that via quantitative control of production and trade rationalization such adjustments must result in the avoidance of over-rapid increase in expenditure, so that it is brought down to a level compatible with the increase in Community resources. Nevertheless, it will still be necessary, as the Commission wisely recommends, to provide for some increase in taxes linked to the production or import of agricultural products.

The functions of the various structural funds have not been equally well defined; expenditure on some has increased very rapidly. General agreement has already been reached that we now need to define their scope and the rules for their operation so that they might more clearly serve the policies the Community has adopted; it should also be possible to improve the effectiveness of current resources. The review of the European Social Fund rightly accorded the necessary priority to youth employment. That of the Regional Fund has still to be completed; it will obviously have to take into account redevelopment needs in declining industrial regions and possible agricultural areas too. As for the Guidance Section of the EAGGF, its activities will become even more linked than in the past to CAP projects. As the structural funds are re-ex-

Cheysson

amined, the examination of the Commission's ambitious proposal on integrated Mediterranean programmes, which was begun some months ago, will be continued; these are intended to deal with the effects of enlargement on those Mediterranean countries which are at present members of the Community.

The Member States are working within the constraints of strict budget policies. No-one will therefore be surprised at the importance our governments and national parliaments attach to the control of growth in the Community budget.

For all that, there is no question of amending the provisions of the Treaties on this subject — and I am astonished that this has even been rumoured — or, therefore, of reducing in any way the powers conferred on each Community institution. However, the problem is so important and could become so sensitive in the eyes of the public that it is vitally necessary for the two arms of the budget authority to act in perfect harmony, with the Commission's help. I am compelled to note with regret that this has not always been the case in the past, and I am thinking more especially of the conditions under which the last budget was adopted.

Gaining control of the budget does not, however, mean depriving future policies of funds. I should like to point out here and now that the Community's lending operations (NCI, Euratom, EIB and ECSC) have reached a high level: 5.3 thousand million ECU in 1982. It would not be right if financing on as large a scale as this — which often entails other, even larger, financing from non-Community sources — did not systematically support the projects decided by the Community; I am convinced that the European Parliament will agree with me on this point. Nevertheless, we are aware that however great the budgetary discipline and financial know-how applied, the Community will very soon be without — and indeed, perhaps, already lacks — a sound financial basis on which to build its development. Europe needs to be able to define its responsibilities.

Yet it already has difficulty in financing its current activities. Increased own resources must therefore rapidly be made available to the Community. Potential agreement exists as to this need, and it should be possible to make it more specific once the other important questions have been settled.

In all this we must obviously not lose sight of the harassing problem of what has been called 'the correction of budgetary imbalances'. In connection with this and other subjects, it was said in Athens that the matter should be dealt with under the Treaty and in accordance with its principles. But this would in no way imply recognition of the idea of 'just returns'.

(Applause)

Nonetheless, there is a problem and it must be dealt with, at least for a certain period. An agreement on

guidelines is beginning to emerge, but the positions of the Member States are still far apart. The Presidency and the Commission will endeavour, as is their duty, to bring the positions together and find a compromise.

I have already noted that in Athens, as in the preparatory work, discussion of future activities and new policies was brief. I find cause for confidence in noting the converging views in the statements of the Ten on the need for their industries, their economic and commercial activities, their monetary equilibrium and even their social development to benefit from the scale offered by Europe.

The rapid summary I have given you of the gap between Europe and its two great industrial competitors is justification, if any were needed, for the importance which all member governments have decided to give to cooperation in industry and research. The Presidency will pay particular attention to the development of all Community projects likely to strengthen the international competitiveness of our undertakings, the promotion of research and innovation and making the most of those activities by the pooling of results, the exchange of researchers, and joint programmes. The Commission has made some important proposals which are being examined by the ordinary Councils. Progress should be made on these as soon as possible, so as to make it unnecessary for the European Council to deal with them. The Presidency would like to see a rapid solution on the Esprit programme; since the Research Council meetings in the autumn, only the financial question is outstanding. We shall also need to continue discussions on the energy research programmes and on basic technology. We should also consider new projects on tele-communications and biotechnology. Finally, discussions should continue on the stimulation of scientific and technical potential and on Community research structures and procedures.

In the industrial field, and more specifically in the advanced technology sectors, the Member States, like the Commission, acknowledge that European undertakings must be encouraged to cooperate or even to come together. Is it not a matter for concern that no large European group has been formed in these sectors since the Community was created? We must seek to create a propitious legal environment; I am thinking in particular of the statutes of cooperation of the European groupings, the directive on the system of taxation applicable to mergers and divisions of companies, etc.

Consolidation of the internal market must be viewed against the background of action with regard to the outside world; it requires affirmation of the Community's external identity. A Europe which is self-assured in its economic activity must speak with a strong voice on the international scene, defend its interests effectively, and live up to the expectations of its undertakings. Thus, the Community must, in particular,

Cheysson

reinforce its cohesion in the field of the common commercial policy. For this, it must have, as the Commission has often insisted, the suitable means for defending its policy and protecting its interests in conditions comparable to those of its principal partners. Discussions are continuing, on the basis of a Commission proposal, with a view to adopting a new common commercial policy instrument. The Presidency's aim will be to see that these discussions succeed.

The search for a genuine common market requires us, as has often been said in this chamber, to make great efforts to ensure the greatest possible degree of convergence in the economic and monetary field. Of course, we must first of all coordinate the Member States' economic policies as closely as possible to ensure, in harmonious conditions, the steady, healthy recovery which we need for the essential industrial changes to take place, while reducing unemployment. Progress must be made in the monetary field too. We shall be acting in four areas: reinforcement of the cohesion of the European countries in relation to the movements of the dollar and of interest rates, increasing the ceiling for Community loans, development of the role of the private ECU, and closer relations with the monetary authorities of the surrounding countries. The Commission proposal on financial integration must be subjected to close and constructive scrutiny, with the view that we all share of working towards increased convergence. Finally, a great many proposals have been put forward by the Commission and certain Member States which would enable the Community, in particular by creating a favourable environment for cooperation between European undertakings, to facilitate the funding of industry and innovation. In view of the importance of the recovery of productive investment, in particular in the technologies of the future, it is very much to be desired that these initiatives, should lead rapidly to practical results.

The social dimension is vital. The Community cannot rely on economic and financial measures to pull it out of the crisis. In this field, it is best to tackle the problems which are compounded by the scale of unemployment and adjustments to the new technology, as a body rather than in piecemeal fashion. The Community must not take the place of the Member States or of both sides of industry, whose independence it respects. But it must lay down guidelines, adopt recommendations, refine the instruments to adapt them to the circumstances and the new requirements. The Presidency will pay particular attention to the progress of proposals and drafts under study — there are important ones on youth employment and the adjustment of working time. It will also pay attention to establishing among the Member States what opportunities there are for joint action regarding the social aspects of new technology, demography in Europe and the future of our social security

systems. Lastly, it will take the necessary initiatives to seek, with both sides of industry, methods of increasing social dialogue at the European level — thereby making a practical contribution to the creation of a genuine European social area. To these ends, it will of course keep up the contacts it has already established with the European Trade Union Confederation and will be able to consult the qualified representatives of economic and social circles. It will also ensure that the debate which Parliament held yesterday in such an exemplary fashion — on the situation of women will be followed up. It should be possible, on the basis of the proposals we are awaiting from the Commission, to arrive at conclusions.

Apart from these major developments, some of which, I recognize, are ambitious, and alongside the activities dictated by the timetable (I am thinking here of the Agriculture Council's very difficult task of fixing the prices for the 1984-85 marketing year), the Community will at the same time reinforce and consolidate the existing common policies.

The worsening of the crisis in the steel industry in the last few months, marked by a serious fall in steel prices, has accentuated internal and external tensions and has made restructuring even more difficult. Measures have just been adopted, based on a plan drawn up by the Commission, to alleviate the immediate difficulties. But — and this is vital — the political undertaking entered into last July to renew the quota system for a specified period remains to be put into practice. The importance of what is at stake is clear to all: if we do not ensure the survival of the present system of organization of the steel market, restructuring of the sector and the unity of the market will very shortly crumble.

In the field of energy, the relative stability of the oil market must not lead to any slackening of the efforts made to decrease the Community's energy dependence. We must keep close track of our 1990 targets. The Council will also have to take a decision on matters currently before it (for example, demonstration projects and the coking coal system) and consider Community action likely to give real added value to national measures.

In the transport sector, the Presidency considers that progress should be made on the infrastructures dossier; the Council will also have to take a decision on matters relating to land, maritime and air transport. The work undertaken to improve environmental protection in the Community will be expedited. We shall try to reach agreement on the texts currently on the table. I have explained what we intend to do in the document which has been distributed to you. In order to respond to the growing and justified interest aroused among the public by consumer protection and information, the Greek Presidency deemed it

Cheysson

necessary to organize a first Council of Ministers to deal with these questions. The French Presidency, convinced of the benefits of an active policy for consumers, will continue along these lines.

Following a referendum, Greenland expressed the desire to withdraw from the Community. In line with the political undertaking we recently gave, the Presidency will make every effort to ensure that the discussions currently taking place are concluded as rapidly as possible. After long and arduous discussions, it has finally been possible to adopt a common fisheries policy. The Presidency will endeavour to ensure its continued implementation. The major efforts will be directed at the adoption of the TACs and quotas for 1984 and the continuation of the negotiations for the conclusion of other agreements with third countries.

In the face of the difficulties currently experienced in international trade, the Community will continue to resist taking the deceptively easy course of protectionism. It hopes that its foreign partners will show the same determination in this respect. In the present period, compliance with the provisions of GATT is essential for maintaining free and open trading. The Community intends to ensure that the work programme decided upon at the Ministerial meeting in November 1982 is implemented. It also places great importance on full observance of the commitments entered into following the multilateral trade negotiations (Tokyo Round), failing which it would consider it illusory to attempt to embark upon a new phase of negotiations.

With its major trading partners, the Community will have to show the greatest possible degree of cohesion in presenting its views and defending its interests. Our relations with the United States are not without problems. Why pretend otherwise? Certain difficulties have been overcome, thanks, in particular, to our firmness and our unity. Disagreements still exist, and may prove considerable, particularly over agriculture. The informal talks held between the American Administration and the Commission have provided a better insight into the respective viewpoints and have enabled progress to be made on specific points. The adjustments to the common agricultural policy as well as certain consequences of enlargement will shed new light on our relations with the United States in the field of agriculture. Extremely wide-ranging and difficult negotiations will therefore be needed, and will play a decisive part in the relaunching and enlargement of the Community.

Our relations with Japan are still dominated by the imbalance in our trade. The measures which were implemented to try to remedy the imbalance, whether they involved voluntary restraint undertakings regarding certain sensitive products or measures to facilitate access for imports to the Japanese market, have, it must be acknowledged, had only a limited

effect, and the imbalance has worsened. The Community will have to follow with the utmost vigilance trends in its trade with Japan.

1 January 1984 marked a new stage in the Community's relations with the EFTA countries. On that date the last tariff dismantling provided for by the agreements was carried out. Cooperation has developed to the satisfaction of both parties in an easily manageable and pragmatic institutional framework which the Community and the EFTA Ministerial Council agree should be strengthened. In this connection, the proposal made by Sweden, which currently holds the EFTA presidency, to hold a Ministerial meeting between the EEC and EFTA in spring 1984 is most welcome.

Finally, in the context of the relations which the Community wishes to develop with the Eastern European countries, the Presidency attributes particular importance to the request by Hungary to strengthen and give a more structured form to its trade relations with the Community. There are possibilities for making practical improvements to the trading arrangements with that country. The Community must seek a mutually satisfactory arrangement in a constructive spirit.

I now come to a chapter which will clearly be at the centre of Community activities during this half-year, and would like to say a few words about enlargement.

Spain and Portugal unquestionably have a European destiny, as history shows us. Once they are members of the Community, these two States will help to consolidate its identity and will enable it to expand its role in world affairs. Accession negotiations have been under way since October 1978 with Portugal and since February 1979 with Spain. The Community cannot and should not leave them in a state of expectancy and uncertainty any longer.

(Applause)

This was generally acknowledged by the Ten at the European Council meeting in Athens. It was agreed that they should be given a rapid answer, i.e. that the negotiations should be concluded at the earliest opportunity and that the date of accession should be published.

The Presidency is determined to contribute to this progress which means expediting the work while recalling that each of the dossiers will be dealt with on its own merits. An effort will have to be made on all sides: the Community will have to expedite the preparation of work, the Member States to place the Community in a position to receive the newcomers and, finally, the applicant countries themselves will have to understand certain difficulties facing the present members of the Community (here I would mention fisheries, the free movement of persons, agricultural and industrial problems, etc.).

Cheysson

The negotiations can succeed on two conditions only : that the Acts of Accession are balanced, i.e. that the just interests of the producers and workers on both sides are taken into account, and that the Community is in a position to welcome the new States. This implies that it will have resolved some delicate internal problems. No-one should underestimate the importance of these difficulties on whose solution the desired success of the negotiations largely depends.

It should also be recalled that the Community attaches importance to its relations with the Mediterranean States, as evinced by the global policy adopted in 1972 and confirmed by the preferential agreements signed with ten of these countries. However, our partners in the Mediterranean are rightly concerned about the consequences of enlargement for their trade with the Community. This is why, at the same time as the accession negotiations are taking place, the Commission is conducting exploratory talks with the Mediterranean countries. We await with interest the guidelines it will propose for the Mediterranean policy of the enlarged Community.

I should now like to broach another important area of Community activity, and one which, as you know, is dear to me, namely, development.

The major forthcoming event in this connection is the renegotiation of the Convention which links us to 63 African, Caribbean and Pacific States, to be joined, we hope, by Angola and Mozambique.

The Greek Presidency had the weighty task of adopting the negotiating brief and of beginning the negotiations. The French Presidency, in close conjunction with the Commission, will have to make as much progress as possible to ensure that the Convention is signed in time for it to be ratified by 1 March 1985.

This is a weighty responsibility, and we are fully aware of it. As we have often had occasion to say — and this has been repeated many times in this forum — the ACP-EEC Convention constitutes an exemplar; it symbolizes our solidarity with the Third World; it is based on principles which, unfortunately, are nowhere else to be found; and it contains original features which have captured the attention of the world.

The Convention is thus a matter of priority for the Community, owing to the historic links which exist between many of us and those States, but also because it is concluded with some of the poorest and least-developed peoples (LLDCs).

Over a period of five years the situation has changed, both for the Member States of the Community and for our ACP partners. In order to respond to the needs of the ACP States and to their proposals, it will therefore be our duty not only to preserve what has been achieved under the previous Conventions but also to seek to improve it, and to increase the effectiveness of

financial and technical cooperation, strengthen Stabex, and affirm clearly the guiding principles, which include the need for food strategies and self-sufficiency.

Negotiations with our ACP partners have already begun — slowly, it is true. It is time to embark on specific negotiations. We shall endeavour to achieve this.

The Presidency hopes that the spirit of dialogue will prevail during the negotiations, thereby enabling us to promote cooperation between us and other regions or countries where there are pressing needs. In this connection, relations with the countries of Central America deserve particular mention.

I need hardly remind you of the concern caused by the situation in that area and its possible implications at regional and even world level. Community action to help the Central American group would, we believe, help to bring about peace and stability in that region along the lines proposed by the Contadora group.

With regard to the North-South dialogue, I would point out that the Community has always played an active and positive part in the various relevant fora (Paris Conference on International Economic Cooperation, United Nations Bretton Woods discussion): it wishes to continue to encourage this dialogue. One particular area worthy of attention is that of raw materials. The Common Fund has to be effectively established in order to carry through the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements on specific products. I am thinking in particular of the meetings which will take place this year on sugar, cocoa and rubber.

In the financial sphere, the strengthening of financial cooperation, especially in the IDE context, is a matter of priority. The Member States of the Community must be able to make a convincing contribution to the urgent issue of determining the amount of the seventh replenishment.

I have touched on a number of major external issues, indicating the Community interest from an economic point of view and outlining possible courses of action.

The same considerations could well be made from the political point of view.

When they think and act together, the ten Member States of the Community possess a strength of their own, and their economic weight is then comparable with that of the greatest. As the President of France said after the Athens Summit, there has to be a 'political resolve guiding our countries towards an objective, a goal, a political structure which will give historical significance to the whole venture'. In the Bundestag, a year ago, he said: 'How could a strong Europe fail to aspire, in all areas, to be one day independent and assume its responsibilities?'

Cheysson

However, so long as the present imbalance of forces on the continent of Europe continues to exist, the allies' solidarity on security matters is fundamental.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

It is therefore important, for political and not only economic reasons, that we should have an on-going dialogue with United States' leaders on major world issues. Such a dialogue is necessary if we are to defend our interests and our own viewpoints, and to demonstrate that there is a European approach.

This special dialogue with the United States is, I repeat, in no way incompatible with the relations which we propose to maintain and develop to our mutual benefit with Eastern Europe in particular, despite the often cool behaviour displayed towards the Community in certain quarters. We belong to a divided continent. Let us never forget that we are only a part of Europe.

We would wish Europe, torn apart as it has been by history, to unite again one day. The present divide which cuts us off from those who for centuries were our brothers in civilization is a source of pain and grief to us. That is why we aspire to have the balance of forces re-established at the lowest possible level. That is why we have an intrinsic interest in continuation of the East-West dialogue in all areas. That is why the Ten will continue to develop cooperation between both halves of the continent and will reject as a matter of principle all sanctions and boycotts.

(Applause from the left)

Our relationship with the democratic countries of Western Europe is therefore easily expressed in freedom and democracy. I have already voiced our satisfaction at the state of our relations with the EFTA countries. I should mention the parallel development of our action with that of the Council of Europe, particularly in the field of human rights.

What else can be said about our political identity? For historical reasons we have woven close ties with several regions of the world: economic links, such as those already referred to, but also political and personal links. Our past has taught us to know these countries intimately and to respect them. If that is true of the Ten, how much truer it will be of a Europe with the heritage and experience acquired by Spain and Portugal in so many countries of such great importance in their respective continents and so close to us by virtue of language and culture.

Already now there is nothing which happens in Latin America, Africa or the Near or Middle East which does not affect us. How many debates within this Parliament have been devoted to the problems of those regions? And there is no political cooperation meeting at which the Ten's analysis and judgment is not awaited with interest.

Indeed I will not hesitate to be more demanding. For often during my travels in the Third World I have noticed that the leaders of the countries I visit find us too cautious; they would like to see Europe take a firmer stance on major international questions, stressing basic principles, proposing solutions. Let us try not to disappoint all these countries which, despite the crisis we too are undergoing, expect a great deal from a Europe which they know cannot be imperialistic and whose birth and development were the achievements of free peoples anxious to affirm their identity and their independence.

We have a responsibility to the rest of the world, beginning with the developing world. Over and above what we are able to do and the aid and cooperation front we must help in our own way, according to our own lights, to contribute in whatever region is undergoing a crisis or is in a state of war to the return of peace and to respect for independence and for the right to self-determination. In international relations we can play a role; let us do so. But let us not cherish any illusions. Europe's ability to influence the course of world events depends to a great extent on its ability to sort out its own difficulties.

(Applause)

The Greek Presidency last month in Athens felt that the European Council could not adopt a political position on serious problems concerning non-Community countries. It would have been presumptuous to dispense advice and utter exhortations when we had not managed to reach agreement on material matters concerning our Community. That is unfortunate.

(Applause)

Let us not forget the lesson of humility.

Nor let us delude ourselves about the effectiveness of our action. We were right, in the Stuttgart Solemn Declaration on European Union, to set ourselves the goal of defining common principles and objectives to increase opportunities for joint action. We must, whenever possible, seek to adopt common positions. But let us look at things as they really are: the ten Member States are not ready to adopt the same positions in every case. So, enough of words, enough of these vague texts which juggle opposing views. We shall not win the respect of other countries in this way.

Whenever we can, let us act. Let us use the diplomatic channels of the Community and its Member States. Let us speak out publicly, knowing that sometimes our voice carries weight, particularly in international organizations. Let us make joint moves, hold talks with third States and groups of States who so wish and find it to their advantage.

Our message, the message of Europe, must be then a message of peace, a message of solidarity, a message to mankind.

Cheysson

A message of peace: we attach great importance to the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on their nuclear weapons and we hope that they can somehow be resumed as soon as possible. We place hope in the Conference on Disarmament in Europe, at the opening of which I spoke yesterday in Stockholm on behalf of the Ten, the Ten whose cohesion was a driving force of the Madrid conference, a factor in its success.

(Applause)

A message of peace: we who through our understanding and our regional proximity have managed once and for all to put an end to the wars which have so often divided us, we shall encourage all initiatives for peace, reconciliation and regional security in all parts of the world: South-East Asia, the Andean countries, the Caribbean, black Africa; but we must also help the States and peoples of the Middle East to obtain recognition and affirmation of their rights; we must act to ensure that independence and peace is finally found in southern Africa. Perhaps we may help to build peaceful relations between the countries of Central America.

A message of solidarity also with peoples who suffer and die or are humiliated, peoples who fight because their right to self-determination is refused them, because they are under foreign occupation or because their very existence is threatened; the Palestinian people, the Lebanese people, the Israeli people, the Namibian people, the Afghan people, the Cambodian people, the Polish people and so many more.

And finally a message to mankind: we are fortunate in being a Community of free peoples and democratic institutions. Respect for human rights, individual freedoms and economic and social rights are protected by our constitutions, our laws, our press. We must never allow these rights and these freedoms to be flouted elsewhere. Europe has good reason to be proud of this Parliament which has always condemned violations of the fundamental rights of human beings and nations and has always denounced attacks on human dignity and human life. We must continue to stand out against torture, arbitrary arrest and detention, disappearances and denials of the individual's freedom to leave his country and return to it.

(Applause)

I will now address myself to you, Mr President, to your colleagues on the Bureau and to those whose arduous task it is to chair committees, particularly the Political Affairs Committee.

During its Presidency, France intends to give effect to the provisions of the Stuttgart Solemn Declaration on European Union, beginning with those relating to your Parliament. The President of the French Republic will come here to analyse the work of the European Council with you.

(Applause)

I myself will be here to answer your questions once a month. On each of these occasions I should be happy to talk — in whatever grouping you wish — to the Presidency of the European Parliament on any topic relating to the Community. I should also like to have meetings as often as possible with your Political Affairs Committee to help keep it informed of negotiations in progress.

(Applause)

Not only will I submit your resolutions to my colleagues on the Council but I will also make a special point of drawing the attention of my external affairs colleagues to them in the course of political cooperation meetings on foreign policy motions; I have asked for the same procedure to be followed at the monthly meetings of the Political Directors.

The provisions of the Solemn Declaration on relations between the Council and the European Parliament must also be implemented. The Commission's proposals on this point will have to aim at improving the conciliation procedure as defined on 4 March 1975. Progress can and must be made in this direction, while respecting the powers of each institution.

1984 will be the year of Europe. It must be. For the second time your Parliament will be directly elected by all the men and women of the Community. In many European countries it will be the political event of the year.

The European Parliament must be Europe's conscience. The elections will therefore be an opportunity for an examination of conscience.

Let me express the hope that the coming campaign will offer an opportunity to transcend the narrow horizon of national interests ...

(Applause)

... and focus attention on the real problems facing Europe today.

The President and Government of France are convinced that, in the eyes of public opinion and above and beyond the arrangements which are possible between parties we shall be able to find new strength not only to make the necessary reforms but also to give our Community the historical dimension it should have and of which we stand in need.

There is no future for Europe unless its youth, its peoples, have hope. But there is no hope for our ancient nations unless they can express and achieve their ambitions with and through Europe.

(Sustained applause)

Mr Glinne (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, Mr President of the Council, Minister, ladies and gentlemen, last month I closed my speech to this Assembly in the debate on the Athens Summit on an optimistic note.

Glinne

For the French Presidency, through the Foreign Minister, Mr Claude Cheysson, had just stated that the very constructive conclusions of the Greek Presidency could become the basis of future discussion. We were equally pleased to find President Mitterrand confirming his personal commitment to the revival of Europe.

It was thus with satisfaction that we heard today the President of the Council confirming before us this desire to bring about this recovery, so essential for the survival of the Community — itself constituting the necessary framework for the preservation of the European economy for the benefit of our peoples, as all the member countries have stressed after the failure of Athens. As the President of the Council has just said, the political will proved insufficient. It must, at last, find expression in practical deeds. It is time we put an end to high-sounding declarations of principle and to untimely regrets and get down at last to giving effect to the new policies without which, Europe cannot do: the European social area, economic recovery, improved monetary cooperation in the face of an aggressive dollar, and, last but not least, closer cooperation in research.

The President of the Council has pointed out to us that whereas the research expenditure of the Ten is twice that of Japan, the results are not nearly as good, because of our national divisions. But it is on research and on the new technologies that the future of our economy depends. Europe, therefore, certainly needs to be more ambitious, but it must also, and above all, be more cohesive, more willing to cooperate and less prone to national egoisms. This is the only long-term chance of survival for the Community and for its Member States. Now, if this European cooperation is to be more effective — and hence more attractive in the eyes of Europe's citizens — we must at last bring about the recovery, we must settle the budgetary problems, we must start on much-needed reform of the common agricultural policy in accordance with the provisions of the Rome Treaty, we must strengthen the Social and the Regional Funds. And, first of all, we must tackle more efficiently and by joint measures of the Member States, the anguished problem of unemployment. In this battle for work for all, a redistribution of the work that is available through substantial reduction of working time is an indispensable weapon.

Yesterday, in the debate on the situation of women in Europe, a majority of this House voted, most appropriately, in favour of this fundamental postulate.

(Applause)

Improved vocational training, redevelopment and modernization of our outdated industries, increased public investment, encouragement of energy saving, economic adaptation to technological progress — these are other means of combating that unemploy-

ment which we, Socialists, refuse to accept as an inevitable evil. The cost of this unemployment is today sometimes met by the dismantling of the welfare state, as is today happening in the United Kingdom, where a certain amount of improvement in productivity has been accompanied by an unacceptable rise in mass unemployment.

(Applause)

For the Socialists the choice between the profits of some and welfare of others is easily made. We shall never acquiesce in an economic system that can only survive through the exploitation of man by man. This is why we demand, in addition to the reduction of working time, democratization of the economy within the Community, particularly through the right to information for workers employed by the multinationals. We insist that the Council take an early and favourable decision on the long-postponed Vredeling Directive.

Mr President of the Council, it was the President of the Socialist International, Willy Brandt, who was then Chancellor, who first launched at the Paris Summit of 1974 the idea of a social Europe. It is some years since François Mitterrand, now President of the French Republic, revived the proposal for the creation of a European social area. Like the President of the French Republic, like Willy Brandt, like you, yourself, we Socialists believe that if economic recovery, if expansion of the internal market, if improved research, if a European industrial area are necessary, then the social aspect is not just necessary but is of absolutely vital importance.

We were therefore glad to hear that the French Presidency would make it its business to advance the progress of the proposals and projects which are already under study and that you have already contacted the European Trade Unions Confederation whose political arm we try to represent in this House.

We also look forward to the fruitful continuation, under the French Presidency, of a Council devoted specifically to consumer affairs which was held on 12 December last under the Greek Presidency — it was the first Council on this subject — and to the implementation at long last of the programmes in favour of consumers which were decided upon as long ago as 1975 and 1981, but to no effect so far.

Mr President of the Council, in the debate on the Athens Summit, speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group, I referred to certain institutional aspects of the crisis of Europe, and in particular I deplored the excessive expectations attached to 'miraculous summits', to the detriment of the regular decision-making process at the level of ministerial Councils. I also emphatically expressed the desire that the Council take more account of the opinions and proposals of this Parliament, which is the democratic expression of European

Glinne

public opinion. In this connexion we are especially pleased to learn that not only will the President of the French Republic address this Assembly, but that also you have personally undertaken to come each month before this House and to meet our President, and more particularly to meet our Political Affairs Committee, so as to help keep us informed of the negotiations in progress.

We also wish to thank the French Presidency for its promise, given to this Assembly, to take greater account of its opinions and resolutions, for it is a most deplorable fact that there have been Council meetings in the past, and particularly those in the framework of political cooperation, at which resolutions voted by the European Parliament were not even included in the dossiers prepared for the participants.

Mr President, as regards the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal, we are entirely of the opinion of the President of the Council that these two countries historically belong to the community of Europe. We are thus happy to learn that the French Presidency is determined to contribute to immediate progress in the negotiations and to speed up the review of the proceedings. We sincerely hope that the enlargement will come about in the best possible way for all the parties concerned.

Mr President of the Council, we well realize that the task of the French Presidency is an arduous one. After the Athens failure, and with only a few months to go to the European elections, Europe must be rescued from its crisis. No less than that! Such a goal imposes an enlightened view of the Community. Nationalisms, of whatever colour, belong to the past, and today the Community in many respects serves better the interests of its component States, when properly understood. A revival of the Community is essential, besides, if our economies are to be saved, to serve the interests of our peoples. Practical proposals to this effect exist; there is, for instance, the Socialist resolution 1/926/82/rev. But there is also the majority decision of this Parliament on the 1984 budget, a decision expressing a clear political will. There must be, first of all, the necessary reform of the common agricultural policy, carried out, of course, in compliance with Article 39 of the Treaty of Rome. Then, there must be found a permanent budgetary solution to the problem of the British contribution. And, thirdly, funds must be made available for the launching of new Community policies, which are essential as much for the credibility as the efficiency of Community Europe.

In closing, Mr President of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, I want to say that what we need in today's world is not less Europe, but more Europe,

(Applause)

for the sake of the workers, in the first place, for the sake of employment, for the sake of the industries which are in crisis and for the sake of the regions

which are disadvantaged. Europe's Socialists understand this, and they hope that, inspired by you, the Council will come to understand it too.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR JAQUET

Vice-President

Mr Pflimlin (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, Mr President of the Council, Minister, ladies and gentlemen, I should like first of all, on behalf of the European People's Party Group, to thank Mr Cheysson for setting out before us a full picture of the French Presidency's intentions, to which many of us, irrespective of party, attach great hopes.

(Applause)

The failure of the Athens Summit upset us profoundly. We had not been at all optimistic, truth to tell, but we had not expected a total fiasco. I shall not try, Mr President, Minister, to localize the blame. If fault there was, then — as in every quarrel — there was probably some on every side. We shall do nothing for the cause of Europe by pointing the finger at a scape-goat, as for instance at the United Kingdom, whose demands, which may be excessive, nevertheless continue to deserve serious consideration. What the Athens failure demonstrates above all is the harmfulness of the approach which consists in leaving to the European Council the solution of problems, most of which fall within the remit of the Council of Ministers who should take decisions on the basis of Commission proposals.

(Applause)

The first lesson to be drawn from this regrettable event is that we must restore the normal functioning of Community mechanisms and confine the role of the European Council to the laying down of principal guidelines and the resolution of fundamental issues. We wish the French Presidency to act along these lines.

(Applause)

My colleague, Mr Notenboom will shortly present our group's views on the financial problems. I, personally, do not question the need for financial stringency. But we should not exaggerate the seriousness of our financial problems. There are some people who make it their business to discredit the Community by presenting it as a great spender, easily tempted into wasting money; there are even some among our colleagues who like to promote this myth. But myth it is,

(Applause)

for we all know that the Communities' budget amounts to no more than 0.8 % of gross domestic product of the member countries and to barely 3 % of

Pflimlin

the national budgets. As to the financial differences, which have been the reason, or the pretext, for the failure to agree in Athens, in the final reckoning they come to derisively small percentages. That is why I am convinced that the danger of the Community's break-up can be averted and that things can be set right in the coming months. Such a recovery is an absolute necessity, if only to enable the Community to face its duties in the agricultural area and to resolve problems which certainly cannot be settled on the basis of the proposals which the Commission presented to us this morning.

There are, in fact, areas in which increased Community spending can be set off by savings in the national budgets. That is the case, notably, of research, to which the French Presidency rightly attaches a fundamental importance. My own view is that the establishment of a common research and industrial area, proposed in the French memorandum of last September, is, subject to some reservations, a good idea. We could not agree to the implementation of certain measures being entrusted to agencies lying outside the Community framework and thus exempt from Parliament's control.

(Applause)

Economic recovery — to which this Parliament has devoted particular attention, having considered it on the basis of the excellent report by Mr Michel Albert, formerly Commissioner of the French National Plan, and Mr Ball, and on the basis of a report by my colleague, Mr Herman — economic recovery should, of course, be aimed primarily at combating unemployment, but it should have the wider aims of thorough redevelopment in which the rescue, in so far as it is still possible, of our traditional industries should be combined with the launching of new ones. Our determination to embark on new policies cannot, obviously, absolve us from the duty of preserving the only genuinely 'Community' policy existing now: the agricultural policy.

You have stressed, Mr President of the Council, the need to reform this policy, but in strict compliance with the Treaties. I am thinking here in particular of European preference.

There is one area where bold initiative seems to us especially desirable: it is the area of security, which has become one of the dominant preoccupations of our citizens. Last November Mr François Mitterrand relaunched the idea of European defence within the Atlantic Alliance. You yourself, Mr President of the Council, have emphasized the importance of security issues. Many of us think that we should indeed undertake without further delay the construction of the European pillar of the Alliance and the problem should be considered as soon as possible within the framework of political cooperation of the Ten.

To get the Community out of the rut into which it is sinking, it is essential to change the functioning of its organs. Interesting prospects were opened by the signing by the ten Heads of State and of Government in Stuttgart of the solemn declaration on European Union, even if it does not go as far as Mr Genscher's and Mr Colombo's proposals. You have just told us, Mr President of the Council, that the French Presidency would draw all the consequences that that declaration implies, especially, as regards the improvement of relations with Parliament, extension of the conciliation procedures and, if I may add to this, consultation of the enlarged Bureau before the appointment of the Commission's President.

I read in the Stuttgart declaration that application of the decision-making procedures for which the Treaties of Paris and Rome provide is of fundamental importance for improving the Community's capacity for action. It could not be better put. But what are the implications?

The truth is that the paralysis from which the Community suffers is to a very great extent due to the requirement of unanimity in the Council's decisions, even those of secondary importance. We demand a return to the observance of the Treaties, where they expressly provide for a majority vote...

(Applause)

... because the introduction of the right of veto, and its abuse, are one of the root causes of the Community's troubles. And sooner or later it will have to be eliminated.

(Applause)

Parliament's approach to this extremely sensitive issue has been markedly moderate.

The draft treaty which next month will be submitted to this Assembly for approval provides for a ten-year transition period during which Council decisions can be postponed if — admittedly, subject to certain conditions — a vital national interest is invoked. I trust you will agree that this shows very great moderation on our part, but do not be misled into concluding that we regard this question as secondary. Let me repeat once again: in the world in which we live, in the crises which we are facing, the essential need is for the Community to acquire a capacity for decision-making.

(Applause)

I have not referred so far to the question of the accession of Spain and Portugal, which we regard as immeasurably desirable. But I must state clearly what is my personal conviction, that, over and above the economic and financial problems to which you, Mr President of the Council, have referred, a Community of twelve will not be viable if the operation of its decision-making procedures remains as it is today.

Pflimlin

Gentlemen of the Council, both you and we know all too well that the problems you will have to tackle are hard. We are convinced that you will do your best to resolve them and we wish you success, for in such a grave hour of Europe's history and in such a debate we must not introduce anything resembling a partisan spirit into our thinking, declarations or attitudes.

If we are to combat the crisis, we need to be clear that it has not been caused solely by the accumulation on the Council's table of a large number of unresolved technical, economic and financial problems. Europe's crisis is a crisis of faith. The real trouble is that many Europeans who put trust in the European idea have lost that faith, and when young Europeans come on their pilgrimages to Strasbourg I am frightened to hear them talk, for it is obvious that they have stopped believing in Europe. I want to believe, however, that we can still rekindle the European faith. More than once France has taken the initiative to pull Europe out of a crisis. That is your mission now, and if you succeed I shall be grateful to you as a European and proud of you as your compatriot.

(Loud applause)

Sir Henry Plumb (ED). — Mr President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, may I join with all my colleagues here so far and others to follow who are expressing their support for Mr Cheysson and their pleasure that he is among us once again.

We welcome his declaration of intent, but this, as others have already said, hardly compensates for the disappointment that we all felt at the failure of the European Council in Athens last December. As one who, like Mr Pflimlin and others, cares about the future of the Community, I was disturbed and surprised by the inability of heads of government to make any progress at all in Athens.

Nobody doubts that today the Community faces a crisis as serious as any in its history. Everybody agrees that our Community and, more particularly, its financial basis needs radical reform. Nobody believes that the common agricultural policy can continue to unbalance the Community's budget simply in order to generate unwanted surpluses. Nobody believes that the burdens on two Member States, disproportionate as they are, can continue indefinitely in their present form. Everybody agrees that the Community is desperately in need of new policies to break out of the dreary cycle of stagnation and disillusionment in which it has been trapped over the past years.

As Mr Glinne rightly said, unemployment is one of the major problems, but I do not necessarily believe that Mr Glinne's solution to unemployment is correct, however admirable his objectives may be.

However, in spite of this general agreement, the European Council in Athens came not a single step closer to resolving the Community's problems.

How could this happen? There are those who seek scapegoats for this failure. Everybody has somebody other than themselves to blame, whether it be individual member governments or the Council of Ministers as a whole.

Mr President and Mr Cheysson, in our Community there are and there can be no scapegoats. Nobody can be singled out for particular blame or for particular praise. In passing, I greatly regret President Dankert's remarks reported in *Le Soir* on 5 January, which singled out one head of government, Mrs Thatcher, for hostile comment. I regret even more his assertion that the United Kingdom is not integrated into the Community, and I hope of course, that he will be able to reassure us that once again he has been misreported.

(Laughter from the European Democratic benches)

In our Community, everything should be shared. The failure of the Athens European Council is a failure of our Community, and no country, no Community institution, nobody active in the political life of the Community can escape a share of the blame for it.

Mr President, I am often asked, not only in my own country, if the failure of the European Council in Athens means that the European idealism of such men as Monnet, Churchill, de Gasperi and Adenauer and people who are present in this Chamber, such as Mr Pflimlin, is dead. Is Europe fated to relapse into the selfish pursuit of short-term national interests? I share the fears of those who put such questions to me as they do to others.

The peoples of Europe may lose confidence in a Community which recognizes that it is in the midst of a severe crisis but is unable to take the measures necessary to confront that crisis. They may lose confidence in a Community where decisions are dangerously postponed because too many people are frightened of taking difficult but necessary decisions. The longer such decisions are postponed, of course, the more painful they will finally become.

The farmers of Europe are already suffering from the Community's inability to devise a sustainable common agricultural policy. Today I welcome Mr Cheysson's remarks on the need to adjust the common agricultural policy to its changing circumstances.

Mr President, and Mr President-in-Office of the Council, I am by nature an optimist. I think it would be difficult to be a democratic politician without a good measure of optimism. In a democratic community painful change can sometimes be long in coming. But when it comes, it will have an irresistible momentum behind it. I am confident that the peoples of Europe will realize where their own best interest lie. For the Community's present crisis to be resolved,

Plumb

the Community's members must, of course, remember the interests of the Community as a whole. Equally, it is in the interests of every individual Member State that the Community's crisis be quickly resolved. The Community is made up of Member States, and the interests of every individual Member State are essentially bound up with the good of that Community. I was encouraged by many of the things that the President-in-Office of the Council said today. The presidency of the Community cannot on its own decide the course of the Community in the next six months. But if the French Presidency can assist the Member States to pursue together their own best interests, it will have done a substantial service to the Community and to its peoples.

I do not think that now is the appropriate time for me to relate at length my own group's views on the Community's financial and other problems. My colleagues, and in particular Lord Douro, will be speaking later in the debate on these issues.

Briefly, we believe that the Community's present financial basis is inequitable and that the disproportionately large net contribution made by two States to the Community is a symptom of this inequity. We recognize, and indeed we insist, that the the Community is not merely a matter of financial profit and loss. We do not seek a *juste retour* for the United Kingdom, any more than does the British Government, which has said that it is prepared for the United Kingdom, one of the Community's poorer nations, to remain a modest net contributor. This fact will not prevent people, certainly in this House, from first misrepresenting and then criticizing our views in this matter.

We believe that CAP expenditure must leave room for the development of new policies which will contribute to the realization of a genuine Community. I am pleased here particularly that Mr Cheysson stressed the Community's role in technological research and development in new industries, and that he said we need action, not words. Action, not words, is particularly essential for industry as a whole in this particular field.

Amidst all this talk of new policies, however, let us not forget that many of our problems would be much more easily overcome if we had already enacted the provisions and aspirations of the original Treaty. I would like to remind colleagues that we still have no common transport policy and no genuine internal market. Perhaps here, in passing, I might ask Mr Cheysson whether he intends following up his remarks by calling a meeting of the internal Council on the internal market, because I believe this is the greatest issue we have to face.

In the light of the changes in the Community's financial structure and the common agricultural policy, my group will be prepared to consider on their merits any

proposals for an increase in own resources and the case for such an increase will, of course, be greatly strengthened by the accession of Spain and Portugal.

I have never been able to understand those who relapse into apathy and disillusionment in times of crisis. The Community is in crisis, but we, the peoples of Europe are the people of the Community and this crisis therefore is our crisis. If we fail today to overcome this crisis, the loss will be our own loss. It is at times of crisis that it is often possible to strike out in new directions. A famous countryman of mine once said that nothing concentrates a man's mind so wonderfully as the knowledge that he is shortly to be hanged. I do not think the Community is in imminent danger of extinction, but its enormous problems serve to concentrate our minds. As ever, my group will contribute strenuously and with commitment in any way it can to overcome the current crisis of the Community — our Community. I hope and I believe that with good will, hard work and solidarity among its members the Community will overcome its present difficulties more quickly than many people might think.

I wish every success to the President-in-Office and, of course, to the Council.

(Applause)

Mrs De March (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, France has taken over the Presidency of the Community at a moment when Europe, in the midst of a crisis, is faced with serious internal and external challenge. Internally, it is under the menace of the recent deadlock in Athens and of the continuing policies of austerity pursued in the majority of its Member States; externally, it is threatened by growing American pressures through the vagaries of the dollar, rising US interest rates and assaults on the Community's trade policy. These pressures, exerted with the intention of undermining the Community's cohesion, could in the long run jeopardize its very existence; is it tolerable, I put it to you, that at the most dramatic moments in international affairs, for instance in the Middle East, the Community should not have the capacity to speak out — if only to re-state the points of the Venice declaration?

All this explains why, as you have said, Mr President of the Council, the Community is losing its image in the public's eyes. And losing it it is. All too often today, the Community is identified with unemployment, with the destruction of industrial production capacity, with doubts as to our agricultural capabilities, with financial waste. Let me refer here to two issues with which we are familiar: the destruction of the steel industry and of the ship-yards. The Communist and Allies Group looks forward to seeing a reversal of these trends under the French Presidency, we want to see the Community turned towards goals which meet

De March

the expectations of those who have elected us to this House. The Community must assert its identity, its personality, first of all by action on the industrial and social content of Community policies. We propose that employment, production, training, workers' rights, and competitiveness, be really placed at the centre of Community planning. How has it come about that the successful industrial cooperation projects, such as the Airbus, nearly all exist outside the Community mechanisms? How is it that, more recently, industrial cooperation agreements have been mushrooming between European and American or Japanese firms — to the detriment of the much-needed European co-production projects?

This trend must be reversed; we must have a number of industrial cooperation projects among the Ten. I am thinking here of the Esprit programme, but there is also all the high technology, all the advanced electronics. There is also the need for the appropriate political will. Today that must include resistance against American industrial domination of our firms, a phenomenon unfortunately all too often encouraged by European enterprises themselves.

The industrial cooperation for competitive production of which we speak must not lose sight of the human factor and, as you have said, the French Presidency should make it its duty to relaunch the projects for the harmonization from the top of social legislation in the Community — in accordance with the Treaty of Rome.

Yesterday's entire debate on the situation of women has shown that we must put into effect all this unfinished business from the past. Nor can the Community afford to continue postponing adoption of the so-called Vredeling directive on the consultation, the information, of workers in mutinational concerns. It will be to the credit of the French Presidency when it has unblocked this matter which is of practical consequence for the improvement of the situation of the workers in our countries.

What we also need to do is to develop further close cooperation with all the trade unions in the Ten, whose support is essential if Europe is to overcome the crisis. Such cooperation will help the Community to direct its financing and its resources towards the maintenance and the creation of jobs. In this connexion we have been reminded by the recent Court of Auditors report that Community funds are still often allocated without an exact assessment of their impact on employment. And, speaking of employment, Mr President, let us not forget that agriculture in our countries is a very effective source of employment, where a proper agro-foodstuffs sector can be developed.

We should like the French Presidency to tackle the issue of the common agricultural policy in this light.

The Commission's proposals on this seem to us unacceptable from the start. What we need is, just on the contrary, to preserve and develop the achievements of the CAP by strictly adhering to its fundamental principles, and notably that of Community preference, so as to secure for our farmers what is of crucial importance for them — guaranteed incomes.

Another imperative need is for us to realize that the Community must defend itself against the unfair commercial practices of Japan and the United States in this respect, because our group is concerned over the likely fate of the proposals contained in the French memorandum on the strengthening of the common commercial policy. If these proposals, which in any case represent the very minimum, should fail to be adopted, it would mean that some of our partners want to make of Europe a mere free-trading area and an outlet for the hard-pressed American industry and agriculture to export their own crisis to us.

Let me, Mr President, say a few words on the crucial issue of enlargement. As you know, the French Communists and Allies are opposed to the entry of Spain and Portugal into the Community. As things are at present we believe that this project is pernicious to all the parties concerned, to France, to the candidate countries, to the Mediterranean countries, to the ACPs and — I would add — to European construction itself.

The present stance of the United Kingdom which, ten years after accession, is still refusing to obey the rules and is hampering the functioning of the Community; the experience of Greece which, within two years, has seen its deficit in the agricultural produce sector double — all these facts only confirm us in our attitude. But let us make ourselves clear: we want a resolute effort to be made to find an alternative form of cooperation with the candidate countries. For enlargement today would only be another means to the ends of those who want to turn the Community into a free-trade area, to create, as you have said, a Europe of shopkeepers. And it is, Mr President, precisely because we have other ambitions for the Community that we want thought to be given to the use that is made of the European Monetary System. Is it not high time that a stop was put to the drain of European funds which are attracted by the high interest rates in the United States?

We are glad to see proposals similar to ours being advanced from several sides for the taxing of European capital which crosses the Atlantic instead of being used for Europe's economic recovery. And indeed, should we not be strengthening the role of the ECU as a currency in order to give better protection to our own currencies against the dollar? Would it not be advantageous to develop its use in dealings with the developing countries, and particularly our ACP partners?

De March

It will be under the French Presidency, Mr Cheysson, that the fate of the Lomé III negotiations will be determined. There, the Community will not be bound by the budgetary rules, so there will be nothing to excuse failure by the member countries to make available the resources necessary for cooperation with the ACPs. At present the Community provides for this no more than four dollars per head of the population of these countries.

Increased cooperation in this area will be a valuable boost to Europe's economic recovery, as well as the fulfilment of a moral obligation: in the face of famine's ravages talking is not enough.

Finally, Mr President, the Communist and Allies Group hopes fervently that France and the Ten will make a real effort to achieve practical progress on dialogue and cooperation in a number of political areas. The Ten's activities should lead to initiatives that promote peace, disarmament and European — and more generally, international — détente. I am thinking first of all of the Stockholm Conference.

There is also the conflict in the Middle East. In view of its responsibilities and its traditional links with most of the countries of the Mediterranean and the Middle East, France is well placed to ensure that its Presidency may effectively contribute to the search for peace for all the peoples and States of that region.

We shall be watching with particular attention developments on the central issue, i.e. the Palestinian question. The Ten, Greece and France have already undertaken considerable efforts in that direction. Our group attaches great hopes to the initiatives which the French Presidency may undertake to promote peace and the realization of all the national rights of the Palestinian people, including its inalienable right to self-determination.

Finally, the Communists and Allies Group will be watching attentively southern Africa. We believe the Ten must do all in their power to ensure that United Nations resolutions are obeyed. The Ten should actively apply the sanctions imposed by the international community against the Pretoria regime, but we also know that the French Presidency can play a very positive part in the settlement of the Namibia issue and in stopping South Africa's military aggression against the Front Line countries, with which there should be more Community cooperation.

Mr President, I have traced some of the paths which we believe should be followed to bring Europe out of the crisis. The Communist and Allies Group, in all its diverse composition, sincerely trusts that the French Presidency will, as it has been mandated by President Mitterrand, make the best of the crisis and that it will work for the achievement of a Europe of the peoples.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* While listening to you, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, none of us could forget that you have spoken to us many time times when you were a member of the Commission.

We therefore hope that the European convictions which you entertained at the time have remained unchanged, and particularly that the sentiments you expressed then as to the role of the European Parliament in the functioning of the Community institutions have not altered as you crossed the Chamber to take your place on the other side. There are only a few paces between the seats reserved respectively for the Council and the Commission — we should like to see a good augury in that.

I want to tell you, Mr President of the Council, how much the Liberal Group, on whose behalf I speak, wishes to see the period of the French Presidency crowned with success.

For there is continuity in the Community's life; it does not consist of a succession of national presidencies. Both failure and success are the failure or success of the Community itself, and anyone who believes that purely national responsibilities are engaged, with consequences designed primarily for domestic consumption, is making a grave mistake ...

Meanwhile, the six months of each presidency always pass more quickly than one imagines, whereas the bargaining needed to reach a solution always takes longer than one hoped. Hence it is not possible to wipe a sponge over what has gone before and one must resign oneself to the fact that a solution on which one has been working may only be put into effect by one's successor. That, incidentally, is the reason why we Liberals believe that it is indispensable to have a presidency arrangement providing greater continuity, as Mr Genscher and Mr Colombo have suggested.

Today, there is little time left. For the first time, the Community's coffers are empty, or at any rate they will not see it through the year, and the procrastination cannot go on. But, as you have said, Mr President of the Council, we should not overdramatize. The Athens failure was foreseeable, had been anticipated. The Council had lacked the political will to settle the technical problems which had existed for a long time and which were continually getting worse. The Community developed during a boom period, indeed it had considerably contributed to the boom, but it was unable to adjust to the enormous changes on our planet in terms of security, in the economy and in technology.

Yet Europe continues to exist and it still has everything going for it: its economic and cultural potential, the democratic values it exemplifies. You have pointed out, Mr President of the Council, what Europe represents to the outside world. And this is why, in order to be able to play its role. Europe must first

Veil

strengthen its economic capabilities. Here, the Council has three tasks to fulfil: first, see to the day-to-day running; secondly, find an overall solution for a set of complex and interconnected problems: the common agricultural policy, the new policies, increasing own resources and the respective contributions from the Member States. And, thirdly, prepare the ground for future new initiatives. Naturally, these three series of activities cannot be separated from one another. But the top priority is not to place in jeopardy the Community's achievements, and these are, essentially, free movement and agricultural policy. But by shutting our eyes to the blows that are struck at the principles of the common market or by pretending that — as we have just heard it said — that the reorganization that is carried out by the Community is deliberately aimed at destroying national industrial capacities we shall not preserve our achievements. Nor, indeed, shall we preserve them by sacrificing the common agricultural policy, the only Community policy that really is in operation — a victim of its own success. The Community will not save itself by sacrificing that.

I would remind you in this connexion that as early as 1979 the European Parliament had warned the Council that the Community would find itself at a dead end unless measures were urgently taken. The warning was not heeded. The farmers are now likely to suffer the consequences, and so will the Community's credibility. No, if we want to save the Community, we must put into effect, side by side with the common agricultural policy, other policies that will concern all the inhabitants of the Community and meet their needs.

The argument that is sometimes put forward, that there is no money for this, seems to me in this case unacceptable. Just think that, for example, in France the deficit of the nationalized undertakings amounts to 40 000 million francs — or nearly 6 000 million units of account — which is more than we need today to preserve the achievements of the common agricultural policy.

We should see this financial problem, which is at the hub of the Community's present difficulties, in its proper proportions. The Community budget amounts to 27 000 million units of account, that is less than 3% of all the national budgets put together, or 1% of the gross domestic product of the Member States.

You may say that 27 000 million units of account is still too much if the expenditure is unnecessary. But this expenditure — it can never be repeated often enough — would have to be borne, and at a much higher cost, by the national budgets.

Abstract talk about the European budget is meaningless unless we answer these questions first: do we want the Community, yes or no? What do we want from it? What common policies do we want to put

into effect? We would do best to go back, first of all, to the provisions and the spirit of the Treaties. Many of our difficulties come from the fact that the Treaties have been misapplied. More particularly, the various policies have been developed in an unbalanced way. There is thus a manifest imbalance between the reality of the common agricultural policy and the non-existence of the remaining policies. It can be clearly seen in a reading of the budget. Many of the difficulties come from this. The economy is a single whole, and if we want public opinion to support Community Europe then we must make all the Europeans feel concerned by it, not just the farmers.

There is a further imbalance between the economic and the political aspect. The founding fathers of Europe imagined that the economic Community would emerge spontaneously from political Europe. The mechanism did not function as had been hoped. Political Europe has remained a stunted growth. The euphoria of boom-time has evaporated, and Europe is left with neither soul nor hope. We therefore need new initiatives that will make each of the institutions really function in the spirit of the Treaties and restore hope to the peoples of Europe. The Commission must be restored to its role of initiator, for it is not meant to be merely a secretariat for the Council, top-heavy with technocrats whose numbers might well grow even further unless they are given real responsibilities.

We should also take cognizance of the role that should be played by Parliament, since the governments themselves have accepted that it should be elected by direct universal suffrage. I was happy, Mr President of the Council, to hear what you had to say on the role of Parliament and on the development of its powers through an improved conciliation procedure. I remember when I was President of this Parliament the Foreign Ministers who came here and the undertakings that they gave. We are still waiting for them to be kept.

But since you have raised the matter again, we are again filled with hope. I should be sorry, however, if rumours which trouble us should be confirmed as regards Parliament's budgetary powers and we expect to be reassured on that score.

(Applause)

But, to go on, the first duty of the Presidency now is to deal with these massive dossiers which are handed on from presidency to presidency and which are so absorbing that they affect the time-table and capture the imagination of the presidency. This package is — yes, you are right — the one to which I was referring just now, the agricultural policy, the budget, own resources, enlargement and the contributions of the States.

Yet, if we look at what is in dispute, it does seem that neither the essential interests that each Member State

Veil

must safeguard, nor the financial amounts involved, represent insurmountable obstacles to finding solutions, provided that everyone is prepared for compromise and really means the process to succeed.

For some, the preservation of the fundamental principles of the common agricultural policy is an unchallengeable axiom. For others, the priority is to readjust their contribution. For others still, the right way will be found in trying to improve the functioning of the institutions. There is no contradiction between these different demands. And this being so, is it not time, when this planet of ours has become a powder-keg, to sit round a table, not in order to score points for the benefit of the domestic electorate, but to try and save Europe and our nations?

(Applause)

Let our heads of government and our ministers understand this: if their names go down in history and if they earn the gratitude of future generations, it will be for having advanced the cause of Europe, not for fighting over pennies or defending the sectoral interests of this or that group of voters.

I will certainly not give advice today to the French Presidency, especially when it is exercised by such a seasoned European. But I shall allow myself to say to him that Europe will assert itself if we look not for what divides us, but rather for those things that unite.

Agreements worked out in the small hours by ministers exhausted by long marathons are destined not to outlive the dawn that greets them as they emerge from their meetings. For these concern questions of the moment, the solutions to which, reached as they are in arduous horse-trading, generally prove to be partial and temporary. There are some much more lasting and more important things on which the Europeans can unite: the defence of freedom and democracy in the world through more active and more committed political cooperation, the determination to strengthen peace by having the courage to declare that we should be seeing to our security together, and, last but not least, the welfare of our peoples to which we can contribute by giving Europe the capacity to face the technological challenge of the third industrial revolution.

It is to this, and to this alone indeed, that the Heads of State and of Government should devote their time, instead of debating quotas or monetary compensatory amounts — subjects whose complexity and importance escapes them, and we can hardly blame them for that. Here is the twin challenge facing the French Presidency today: to persuade its partners to engage in dialogue in a spirit of compromise so as to untangle at last that knotty skein which, once its threads are unravelled, will prove to be full, not of booby-traps, but of boons for everyone; secondly, to

induce the Heads of State and of Government to open the really important dossiers, the ones that are worthy of them and of the hopes our fellow-citizens placed in them when they elected them to take charge of their countries' affairs.

In keeping with this spirit, the French Presidency should refrain from initiatives calculated to persuade the French electorate that it would be ready to do so much for Europe, were it not for its over-cautious partners who are holding it back.

We have no need of bluff or of nationalistic and ideological point-scoring, and I was pleased to hear you say as much, Mr President of the Council.

The renewal of this Assembly's parliamentary mandates will coincide, within a few weeks, with the end of the French Presidency. This is no time for shilly-shallying, ambiguities or double-talk. All the partners must be made to face their responsibilities so that Europe can be saved from its decline in the midst of a dangerous world. For years now, the gap between reality and talk, between Europe's effective incapacity and its potential capabilities has been growing. It is time to stop these fruitless, but by no means harmless, games of which all European are the victims. It is time, too, to take action to restore confidence, not only to Europeans, but to all those who realize that Europe represents their last chance.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR NIKOLAOU

Vice-President

Mr Israël (DEP). — *(FR)* Minister, it gives us great pleasure to see you again in this Chamber because you have always been the European champion of development aid and this Assembly has always had excellent relations with you on this subject.

Today, on behalf of our country, you preside the Council of Ministers of the European Community. No one would question the sincerity of your convictions, nor even of the party of the government to which you belong, free as it is of outside ideological constraints. Sadly, however, as the experience of recent months has shown, the Council over which you preside today has no decision-making capability. It has abdicated in favour of the European Council, of the big countries which, you seem to believe, are alone capable of settling the quarrels of the small ones.

The Council has become the secretariat of the European Council and the Commission too, as Mrs Veil has just pointed out, has been reduced to the rank of the Council's secretariat. This interlocking puzzle-box of multiple secretariats is pointless and time-wasting.

Israël

You will not say so, but you are thinking no doubt that the Council's decision-making is gravely hampered by the unanimity rule and that there lies the root-cause of the stalemate in the Community. Well, this is then the challenge before the French Presidency: how to reconcile the vital interests of the States with the need to arrive at decisions in the general interest of the Community.

The majority principle has the merit of encouraging debate: it allows discussion to take place and obliges the parties to try to win over the other side by persuasion. When we try to persuade one another we shall, in many cases, achieve unanimous results. Unanimous and majority decisions will then be indistinguishable, but unanimity should not be imposed as an *a priori* rule.

You will also have to define what is to be meant by the 'vital interests of States'. The right of veto, which will have to be accepted for certain most exceptional cases, must really be made to serve the purpose for which it is intended. Mortal danger must not be invoked at every turn, one must not be allowed to cry 'Wolf!' at the approach of a miniature poodle. Mr Cheysson, we ask you to be firm.

(Applause)

The problem posed by the accession of Spain to the Community is an anguished one. There are imperatives which must be obeyed: not to refuse entry to a democratic country which has deep roots in European history; not to allow the Community's Mediterranean farmers, fishermen, shipyards to be ruined. But what is needed most of all is that there should be simultaneity between the accession of Spain and the launching of a Community industrial policy. The two issues must be linked, because only industrial development of a Europe of the Twelve can set off the difficulties in the agricultural area not to mention the budgetary problems connected with the British claims.

I suspect, rather than observe, Minister, the shadow of a smile around your lips. You must be saying to yourself that some Gaullists have undergone a thorough sea-change with respect to the European idea. Well, in today's thoroughly changed political context, we stand for a new European policy of security and defence, for an autonomous, independent policy based on our continent's right to take responsibility for its own defence. The French nuclear force, independent of its nature, should dovetail with an overall European strategy of effective deterrence.

The totalitarian threat facing Europe today is too grave and the dangers of subversion too real, to allow us to have any hesitations about organizing Europe's joint defence within the framework of the Atlantic Alliance and with Germany, of course, taking its full share of responsibility.

Mr President of the Council, you are going to do your best. But France can do even better than that. Do

better than you think you can, Mr Cheysson, do not let yourself be hemmed in by the burdens of your alliances. Please forgive me for speaking so frankly, but at this hour we need to be lucid and firm.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Bøgh (CDI). — *(DA)* Mr President, there is a special relationship between agricultural advantages and political pipedreams in the EEC. The worse things stand with the Community's much vaunted farm policy arrangements, the more inflated union plans and superpower ambitions become. And the further the Community's regulating machinery for agriculture sinks into the mire and the higher the union plans rise, the more sceptical Danes become towards the EEC. When a majority of Danish voters in 1972 allowed themselves to be talked into voting for Danish membership, it was for reasons of agricultural economics, not political reasons. And when an even greater majority today want Denmark out of the EEC, it is because the Community's agricultural provisions are a fiasco, and because the Community's thirst for political power has become a threat to Danish independence. We have reached a point where the so-called EEC advantage will soon be gone. EEC money in Denmark is not money we are to get but money we are to pay. And at the same time we are seeing, more than ever before, pressure being put on Danish politicians to endorse grandiose declarations on union, which perhaps give us a voice in former great powers but have the opposite effect in Denmark, which only survives by our adherence to our right to decide for ourselves.

The Danish EEC debate, which has continued through the years, is about to change, because the conditions for Danish entry have altered completely. The promised advantages have been replaced by disadvantages. I do not think that Danish voters will take the trouble to go to the polls on 14 June merely to vote on whether socialists, liberals or conservatives should occupy the 15 Danish seats out of the 434 here in the European Parliament. It goes without saying that that is an illusory notion. The elections in Denmark will be elections for or against continued Danish membership of the Community — a Community which means the distortion of the Danish economy and increasing Danish dependence on others. It is possible that the Community has advantages to offer other Member States. It becomes difficult if not impossible to find anything but disadvantages for Denmark, but an increasing number of people see that it is both necessary and possible for Denmark to leave the Community soon, and that is not a pipedream.

Mr Romualdi (NI). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the statement made by President Cheysson, whom I thank on behalf of the Italian polit-

Romualdi

ical Right, has convinced us — despite the very considerable doubt that exists, not only in France — that the French socialist government intends and will be able to represent not only the European socialists but indeed all Europeans, and will defend the interests of the Community in this grave moment of crisis, taking the necessary political, economic, financial and social steps regardless of all ideological considerations, and seeking the best way — and the most concrete way — to put the Community back again on the rails — as Mr Cheysson said, thinking perhaps of the Athens derailment — and solve, or start to solve, the problems of greatest urgency and importance, whether they are institutional or economic, social or financial, or problems to do with cooperation, the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal, or North-South and East-West relations — all the problems, in short, that are typical of the difficulties and grave state of crisis and danger in which we find ourselves.

We are sure that experience will help President Cheysson to look on the Athens failure in the same way as the many other failures that have attended almost all summits in recent years and which have shown — as Mrs Veil said here a short time ago — that the European Council may be an important high level political assembly, but is not a valid body for tackling the practical problems of the Community and its particular policies. Moreover, a summit failure will not bring the Community crumbling in pieces about our ears: the Community, in spite of the political poverty and shortsightedness of some of our governments and their lack of individual will, has indeed other forces which support it and enable it to continue on the road ahead, strengthened by the will of its peoples who, despite their disappointments, continue to consider an integrated Europe as the only trump card for resolving the crisis and ensuring a future worth winning and living in.

And I am convinced that — despite everything — the forthcoming elections will show this to be so. True, the way ahead is not easy, the road is long and beset with obstacles. But if the peoples of Europe expect — and this seems to be their wish — to become once again a great economic power, able to keep abreast of the most advanced technology to which President Cheysson also referred a short time ago, and able to accept the challenges that face us daily from the United States and Japan, there is no other way. Just as there is equally no other way if Europe is to play an active, responsible part in the difficult dialogue for security and peace between the great superpowers.

Of course, we have also to be more united in order to be able to vindicate more credibly our capability and freedom of decision, as well as our interest in knowing, for example, and making an independent appraisal of, the status and importance of the present political and economic situation in Russia and the

countries of the Eastern Bloc, and their initiatives. It remains a fundamental principle that peace is above all a question of security, and that security is not so much a question of disarmament, which is moreover impossible, but one of a balance of powers closely linked to the spirit and real commitments of an alliance, wherein loyalty does not mean subordination to anyone, still less a restriction of the sovereignty and freedom of individuals and nations, but means, instead, an awareness of responsibilities, of duties, which in the case of an alliance such as the one to which we belong follow for everyone — starting with the United States of America.

Of course — and I hope that during the Stockholm Conference we shall be able to make this clear — one's attitude in an alliance is an important question affecting the dignity and due awareness of one's own interests, as well as one's own particular capabilities.

But let no-one think that the problem can be tackled from outside. For Europeans — for all Europeans — there is no longer, outside the Alliance, that world of neutral States that we still hear so much about — now more than ever before — from certain impressive pacifist movements. There can, alas! only be the world of the subjects of another alliance, a very much worse, more dangerous one! The policy of power blocks is a monstrous policy, ladies and gentlemen, but how much worse is the policy of those who believe, or pretend to believe, that they can live in freedom, in dignity and in safety amongst the blocks, without arms.

Mr Jaquet (S). — (FR) Mr President, Mr President of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, the French Presidency is taking over with the Community in a state of crisis. Some will say, after all it is no more than another crisis. It is true enough that since the first Community, the Coal and Steel Community, came into being, Europe has undergone many sore trials and, so far, it has come through. But each of these successive crises has left the Community weakened and less confident of its future.

Today the hour of truth has struck. This trial is a decisive one and at least it has the merit of putting everyone squarely in the face of his responsibilities. What kind of Europe do we want? In the aftermath of the war, the aims of the first founders of the European undertaking were clear enough: they wanted to create a Community to which everybody would give his best, as much at the economic level as at the social, political and cultural. In this way, they believed, the nations rising from the ruins of war would forge their common destiny for the benefit of all. We have to admit today that we are still a long way from achievement of those aims.

Yes, the customs union exists. Yes, an agricultural policy, imperfect though it is, has been worked out; yes, we have done something for the Third World.

Jaquet

But in all the other areas, what do we see? No consistent policy has emerged. True, in some sectors joint measures have been put into effect. But for the most part they are far short of the overall aims, and because of that they are costly and often not very effective.

What has happened is that while we looked to a Europe of joint policies and common rules, we have had a free-trading Europe thrust upon us. Perhaps that was what some people wanted, but I am convinced that it was not in the interest of Europe properly understood. Anyway, the facts are there, and they cannot be denied.

In the far, as well as in the more recent past, our continent played a crucial role in the progress of the world. Here was the cradle of the first industrial revolution, yet today we experience a slow but progressive decay, going back for many decades. In the economic area we have been overtaken by the United States; now this is also true of Japan. We wait with justified impatience for economic recovery to reach us from across the Atlantic, but we remain powerless in the face of the unprecedented dominance of the dollar. The inevitable consequence is the dreadful scourge of unemployment which is becoming less and less bearable for each of our countries.

No doubt, had we succeeded in building a European Community in accordance with our initial aims we would not be at this pass. But our nations, still too ignorant of solidarity and no longer able to face the exigencies of the modern world, are proving incapable of rising to the great challenges of our time.

These, I believe, are the distant but real roots of the present crisis. It did not start in Athens. It has been present, in a more or less latent state, for a long time now. The last summit merely served to reveal it. Shall we succeed in overcoming it? If, tragically, we should have to answer 'no', our common future would be sombre indeed. Perhaps we would keep an administration in Brussels, but it would be a management with precious little to manage. Perhaps we would still retain a parliamentary assembly, but it would have little serious business to debate. The Community itself would become little more than a fiction. I refuse to countenance such a hypothesis. And because I do, I am putting my full trust in the French Presidency. I know how well it understands the importance of what is at stake. I am convinced that it will do its utmost to overcome this crisis and give a new impetus to the Community. What precisely are the difficulties it must overcome? The President of the Council has listed them at length. There must be reform of the common agricultural policy. It is a fact that in recent years there has been a technological revolution which has changed the face of European agriculture, resulting in surpluses in some sectors.

This fact must become the starting point for new solutions which will preserve the family farm. The common agricultural policy is founded on three fundamental principles: unity of the market, Community preference and financial solidarity. Obviously, none of them must be infringed.

It is clear that the question of the British contribution represents a difficult problem. A solution must be found, but it must be concordant with the Community spirit and obey the norms by which we are ruled.

The negotiations on enlargement will undoubtedly be examined in detail at the coming European Council. These negotiations, which have been dragging too long, are now getting down to the real issues. These are essentially of a technical nature and do not seem of insurmountable difficulty. If the political will is there, and if all the Community countries are prepared to make the necessary financial effort, we should, on this point too, find a favourable solution. At the same time we must introduce a number of new policies, for it is no longer tolerable that the only common policy should exist in the agricultural field and that the bulk of our budget should thus go on agricultural expenditure.

We must therefore make an effort in two directions: in the social area, where naturally the main preoccupation is the problem of unemployment, and in the areas of industry and technology where we must try to meet the demands of the third industrial revolution. In fact, the French Government has put forward proposals to this effect. Only recently it has submitted a plan for the creation of a common industrial and technological area; it will have all the more reason to champion the cause before its partners.

Finally, we shall have to find a solution to the problem of own resources. This is a crucial matter, because it will determine the success of all the negotiations. All the reforms proposed will cost money and we have already reached the ceiling of 1% VAT. Let us not delude ourselves that savings — necessary as they are — in the agricultural sector will be enough to meet the needs of which we have spoken. So we must make up our minds to exceed the 1% ceiling.

These, then, are the problems calling for rapid solution. They are all interconnected and represent a single coherent and indivisible whole. If, as I fervently hope and wish to believe, the next summit allows us to overcome them propitiously, we shall be over the worst. But that will not mean that the French Presidency's task is over. Between March and June other initiatives must be taken. It would be most desirable to improve political cooperation. Tangible progress has already been made and it is significant that the present President of the Council was able yesterday in Stockholm to speak in the name of the Ten. But we must do more and we must do better in this area.

Jaquet

We should also give priority attention to the negotiations for Lomé III. The French Presidency has just told us that it intends to have improvements in the new convention, both quantitative and qualitative. I was very pleased to hear that.

Lastly, I was also happy to hear the statements by the President of the Council on the need for improving relations between the Council and Parliament. It is true that this Assembly is enjoying growing prestige, but it does not yet enjoy a sufficiency of powers that such prestige dictates and that it is entitled to demand in view of its responsibilities.

Those, Mr President, are the remarks I wished to contribute to this debate. I said at the beginning of my speech that we had arrived at a decisive moment. It is usually in moments of decision and in the realization of what is at stake that the inevitable bold solutions are most readily accepted. I have full confidence in my Socialist friends that they will find these solutions and make them succeed.

(Applause)

Mr Notenboom (PPE). — *(NL)* I listened to your statement, Mr Cheysson, with approval and emotion. On behalf of my group I should now like to follow our chairman, Mr Pflimlin, and devote a few minutes to the financial questions.

Europe is, of course, more than a budget, but the budgetary problems are undoubtedly such at the moment that, unless action is taken, unless rapid decisions are taken, they may bring the Community to a standstill and even affect and destroy what has been achieved. That is why, Minister, you rightly spent so much time on this subject, because solutions to both the short-term and the medium-term problems must be found during your Presidency. In the short term we expect the Council to take decisions, particularly on agriculture, which enable the 1984 budget to be implemented and payments to be made, through changes to the structure of the budget, on which Parliament invited the Commission to submit proposals before 15 January.

The consensus in the Council, Commission and Parliament that the rise in agricultural spending must be less than the increase in existing own resources should act as a guide in this respect. Unless rigorous decisions are taken, the 1984 budget cannot be implemented and the agricultural policy cannot be paid for. That might have extremely adverse effects and do permanent damage to the common agricultural policy. It is therefore better to take painful decisions and accept losses of income now and not to look for a way out by reducing national financing or national contributions now in order to escape budgetary and political discipline. In the Council the Member States must make these instruments available so that the Community can be maintained in good order. Otherwise, deterioration is not simply hypothetical.

During the French Presidency a decision must also be taken on future own resources, so that the Community has future prospects, subject to strict conditions and in a Community way, not through financing outside the budget, as Mr Pflimlin, now in the Chair, said before me.

I detect in your statement, Mr Cheysson, I am pleased to say, elements which I would regard as being geared more to the 'quality of Community expenditure'. It must be established whether all expenditure is a consequence of Community policy, whether all spending is efficient. The European Court of Auditors is providing more and more useful material in this respect, and we are grateful for this. I believe that Parliament is willing to undertake this analysis, this investigation, Mr President, but the Council must involve Parliament in the drawing up of guidelines, in new and stricter budgetary discipline. Parliament has been given budgetary powers and you, Mr Cheysson, were very closely involved in this process as a highly esteemed Commissioner, and, as you will appreciate, we cannot, of course, surrender the powers we have attained. In fact, they must be increased.

So far, however, the Budget Council and Parliament have not had a conciliation meeting to discuss the quality of expenditure. The Budget Council has, for example, never discussed such reports as that drawn up by Mr Pfennig on what expenditure should be included in the budget and what expenditure should not be included. When the Council chooses to do so — and I hope that you will encourage it so to do, Minister — when the Council of Budget Ministers chooses to do so, I believe Parliament will be quite prepared to discuss the matter, and the emphasis on purely quantitative increases in the budget will wane.

Your country and mine, Minister, and other Member States too have discovered that economic and social salvation is not to be found in simply increasing government spending time and again. We must abandon that idea. Do you not think that the majority of this Parliament has learnt this lesson? And yet we want the ceiling on own resources raised, on certain conditions, so that the Community does not get bogged down and what has been achieved does not go into decline. The additional own resources must be used to finance expenditure which will — as Mr Pflimlin has just said — ease the burden on national budgets, remove grave imbalances, enable new Member States to join the Community and, Minister, ladies and gentlemen, finance policies which continue to give Europe its rightful economic and political place in the world, now and in the next century.

Some redistribution of public spending between national and European budgets will also be needed. This will be politically and technically difficult, but it is the obvious course to take and one that can be

Notenboom

taken given political will and political courage. My group and most Members of Parliament are certainly ready and willing to participate in these consultations. The Member States must realize that what we want is in everyone's interest, but the Member States do not have a great deal of time to pluck up and show political courage. I have confidence, Minister, in the French spirit and French skill, in your imagination and precision, in your contribution *à découvrir des compromis*. You, Minister, must have confidence in the *esprit* and *conscience européenne* of this Parliament.

IN THE CHAIR : MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

Mr Møller (ED). — (DA) Mr President-in-Office, many of us here remember when you sat on this side of the chamber. You now sit on the other side, and we welcome you and hope that the speech you gave today will also prove capable of being translated into action.

It has indeed become apparent during the past year, during the most recent presidencies, that the capacity of the presidency for taking action is too weak. National interests have been too strong. The presidency may have had the best of intentions, but it has been too weak. It was as though the previous presidency, that of Greece, had entirely mislaid the sword with which King Alexander in his time cut through the Gordian Knot. Budget problems and financial questions, bookkeeping matters, have become the Gordian Knot which we are no longer able to untie but for which we perhaps need a President who can cut through it, so that we will have regained Alexander's sword, even if not in the hands of a Greek President.

You will be welcome for that, for we want to return to the European development which was in progress before it all became bogged down in frustrating concern for bookkeeping matters, in wranglings over net receipts and net payments between the Member States of the Community. We want to return to the development of Europe, to the Europe of the citizens, the Europe we dreamed of when we were young, a Europe in which the freedom and possibilities of the citizens were being extended and in which new chances were really being offered to the young, the new generations. We want to return to a Europe moving towards free frontiers, where we are not confined within our own compartments in a situation, everyone growing up in a State compartment and only having the State itself to think of and be interested in. Freedom of movement for people and goods across the frontiers in our Europe must be the objective, and we must achieve it soon. We have advanced so far through the Community's history that this business of

having to show a passport issued by a public authority in order to travel from one country in the Community to another is truly an anachronism. It militates against the very spirit of the Community, against the promise enshrined in the Treaty itself.

We therefore expect you, Mr President-in-Office, to make an effort to rid us of the passport obligation between our countries. We must ensure that freedom of trade becomes a reality, that technical barriers are effectively removed and phased out in those countries which still flirt with the idea of introducing technical barriers to trade or attempt to do so now and then. The Commission must be the guardian of the Treaty and its provisions and ensure that no country can return to the protectionism of former times. We must introduce a common labour market, which again means that the citizens must have greater freedom with more possibilities in the new Europe we are to create than they had in the old Europe in which they grew up confined within the State framework, subject to State authority. But it is not only the Europe of the citizens we have to create, it was not only that we dreamed of, with the greater possibilities it afforded, the greater freedom for each human being, for the individual, it was also the Europe of peace we dreamed of. It was the reaction against the Europe of wars, the European history we learned in our time. It was a history which for 2000 years had told of European wars. That was what we had to learn about the history of Europe when we went to school. It was the wars, war after war, in which millions of people were killed for petty national interests, which were not worth that sacrifice. That is something the major European nations recognized at the end of the Second World War.

Mr President-in-Office, you are right in saying that the political will must be there, but it must also be based on a deep conviction that Europe has something not just to give to people but also to give to the future, namely peace. We must of course take an interest in East-West discussions on the reduction of tactical weapons and in discussions on the Middle East. Here Europe must again speak with authority, but with an authority which can give Europe a new influence.

We must maintain the line that you, not least as a Commissioner, sought to apply in relation to the developing countries, in relation to the Third World, the new world. A development in which Europe took its responsibility seriously and took upon itself the task of helping these new people, who had lived under European colonial domination, to move towards new development, new possibilities, a new future.

We must also work towards an extension of the Community, Mr President-in-Office. It is perhaps here that it will be most difficult for the new President-in-Office of the Council to give effect to his

Møller

political will, for it is his government which shows most reluctance towards the idea of an extension of the Community. But we have always said that the Europe we are to create must not be the club of the rich. There must also be a possibility for poor countries of Europe, European countries with fewer resources, with lower standards of living than ours, to join the Community. Now Spain and Portugal are knocking on our door; we must not close it against them, we must not slam it shut. It must be opened, even if it is not to be thrown open wide, at least wide enough to let them gain entry.

Mr President-in-Office, in presenting these considerations, it was my concern to supplement and build upon what I understand by the Europe of the citizens, the Europe of peace. The Europe we dreamed of when we were young, at the end of the Second World War, the Europe which was to rise up over the ruins of the Second World War, the ruins of the Europe of wars. With these remarks, Mr President-in-Office, I wish you all possible health and happiness in the coming half-year.

(Applause)

Mr Segre (COM), — (IT) Mr President, the President of the Council has certainly not attempted to spare our feelings with the realistic and hence valuable picture that he has painted. The same can also be said of the overall picture of the motives underlying the principles set forth: it is a truly broad picture.

Once upon a time, in Italy, and perhaps not only in Italy, when Prime Ministers presented very wide ranging programmes, we used to refer to them as 'dream books' even though the period of office was not restricted to six months. Today, in Europe, there is very little reason to dream. The crisis is serious and, as the President has recognized, it could even have fatal consequences. Today, being ambitious and being realists means in the first place facing up with all the necessary commitment to the double challenge of the Community's internal and external crises. The first is a crisis of existence, the second, one of identity: yet they are both crises, to surmount which, reviewing with institutional courage everything that must be reviewed, we have to resume the pursuit of economic and political integration, the enlargement of the Community, and East-West, North-South, and Euro-Arab dialogue. And, since it is the prerequisite of the everything else, affirmation of an independent entity — the Europe of the Ten, and tomorrow of the Twelve — as a factor for peace and progress.

No-one in the world today can claim to be judged only on the goodness of their own intentions. Everyone is judged by his concrete achievements, by what he really does.

Europe as well — especially after Athens — is and will be judged according to these principles. Let us

ensure that it will not be condemned by the developments of history, and with that in view let us therefore all come down off the rostrum, with its declarations that are as vague as they are high-sounding, and come finally to grips with the problems that cannot be allowed to fester any longer awaiting solution.

Europe is entitled to expect a great deal from France, from the French Presidency, from the presidency of a France that is under socialist management. Do not disappoint it, Mr President of the Council, because that would be another, more serious blow to the construction of Europe!

Mr Nyborg (DEP). — (DA) Mr President-in-Office, I have also listened to your speech and have tried to draw the consequences from it. Economic independence and freedom in Western Europe — as has also been stated — are a precondition for us to be able to play a part freely and without constraint in the international political arena. But I must say that it does not unfortunately look particularly promising for the competitiveness of Europe's industries on the world market. Japan and the United States have run ahead of us and are still running ahead, and there are two reasons for that. To begin with, the European Community lags behind in the introduction of new technology, new production methods and new ideas. Secondly, we have hitherto regrettably only had a European home market on paper, which is why we do not exploit the advantages to be gained from large-scale operation. We do not exploit the advantages we could enjoy if the European home market was a reality, if our industries could base their research, planning and development on a market base of 270 million individuals instead of the national populations. It makes an immense difference if costs can be spread over a market base of 10, 30, 40, 50 million people or 270 million. Here in my view the French Presidency has a major task to perform, for France has not shown any particular eagerness with regard to the implementation of the European home market. So we have great expectations of the French Presidency, and I hope we shall not be too disappointed.

I must also say that I find it completely inane and idiotic to allow huge economic resources to be squandered on paperwork and waiting times at our internal frontiers. This badly needs remedying.

Time unfortunately does not allow me to raise all the many points I should like to raise, but let me say that it emerged quite clearly at the Athens meeting that there is a lack of political will and courage among the top politicians to make progress. I have therefore gradually come to the conclusion that it will be necessary to appeal to our populations to exert pressure on the political parties, which can in turn exert pressure to bring about the political will and the political courage which are so catastrophically lacking today.

Mr Blaney (CDI). — Mr President, may I first of all join with other Members in wishing the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Cheysson, the very best during his six-month term. Might I also say that many of the things he said I could applaud and would have applauded some five or ten years ago, but I am afraid that today, rather cynically, I no longer follow quite the same line of thought. He talks about 1984 being the year of Europe, notably with the election coming up in June, and he talks about a time for examination of conscience. I would say to the President-in-Office of the Council that he, particularly as a French President of the Council, has the opportunity and, indeed, the challenge to try and save the EEC, for, as I see it, I cannot but talk as an angry, disappointed, disillusioned Member of this European Parliament almost five years after the elections of 1979, and I do so because those ideals which were talked about today by the President-in-Office and others, those ideals of convergence, of closing the gap between richer and poorer, have proved to be an illusion, a sad illusion so far as my country and my electorate are concerned.

It is as on these grand ideals contained in the Treaty of Rome that we in Ireland went to the polls in 1979, and had one of the highest turn-outs of any country in the Community on that occasion. Indeed, in 1973 when we were deciding whether or not to join, it was on the grand conceptions contained in the Treaty of Rome that we had the highest percentage of votes to join Europe of any country that had attempted such a referendum up to that date. We did so on the realistic basis that in order to avail ourselves of what was held out to us as the great market for our prime industry, agriculture, we should have to pay the penalty of reducing our protectionism, abolishing our tariffs and allowing free trade within our country.

We have done this, but what has the Community done to our major industry? They have brought it to its knees, and it is now facing disaster as a result not only of what was announced by the Commissioner for agriculture here today but indeed of what has been contained in the proposals from the Commission over these last six or seven months — all of it being presented to us as a necessary part of balancing the budget. Is it not rather the case that it is the major countries, the major multinational manufacturing giants who are calling the tune, who are, in fact, flooding the Community with produce that could be supplied by our own agriculture in the Community, in order to get free access for their manufactured goods to North America and to countries in the Third World? All in the name of humanity and, so far as the Third World is concerned, all under the aegis of that sacrosanct sacred cow that is now the GATT, under which everything that has ever been agreed, regardless of what damage it is doing to members of the Community, is allowed to stand.

I want to say to Mr Cheysson that he has not only the challenge, he has the requisite knowledge and experience culled by French representatives over the years, to try and protect the small family farms of which my country is largely composed and on which our economy almost entirely depends. Take that away, as you are now doing, and disaster faces that economy. Are we then in my country to accept this, to accept it as part of the price of being Europeans, so that we become almost an extinct nation?

This we are not prepared to do, and I feel that after Mr Dalsager's announcement on prices today and that which will follow, there is nothing open to my government at home when the time comes but to use that blunted and deadly instrument of the veto and to say, if we are going down, as we *are* going down as a result of machinations within the Community, then let us take it all down together! That I do not want. That is not why I am here, but that is the way it appears to me and to a great deal of my electorate, whom I, unfortunately, with others from my country will be facing again in June with the record of nothing but a trail of disaster behind us over the last four years.

Mr Psemazoglou (NI). — (FR) With conviction and enthusiasm, the President-in-Office of the Council has traced for us a comprehensive and detailed picture of the areas and the particular Community measures in which the degree of convergence appears high.

But what he has told us of the strategy that France proposes to adopt to obtain the agreement necessary for recovery is not enough.

How does the President-in-Office intend to secure the political will essential for an overall agreement sufficiently powerful to set in motion the dynamic of a throughgoing European revival?

I have the following observations to make on this.

First point: the revival and continuous strengthening of the Community's economy requires an active and effective policy for reducing inequalities within the Community and for accelerating growth in the weaker regions, especially in the Mediterranean South, which are of particular importance for the whole of Europe.

Second point: decisions in economic policy and decisions in political cooperation are interdependent, as the President-in-Office has said, but his statement does not sufficiently stress the organic link between Europe's common external policy and security.

Third point: the strengthening of our economic policies and modernization policies is intimately related to the reform and strengthening of our institutions. This Parliament has drawn up a plan for such a fundamental reform. We hope that this important initiative will receive the necessary attention from the Presidency.

Pesmazoglou

All of us in this Parliament, Mr President, having been elected by our peoples to this great institution which is the embodiment of our beliefs and our democratic spirit, must take serious responsibility for ensuring that Europe's second breath is a powerfully reviving one.

The French Presidency gives us hope for that decisive leap which will take the European construction out of its negative and harmful stagnation into an autonomous Europe of peace, democracy and economic and social progress.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, ladies and gentlemen! It is perfectly correct when the President of the Council points out that what we have been calling the European crisis has been with us for a long time. When the 1980 budget was rejected by this House in December 1979, we forecast what would happen if the necessary reforms were not introduced as a matter of urgency. Almost four years ago, on 30 May 1980, a mandate was issued asking for proposals to solve the manifest crisis. Since then, the Council has unfortunately persisted in its procrastination. But I place my hopes on two declarations made when France assumed the presidency of the Council. Firstly: the President-in-Office said that we should stop setting up special councils and leave the real work to the councils as constituted in the Treaty of Rome. The Commission makes proposals and it is up to the Council to take decisions and it should not try to transfer this responsibility onto any sort of special council. I hope, Mr President-in-Office, that your declaration will lead to concrete results.

Secondly, I attach importance to what your President François Mitterand said in connection with the Athens summit. He said that it was wrong for the European Council to be asked to deal with matters of detail that should be handled by the councils. I hope that this view will prevail. The European Council is bound to fail if it has to deal with trivia. The European Council must take the basic policy decisions and the individual councils are the place for concrete, detailed decisions. I hope that these declarations by the French Presidency will be put into practice in the European Community — and then I think the institutional organization will work better.

We, in particular the Socialist Group, have consistently warned that with the rising costs of agricultural policy and with no clear decisions on other problems, it was clear that the Community would bankrupt itself and that this would lead to the downfall of the common agricultural policy. The common agricultural policy cannot be saved by those who constantly argue for higher farm prices, but only by those who advocate reforms to eliminate surpluses, because this is the only way to save this policy.

A year ago in this House, the German President-in-Office of the Council announced that almost all the problems would be solved by the summer of 1983. All that happened was that the problems were nicely gift-wrapped in Stuttgart and passed on from the German Presidency to the Greek Presidency. A year ago I accused my Foreign Minister of promising too much and was taken to task for this by my colleagues Mr Rumor and Mrs von Alemann. These reproaches were unfortunately unjustified: I was right. I am therefore very grateful, President-in-Office, that you have given a clear analysis of current problems without making too many grandiose promises that cannot be met. We would be satisfied if, during the next six months, at least some of the problems could be solved and we could recognize where we are going in future.

Mr President-in-Office, my group supports nearly all the political aims you mention. All these great ideals are right, and they have been mentioned in various ways here today. But occasionally there is an undertone in the discussion that disturbs me. You yourself said that economies were necessary, but should not be overdone. Others have said that negligible sums of money must not stand in the way of Europe and Mrs Simone Veil said that we should take decisions on major issues, not on milk quotas. I think that this could give rise to a false impression. If we cannot balance our own budget, then we are not capable of solving much greater problems or, to put it bluntly, if we spend less money on combating youth unemployment in Europe than on feeding skimmed-milk powder to calves, then we cannot be expected to realize the great European goal and ideals. Let us first put our own house in order before we demand greater things of others.

This idea was reflected in the President-in-Office's speech and I felt it was really necessary to remind ourselves of it. I should therefore like to reiterate the demands of the Socialist Group to the presidency: first of all we must put our agricultural policy in order, i.e. take firm steps to prevent surpluses, above all of milk, cereals, fruit and meat. I would like to give two examples to demonstrate the nonsense and untruths that are being put about. The farmers' unions are currently claiming that the Commission's proposed prices will lead to an intolerable situation and that farmers have already had to bear great burdens in the past. I have the latest figures for my country, West Germany, before me. In 1983, the milk levy rose by 6.5% compared to 1982. In addition, milk prices increased by 3.2%. This means that in 1983 alone, 9.9% more money came into Germany for milk than in 1982. Hardly any other area of the economy has had such increases and after all what is at issue is merely the reduction of surplus production.

In relation to this matter I would like to direct a special request to the French Presidency: Community agricultural statistics show that last year small family

Arndt

holdings grew by 3 %, whereas the large-scale holdings had increased earnings of approx. 30 %. My group cannot accept more and more money being given to large-scale agricultural businesses which flood the market with agricultural products. Agricultural reform must ensure a complete change of course so that small and medium-sized holdings can survive, so that it is not possible for the large farmers to make high profits and then present small farmers as an example of how badly-off agriculture is. We want an agricultural policy which benefits small and medium-sized farms and not the large businesses.

Secondly, we wish to eliminate the imbalance in the budget which provides two thirds of funds for the agricultural policy and not even a quarter to combat unemployment. I am aware that this can only be achieved along with our third demand, namely a fairer distribution of the advantages and burdens of the Community by means of long-term solutions which do not favour richer countries over poorer countries. The majority of our group voted against the way the question of Britain's contribution was being handled by the Commission and the Council. But we must be clear about one thing: it is scandalous to expect Great Britain, with a gross national product below the Community average to pay for the Community without an acceptable return. This scandal must be brought to an end. I can only say to Mr Bøgh, who tried to claim that the Danes suffer from the common agricultural policy and the European Community that I have seldom experienced such barefaced mendacity: the Danes receive more money for agriculture alone than they pay into the European Community. This is the scandal that must end and a state of affairs that must be sorted out.

Our fourth demand is that Spain and Portugal should be admitted to the Community as soon as possible. The Socialist Group wishes to stress that Spain and Portugal have a right to membership of the European Community without preconditions: we cannot say that the finances have to be in order and this and that must be settled. The political decision comes first, then the financial.

Our fifth demand, related to these decisions, is that the percentage of value-added tax should be raised.

Mr President-in-Office, in conclusion, I would like to refer to a few points that came in the debate. For example, Mrs Veil said that under no circumstances must there be any interference with Parliament's budgetary rights. I agree entirely! But I would ask Mrs Veil to ensure that the following also does not occur: the agriculture ministers decide on agricultural policy and both sections of the budgetary authority have to submit to these decisions. In this way, previous practice has seriously restricted Parliament's budgetary rights. In future, the agriculture ministers must conform to the decisions of the budgetary authorities

when making their decisions, which must remain within the framework set by the budgetary authority.

Mr President-in-Office, the whole of this House gives you its best wishes. We wish you every success. Seldom was this wish so unanimous. We trust that the French Presidency of the Council will be fortunate enough to achieve all the great European goals that have been mentioned during this debate. Good luck to you, us and the Commission in our progress towards a united Europe!

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, membership of any particular political party by those in authority should not be of any significance for Europeans when we are deciding on the future of our part of the world. Even those who do not share the views of the present French government on cultural and economic policies have hopes of a Council presidency that is known to be deeply committed to Europe. I wish to welcome France to the presidency and assure the President-in-Office that the European People's Party will do all in its power to support vigorous measures towards political and economic unification. Such initiatives are urgently needed now that the failure of the Athens summit has deeply disappointed the people of Europe. It has been recognized that it is the national bureaucracies which are hindering progress because they cling to their old-fashioned concept of nation States. Their lack of political will is threatening everything. I appeal to Parliament to take action, now that the governments have failed. I am far from happy about this situation. I would prefer it if 'we' were less popular and the governments could be praised for their commitment.

A European future is not so much a technical or institutional problem, but rather a question of political will. Institutionally, only one point really matters at the moment: the nonsensical requirement of unanimity in the Council. In a democracy — and we want a democratic Europe — the demand for unanimity is unjustified. Pluralism and unanimity are mutually exclusive. The history of Poland with its *Liberum Veto* prove that a demand for political unanimity is the first step towards catastrophe. Parliament manages to solve problems, even where agriculture and budgetary matters are concerned, but as soon as the Council has to tackle them they become insoluble. We are looking to Paris for a sign, which is urgently needed. Mrs Thatcher was right when she said that Great Britain did not join the Community principally for economic reasons, but for security reasons. The choice, at a time of international crisis, is: major power, or battlefield. Wars always start where there is an unsettled area of small States, such as the Balkans or along the Danube. The same applies to the economy. We bemoan the crisis but we forget how much worse it would be if the Community did not exist: for a start we would have at least 3 million more unemployed. We expect France to demonstrate

Habsburg

its political will. As Chancellor Kohl is a real European and will do all in his power to support Paris, our hopes are justified. We are counting on real progress and clarification of the question of Council unanimity. This should give us the political impulse we need.

I would like to make very brief comments, Mr President-in-Office, on four of the points in your speech :

Enlargement to the south : I am disappointed by what I have heard, which was simply a repetition of what we all know. The new concept we need was missing.

Lomé III : I would ask you to attach greater importance than in the past in negotiations to the question of human rights.

Central and Eastern Europe : thank you for not forgetting those of our people who are separated from us by a foreign occupation. I hope you will continue to remember them and if I may add a personal comment : Hungary should not be confused with Eastern Europe.

I am also grateful that you devoted serious attention to cooperation with the European Parliament, in particular with its Political Affairs Committee.

(FR) Mr President-in-Office, I do not need to prove to you, I am sure, that I have always been a friend of France. I expect great things of the country of Robert Schumann and General de Gaulle. I have not forgotten that it was the historical reconciliation of the French and German nations in the spirit of the speech of Bordeaux that laid one of the strongest foundations for European unity. In this spirit, I would like to express my dismay over certain incidents that have happened on the roads of France, which violate the letter and the spirit of the common market.

I am well aware, Mr President-in-Office, that governments are not always responsible for what extremists may do, but what happened to the English and Dutch meat cargoes was very unfortunate and provoked doubts as to France's European intentions.

I would ask you to take steps to put a stop to these illegal actions. Your partners would be grateful.

(DE) Mr President-in-Office, we have confidence in your political will. We as Europeans hope that at the end of your presidency, we will be able to thank you with all our hearts.

(Applause)

Lord Douro (ED). — Mr President, I want to start by saying a few words about the budget. There is nothing which has so demeaned the Community in the last decade as the bitter quarrels between the United Kingdom and the other Member States about budget

contributions. After the world economic recession, it has probably been the single most serious brake on the development of the Community. It has given no pleasure to those who believe that the United Kingdom is an integral part of the EEC. These quarrels must not continue.

One of the most challenging tasks of the French Presidency will be to try to resolve the so-called British problem. It must be a long-term solution so that the nightmare does not recur two years later. It must be a solution which limits the size of a Member State's contribution to a percentage of some index, such as gross national product.

I am quite certain that if any other Member State were making a net contribution of comparable size to that of Britain, it also would feel aggrieved. So the most fervent hope of my group is that before the Brussels Summit in March, the French Presidency will make some real progress towards achieving a long-term solution.

Unfortunately there is also a short-term problem with which the President-in-Office of the Council will be very familiar. The European Parliament decided in December to put the agreed refunds to Germany and to the United Kingdom into the reserve Chapter 100. For the money to be disbursed two procedures must be concluded. Firstly, the necessary regulations must be enacted. This would have happened anyway, whether or not the amounts had been put in Chapter 100. The draft regulations, as proposed by the Commission, are now being considered by the various competent committees of the Parliament. Mr Lange, the chairman of the Committee on Budgets, intends that Parliament should complete its consideration of these regulations in February.

Secondly, the necessary transfers from Chapter 100 to the spending lines must be approved. Parliament has the last word on these transfers on account of their classification as non-obligatory expenditure. We hope these transfers will be approved during March. But it would be wrong of me, Mr President, not to say to the President-in-Office and to all Members of the European Parliament that the political consequences of any failure, for whatever reason, to disburse the money by 31 March would be extremely serious. We respect absolutely Parliament's rights in the budgetary procedure. Indeed, I am very glad that the President-in-Office of the Council confirmed that there will be no attempt to tamper with these budgetary rights.

We also wholly support Parliament's desire for an end to the annual *ad hoc* payments. I am quite sure the British Government will do everything it can to agree with the Commission ways of spending the money so that it conforms to Community policy and to priorities established by Parliament. However, both arms of the budgetary authority must understand the significance of the date of 31 March.

Douro

Mr President, in the short time remaining to me I would like to comment briefly on enlargement. I am rapporteur for the Political Affairs Committee on the subject of enlargement, and in that capacity I very much welcome the statement by the President-in-Office that the Community cannot leave the applicant States any longer in a state of expectancy. Indeed, that was one of the points of his speech that I think received the broadest support in this House.

He went on to refer to the Accession Treaty being balanced. Well, of course, the EEC as a whole is many times larger than Spain or Portugal on their own, and I hope that the President-in-Office, when he undertakes these negotiations and discussions, will be as understanding and magnanimous as his position allows him to be.

When we resolve our internal problems within the Community, we have an unfulfilled obligation and duty to accept these two countries. I am sure the President-in-Office is aware of this and will use his experience and skill to conclude the negotiations during the important six months of his Presidency of the Council.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — (*GR*) Mr President, I want to mention the fact that although the President-in-Office is a socialist minister in a socialist government he drew applause from the conservative and reactionary side of the House. The reason is not difficult to find. The Members on that side of the House recognized that his speech was nothing more than an expression of ideas and aims, and assertion of wishful thinking about solutions for all the Community's problems — with a different style, of course, than we have been accustomed to from other presidencies, with the exception of the Greek Presidency. The programme is strictly within the framework of the interests of the ruling class in the Community as a whole and in each of its member countries, and the statement rested on this narrow ground either out of design or because it was impossible for it to be any other way. Looking at it from that angle we doubt very much whether any of these ideas and aims which are transmogrified into wishful thinking and recipes will lead to anything concrete since they are only a reiteration of what has been said for the last 25 years. And if someone were to say that Mr Cheysson's personality and experience will make it possible for these ideas to be put into effect, we fear they would be setting too much store by those two factors. The problem for us, however, is that even if a miracle does happen and they are put into effect they will do nothing to improve the lot of working people in Europe. They will not narrow the gap between the less developed and developed countries and the implementation of these ideas will do nothing to help Europe regain its independence, as Mr Cheysson wishes. For Europe to become independent it must first become

strong, and for it to become strong its wealth and the creative force of its workers must be freed from the grasp of the monopolies which spawn crisis for their own benefit.

Mr President, we believe that the French Presidency will be just a continuation of the familiar scenario. There will be discussions here for six months and we shall end up with a summit conference, this time not in Athens with its Parthenon but in Paris with its Eiffel Tower, where it will be confirmed yet again that nothing could be done because of the differing views, and the difference in the way each country sees the problems from its own national standpoint, whereas in fact it will have been due to conflict between the powerful cliques which, each for its own ends, seek to exploit the combined labour of the working people of Europe.

IN THE CHAIR : LADY ELLES

Vice-President

President. — According to today's agenda Question Time starts at 6.30 p.m. I still have six speakers on the list and, of course, the President-in-Office has the right of reply and will possibly want to make a short statement, I would ask the House if the six speakers — Mr Paisley, Mr Antoniozzi, Mr Kyrkos, Mr von Bismarck, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti and Mr Beumer — would possibly agree to speak for one minute each in order to speed up events, or even if they are willing to withdraw their names. If they would agree to speak for as short a time as possible we need not cut Question Time too short, I hope Members will agree to this.

Mr Antoniozzi (PPE). — (*IT*) Madam President, it is absolutely impossible to speak for one minute; either we keep to the allocated time which, in this case, means that we should be speaking for 25 minutes — and this is the solution that I favour — or, alternatively, since it is not possible to restrict oneself to one minute only, as far as I am concerned I should be obliged to furnish the Verbatim Reports Division with the written text of my speech.

President. — Mr Antoniozzi, you certainly have not got 25 minutes. You have got four minutes, and I do not want to take up more time arguing how much time people should have. We will keep to the list in that case, and I will just request Members to be as brief as possible.

Mr Paisley (NI). — Madam President, in this Chamber this morning the Agriculture Commissioner reminded us that a proposal from the Commission is before the Council for the extension of the less-favoured areas of Northern Ireland. That proposal has

Paisley

been put on the long finger by the Council, and the farmers of Northern Ireland would welcome an assurance from the new President-in-Office on this very vital issue. It is urgent, as the Commissioner implied, that a positive decision be taken.

Northern Ireland has two other agricultural problems. With 9 m for the hill livestock compensatory allowances, which should be paid to the needy hill farmers by the end of March, frozen and at the moment no rule for retroactive payments, those farmers find themselves in imminent peril. To drive more of our people from the land would be disastrous. Immediate assurances are therefore needed on this issue.

Now on top of the farmers' troubles comes the attack on lamb from Northern Ireland being transported through France to the Paris market. On Wednesday, 11 January a meat lorry belonging to Lagan Meats, Belfast, was going to the Rungis meat market in Paris. When it stopped to pay its tolls three to four busloads of French farmers attacked it. Six hundred lambs were pulled out of the lorry, thrown on the roadway, covered with diesel oil and thus destroyed. Consequently 27 000 to 30 000 pounds of meat were destroyed while the police looked on.

Following this, there have been long delays of up to three hours for other meat lorries at the customs clearance stations. As those who have been attacked have suffered heavy loss, can the President-in-Office help us in regard to compensation? As these exporters were working under the export and import laws of the Community, surely the Council must ensure that they be guaranteed safe conduct to the markets and given adequate compensation when Community laws are broken and commodities vandalized and destroyed. Northern Ireland farmers will listen with great concern and interest to the President's reply.

Finally, I trust that during the Presidency an effective decision will be made regarding the extradition of terrorists between Member States. A convention for the suppression of terrorism, like that of the Council of Europe, would make the Community states generally safer for their citizens and help Northern Ireland particularly at this time of great peril.

Mr Antoniazzi (PPE). — *(IT)* Madam President, the President-in-Office of the Council has spoken about the next six months in the life of our Community, but what he has said is overshadowed by the past, especially the recent past in Athens.

The Community is influenced by the chronic long-windedness and favourable or unfavourable experiences of some thirty years, during which there has moreover been ample proof of the validity of the European idea, which still remains the broadest, most useful, most stimulating political proposal of this century; an almost revolutionary concept, to be implemented with determination and democratic systems.

Athens is now past, but the problems that were not resolved in December 1983 still remain open. Everyone must make a more convinced effort to find the best possible solutions, but the greatest effort must be made by the governments and national institutions, which often appear to want Europe just as some kind of a label, without doing anything to ensure its true significance.

At Athens, some years ago, the experts removed the famous Caryatids for timely restoration: to judge by the performance of the national governments at Athens, some very real restoration of the way they see Europe would seem to be called for.

President Cheysson has today given us an interesting, responsible picture of the situation; but how often have we not listened to proposals — even expressed in good faith — at the start of these six-monthly periods of office, which are so short? So many such periods of office have gone by over the years, but some of the basic problems are still without solution.

You, Mr President, have provided a full picture of the existing problems, and for this we are grateful to you. We have however been given no indication of the solutions to these problems, nor the instruments by which we are to proceed. What you had to say about political cooperation and security had much to commend it, even if we should have liked to hear something more about the Middle East, Cyprus and nuclear equilibrium in the Mediterranean. What you said about monetary problems, the 'social space', internal and external development, research, the markets, agriculture, enlargement, and so on, was also interesting.

I should, though, have liked to hear something concrete on the question of the budget: otherwise, the statement — broad though it was — will hold out no prospects of solving anything. In one part of your speech you said that it is not a question of reducing the powers of each authority in the Community.

I think this sentence requires explaining more fully: otherwise we might reflect on the lack of readiness to make those institutional reforms that will carry the Community towards the second stage of its journey. For that reason I wish you had made some reference in your speech to the draft Treaty for European Union which is well on the way to being approved here, and which will soon be submitted to the scrutiny of national governments and institutions. Your silence on this question worries me. In a year when we must render an account to the citizens of Europe of the way in which we are proceeding, Parliament has a clean sheet on this and other points. But that is not what interests us: what we should like is for the lack of effective solutions not to be concealed by political alibis.

Antoniozzi

It will not be sufficient to say: 'I said it!' It would be far better to be able to say: 'We did it!'

Let us hope that the governments will not let slip through their fingers opportunities which in some cases might be their last. Parliament reaffirms its own determination to promote the relaunch of Europe, convinced that its political strength will enable it to come through the difficult test that will help strengthen peace, freedom and progress.

Mr President of the Council, our respect for you personally and for your work, carried out in an extremely important Community institution for so many years, allows us to hope that you will bear in mind what our Parliament calls for and affirms.

Mr Kyrkos (COM). — (GR) Madam President, I hold the French Foreign Minister in high esteem but I cannot, however, conceal a certain disappointment with his declaration of intent as President-in-Office of the Council. In his inaugural speech Mr Cheysson stressed that unless it can offer hope Europe has no future. But I am wondering what hope his speech contained.

Europe is not an abstraction, its meaning lies in its peoples, in its workers and farmers. What message did Mr Cheysson convey to them today as President-in-Office? Very little, we think; only a few things which we have noted very carefully. For the rest it was just ideas which have been heard in this Chamber on many occasions, ideas with little inspiration, or imagination, whereas what Europe requires at this time are inspiration and imagination. In our opinion Mr Cheysson did right to mention the foreign interference which many countries, such as those in the Middle East, are having to contend with. We believe, however, that the Cyprus problem should also be on the list of the Community's concerns, and I do not say that from the point of view of Greek sensitivity.

The European Community is choking on contradiction. It looks to the United States for military protection, thus subjecting itself to that country which, as the merciless war on interest rates and markets shows, is at the same time its harshest economic and trade competitor. The solution lies in autonomy. Mr Cheysson touched on this great and stimulating idea when he called for the EEC to assert its independence at all levels, only to point out, immediately afterwards, the need for it to maintain solidarity with its allies, in other words the United States. It will be difficult for the EEC to walk this tightrope, no matter how capably the Presidency performs.

Mr Cheysson reminded us that the Third World would like us to be bolder. He is right, but before anything else the peoples of Europe who are fighting for peace and against the missiles, and against unemployment and the division of society into rich and poor, also want us to be bolder.

We hope that the French Presidency will respond to this call.

Mr von Bismarck (PPE). — (DE) Madam President, the hope of the fathers of the European Economic Community that the seeds they had sown would one day blossom into European unity has not been fulfilled. In the last ten years it has become obvious that the major economic and social policy goals of the Community cannot be achieved if the necessary political resolve is lacking. Unemployment currently provides a particularly painful example of this. More than others, the European Community lives from the imports of major raw materials, which must be paid for by exports. But we have fallen and are continuing to fall behind the USA and Japan in essential areas because we do not exploit our major trade advantage, the largest home market in the world. Instead of being opened up to provide a socially and economically satisfactory future, the governments of the Member States and their bureaucracies are suffocating it more and more by trade barriers. The result is that we are now importing unemployment from other countries in certain sectors, and at the same time using exports of capital to finance jobs outside the Community.

Mr President-in-Office, we would welcome the successful continuation under your presidency of special Council meetings with a view to opening up the home markets. We criticize the economic policy of our allies, whose policies, above all on interest rates, are undermining our attempts to achieve economic recovery. But we ourselves are incapable of implementing the common economic policy which the Council decided on in 1974, in the way the President-in-Office described in his speech. We criticize fluctuations between international currencies which obstruct our economic goals, but we have not been able to take the necessary political steps to complete our monetary system. The Treaties provide us with opportunities for eliminating step by step the present obstacles to economic recovery — above all establishing competitiveness on an international scale — by the appropriate majority decisions in Council, but the member governments do not have the political courage to release the Council of Ministers from the political impotence it wished upon itself in 1966.

I place my hopes in the strength of the French Government. Friedrich von Hayek recently said: 'Democracy is possibly too cowardly to survive'. At this point in the history of Europe we must ask the governments of the Community: Are you too cowardly to rescue Europe? I place my trust in the courage of the French Head of State. Let us take as our motto: *Voluntas facit spem* — where there is a will there is a way.

(Applause)

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (PPE). — *(IT)* My dear President, it would seem that the social sector occupies a position in the forefront of the programmes of the French Presidency. The Minister for Social Affairs put forward the notion of a 'European social space' seen as the ability to bring together all the social forces in implementing the necessary economic and technological change and promoting as far as possible the integration of social policy with economic policy.

Amongst the priority items in this sector that were referred to by the French Presidency, there was the question of the reduction and reorganization of working time. These measures need to be adopted on a vast scale throughout Europe, and their adoption must not be reflected in an increase in production costs, as our Parliament has indicated.

In addition to the draft recommendation on the reduction of working time, the Council has still before it the draft Directive on temporary working, and the draft relating to parental leave for family reasons.

The development of new technology is undoubtedly an essential element for economic growth. As you have said, it is essential for the European Community to bridge the gap that has developed in this sector *vis-à-vis* the USA and Japan: the creation of new jobs is bound up with new technology, but so also is the abolition of a number of jobs of the traditional kind. For this reason, the social impact of technological advance must be carefully assessed, and appropriate concrete measures adopted.

The 'Vredeling' directive on the information and consultation of workers in undertakings with a complex structure — and, in particular, multinational undertakings — appears to be another priority item of the French Presidency. This dossier, the new version of which is still pending before the Council of Ministers, is apparently being treated with some reticence. The dialogue with the social partners therefore needs to be encouraged, since it is extremely important for both sides of industry to take a fuller part in the work and procedures of the Community, with special regard to the Standing Committee on Employment, which has not given the results that were hoped for.

The contribution to local initiatives for creating jobs is finally another subject which the French Presidency would like to make progress with. Apart from the main measures for fighting unemployment that have already been discussed at Community level, the Council has appointed the Commission to examine in detail the process of job creation through local initiatives and cooperatives. The Commission has therefore proceeded with an investigation of the part that local initiatives and cooperatives can play in the fight against unemployment. The results of this investiga-

tion are contained in a communication from the Commission that will be put before the European Parliament.

As can be seen, the Commission, in its communication, has put forward precise initiatives in conjunction with NCI III. It is important, therefore, for this project to be examined again, but above all it is important that a new line should be proposed that will produce certain employment.

Finally it is extremely important, in relation to the recent debate on women, that a Council of Ministers should examine the questions produced not so much by the resolution as by the concrete proposals which the document contains.

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(FR)* Madam President, you will allow me to thank the Members for their speeches.

I have found in them great encouragement. Personal encouragement, first, in those few words which could be said to recall my very long cooperation, of which I am proud, with this Assembly in my earlier capacity. But more importantly, in the response to the President's statement.

Specific questions were posed in those speeches. Let me very quickly reply that, of course, we shall hold a Council on the internal market; also that if there had been abuses or excesses in my country, proper compensation will be made. I shall leave the remaining specific questions.

What I was most interested to hear was so many speakers giving approval to some of our major stances, especially on enlargement. The negotiations should finish quickly. We have undertaken to give a lot of effort to this.

As regards the determination to get out of the present almost stale-mated situation, we shall not go as far as some, who would wish to extend the Community's field of activity in singular ways. They even speak of joint defence — a subject that would merit a debate on its own. But we were happy to hear speakers of all parties referring to a Europe of wider dimension, a social Europe, a Europe of the citizens, a Europe that is not a rich men's club, a Europe that is not imprisoned in petty squabbles, and so on...

It may be that the failure of Athens, the feeling of failure after Athens, will act as a spur. We all recognize that we must start from what we have — and what we have comprises important factors for success; that we must not be bogged down by a single problem, say the budgetary problem, which is far more complex than has been here said and which, incidentally, is not due to the attitude of a single country, as some claim. When a difficulty arises in a community such as ours, the blame cannot be laid at a single door.

Cheysson

I have listened to the questions and I want to say here once again that we wish very much to take as our starting point the Treaty as it stands, the institutional balance as it has been defined by the authors of the Treaty. It is an insitutional balance in which — let us never forget — two institutions have the special mission to speak in Europe's name: the Commission, which should at all times be pointing — and this it may do even in a provocative manner — to where Europe's functional, operational, interest lies; and the Parliament which — with all the differences of shading arising from the positions of the various political groups — should be explaining their political view of Europe. This is why the electoral campaign can be of such importance, if it can concern itself with the different political concepts of what Europe should be, and does not become a mere reflexion of the partisan quarrels which, of course, do go on in our countries. And then there is the Council of Ministers which has the perfectly honourable function, of which I am by no means ashamed, of representing the interests of the States in this business of constructing Europe. These three approaches are different and complementary. That is how the Treaty disposes and, as I have said in my speech, the Treaty has proven the richness of the possibilities of its application and the wisdom of the arrangement between the three institutions, which do not have the same function although they work together for the construction of Europe.

Madam President, having said that, what I find perhaps most encouraging of all is to hear convergent views being propounded by all the parties in this Assembly, to hear men and women from opposing political parties, and from political parties opposed to mine, wishing success to the Presidency and acknowledging that what matters above all else is that this Presidency should see — it would be too much to say that it will bring about!... — at least the end of a crisis whose continuation would be particularly grave.

This is the encouragement I have been given today. I thank you for it.

(Applause)

President. — Thank you, Mr President-in-Office. I am glad you are aware that the whole House wishes every success to the French Presidency in the next six months.

The debate is closed.¹

7. Question Time

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 1-268/83).

We begin with the questions to the Council.

¹ Membership of Parliament — Topical and urgent debate (objections): See Minutes.

Question No 46, by Mr Rogalla (H-229/83):

During the peak holiday season, when will the Council, as members of the Council, visit two typical Community frontier crossing points to discuss the purpose of frontier controls with travellers?

When visiting these crossings, is the Council willing to select one of the Benelux type and one of the old-fashioned small State type to satisfy themselves with regard to the advantages and inconveniences of one or another control procedure?

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(FR)* Nationals of the Member States arriving at frontier crossing points are aware of the reasons — mainly security considerations — for which it is necessary to have controls. The Commission has proposed that they be relaxed. The Council is proceeding with an examination of the draft resolution submitted to it along these lines.

Mr Rogalla (S). — *(DE)* I would first of all like to express my pleasure at the fact that my question is the first to be addressed to the Council under French Presidency. As I understand the President-in-Office's reply, he feels that the citizens of this Community are aware that border controls are still necessary. I and my colleagues dispute this. Would the President-in-Office not agree with me that the citizens are just beginning to question whether it is necessary at all to have controls at internal borders, whereas it is accepted that controls should be carried out at external borders? Will he undertake to press for better controls at external borders, particularly as far as security and drugs are concerned, so that border controls at internal borders become increasingly superfluous?

Mr Cheysson. — *(FR)* I wish that what the honourable Member has just said tallied with the feelings of all European citizens. Unfortunately, when they see the increasingly frequent threats to security from people who have entered one or other country, often from another European country, I fear that their thoughts run on quite the opposite lines of what has just been said. This saddens me, but I fear it is the truth of the matter.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE). — *(DE)* Despite your somewhat negative reply, may I take the question a little further? Would the French Presidency consider, as an experiment, opening up the borders between France and the Federal Republic of Germany, between France and Italy and France and Belgium, at any rate more than they have been up to now? This is a request we Parliamentarians would like to put to the Presidency.

Mr Cheysson. — *(FR)* For that there would have to be progress in the manner of dealing with travel by citizens coming from third countries. Take for

Cheysson

instance the manner in which Maghrebi nationals are admitted to European States, or to one country from another. In addition, we have found that, at a time when certain Member States have been looking for an outflow of migrant workers, attitudes have differed markedly from one country to another, so that there have been many clandestine movements of migrant workers from one country where they have become undesirable to another with a more amenable attitude. If there had not been frontier controls, the numbers would have run into tens of thousands. Unfortunately, therefore, we are not getting closer to what I, in common with parliamentarians, would regard as the ideal situation.

Lord O'Hagan (ED). — Will the President-in-Office now volunteer that Ministers of this Presidency should accompany lorries from other Member States who wish to travel into France to ensure their safety? If not, will he unequivocally condemn those in Member States of the Community who prevent others from complying with the Treaty of Rome and remaining subject to the rule of law by importing goods into Member States as they choose and wish to do?

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) Let us be serious. I see no more likelihood of a British minister riding shotgun for the lamb which is unable to get into France than of a French minister doing the same for the UHT milk which cannot get into England.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 47 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 48, by Mr Seligman (H-461/83):

What does the Council propose to do to implement Article 48, 49 and 50 of the Rome Treaty, concerning the mobility of workers, particularly young workers in the Community; in particular the setting up of machinery to put offers of employment in touch with applicants for employment as stated in Article 49(d)?

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) Articles 48 and 49 of the Treaty on the free movement of workers within the Community were implemented by Regulation 1612/68 and the accompanying Directive 68/360. The Regulation comprises a clearing system for job vacancies and applications, operation of which is monitored by the Commission.

With regard to Article 50 of the Treaty, which makes provision for exchanges of young workers under a joint programme, the Council recalls that, following the first programme launched in 1964, it set up a second joint exchange programme under its decision of 16 July 1979. The Commission is handling this programme. It is planned that the Council will review its decision, on a proposal from the Commission, before 30 June 1984.

Mr Seligman (ED). — That information is extremely useful; but, with 40% of the young unemployed people under 25 years old, there is certainly a crisis. In France, which is the President-in-Office's country, vacancies are notified by a computer network embracing various job centres throughout the country. I have been to see them. There is nothing comparable in the Community.

Would the President-in-Office consider accelerating the idea of a computer network for vacancies throughout the Community, because there are a lot of vacancies, particularly for qualified people, which we never hear about. Perhaps three or four vacancies are notified on Sedoc every month; that is peanuts compared with the actual vacancies which are available throughout the Community.

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) This is a subject to which the French Government is very alive. I am therefore well placed to understand the question put by the honourable Member.

We are pleased that it was decided at a recent meeting of the Council of Ministers responsible for social affairs that priority would be given to problems connected with the employment of young people in the allocation of Social Fund resources. I am most interested in practical proposals, such as that just made by Mr Seligman. It is the role of the Commission to judge their merits and then make proposals to the Council, seeking Parliament's opinion as appropriate on practical steps which could be taken.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Would the President-in-Office agree that Mr Seligman's scheme, and indeed the whole of Sedoc, would be very much more easily operated if the Council were to adopt the proposed decision on the comparability of vocational training qualifications between Member States, which is currently before both Council and Parliament? Will the President-in-Office, if he does agree, pledge himself to have this decision adopted before the end of his presidency?

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) In our view, the objects of each of the Funds should be clearly defined, as should the policies to which financing from these Funds is attached. I therefore think that any proposal aimed at clearer definition of the conditions under which one of the structural Funds is used is important. A link with recognition of qualifications is in fact possible. Once again, I invite the Commission to examine the matter and bring forward proposals.

Mr Maher (ED). — We all have different problems with this unemployment question. I should like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council whether he is aware that in the city of Cork — the second city in the Irish Republic — the Ford Motor Company, established there for more than 50 years, is about to close down with the loss of 800 jobs, and this in a city

¹ See Annex.

Maher

where the unemployment rate is at 16 %? Could he suggest some way in which the Ford Motor Company might be prevailed upon to continue production there or be replaced by some other industry that would help to alleviate the unemployment situation?

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) This is clearly not a matter within the remit of the Council of Ministers. As a member of the French Government, I am very conscious of this issue, since we have the same problems in many industries, especially the motor industry, to which the honourable Member has just referred in connection with Ireland.

President. — Question No 49, by Mr Normanton (H-537/83):

I should like to ask the Council whether the opinions of the European Parliament are ever specifically and in detail reported and discussed by the Council during their meetings, and if this is confirmed to be the generally agreed procedure, will he instruct the Council Secretariat to reflect this in the drafting of all communiqués and in their announcements of the promulgation of Community decisions?

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) All resolutions of the European Parliament are reported in documents brought to the attention of the Member States. After each session of the European Parliament, the Council takes note of the resolutions that it has adopted, while at the same time relevant resolutions are taken into consideration in the examination of proposals.

The Council has laid down appropriate procedures for this purpose, to be followed at each stage of its proceedings. When the Council adopts an act on which the European Parliament has stated an opinion, there is a citation in the act and a reference to the issue of the Official Journal of the European Communities in which the opinion appears.

Mr Normanton (ED). — I am grateful to the President-in-Office for that, if I may say, formalistic reply. I am sure it conforms exactly to the procedures followed. But I am more concerned about the practices. All the evidence I have accumulated over the many years I have been a Member of this House and the evidence of friends and colleagues who have served in the various Councils confirm to me that Parliament is very very rarely, and then only ritualistically, referred to. May I ask the President-in-Office whether he will do a little bit more on this particular point to convert ritualism to a living evidence of the awareness of the members of the Council of the views of Parliament — not just on paper but in reality?

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) The honourable Member is absolutely right. The reply that I gave him was a formal reply. It described the formal procedures followed, under the mandatory texts. In the speech that I had the privilege to give to honourable Members earlier on, I indicated that we considered it

very important to go further. This is in fact already happening in practice, since there have been many times in the Council of Ministers when I have had occasion to examine resolutions of the European Parliament in fields in which Parliament's opinion was not formally required.

As I have indicated, we hope to extend this procedure to the meetings on political cooperation. This is an area in which the European Parliament is especially active and, as I said earlier, often performs the role of protector and custodian of the principles that we hold to be fundamental in the life of a free community such as ours. I therefore consider it very important for the resolutions passed by Parliament to be examined not only at the ministerial meeting on political cooperation but also at each of the monthly meetings of the Committee of the Heads of Political Departments.

Mr Simpson (ED). — One appreciates, of course, that the opinions of the European Parliament have no legally binding effect and that the Council of Ministers is not bound to take them into consideration. However, does the President-in-Office not agree that there might well be a case for considering — both in the interests of courtesy to Parliament and also to help concentrate the minds of the Council — giving reasons for refusal when the opinions of Parliament are disregarded by the Council of Ministers?

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) I have already indicated my agreement with the point brought up by the honourable Member. It gives me an opportunity to hark back to the past. I know of cases in which resolutions passed by the European Parliament have had quite considerable repercussions. Let me quote just one example: Greece. During the colonels' régime, the resolutions passed by this Parliament made a deep impression in Greece. Anyone who has been to that country since that time will be aware of this.

Mr Kallias (PPE). — (GR) I would like to expand somewhat on the question of my honourable colleagues and to say to the President-in-Office of the Council that it is five years since Parliament first became an elected body. Is it not perhaps time to look into the possibility of giving Parliament some regularized form of influence over Council decisions, even before measures are taken to make its — Parliament's — own decisions binding? Perhaps, that is, the current practice could be extended yet further during this transitional period as we draw near to the time when Parliament's own decisions will be binding? This would help Parliament to carry out its proper role.

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) I must make the distinction between those fields which fall within the area of political cooperation and those which are within the direct competence of the Community. Where the Community has direct competence to take decisions or adopt directives, Parliament's rights are defined in the Trea-

Cheysson

ties and must be respected scrupulously. Formal extension of these rights would require debate — I was going to say a legislative debate.

The Community has no direct competence in the field of political cooperation, but cooperation among the Ten lends weight to their statements, affirmations or declarations. At this level, Parliament's influence is already considerable and has potential for development; I referred a moment ago to Greece, but could have chosen any of a number of other examples, such as hunger in the world.

On the first point, Parliament's role in what I would call the 'normative process' — in other words, the run-up to the legislative process, prior to the formal beginnings of legal definition — is a very important subject which should be examined by the institutions of the Community as soon as the next Parliament has been elected, for it will probably give rise to long discussions among the Member States, Parliament and the other institutions.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — As the European Parliament is the democratic face of the Community without which there would only be a bureaucracy and an autocracy — and the citizens of Europe would not long put up with that — could I ask the President-in-Office, whom I am very glad to welcome here today, how he counsels Members of this Parliament in the frustration they feel when Parliament accepts a principle — to give just one of many possible examples, road equivalent tariff — and passes it pretty well unanimously, both in the old Parliament and in the new, whereas the Council seems to be able to pay no attention whatsoever to something of this kind which is of proven value in other countries where it clearly works?

Mr Cheysson. — *(FR)* I apologize to the Honourable Member, but I must beg to differ with her.

It is not the case that the Council pays no attention to what is said in this House, especially when it is said unanimously. The response may not always be immediate but, ladies and gentlemen, when you take up a clear stance on a subject, I would submit that it will be found that your political parties are of the same persuasion. Now democracy in the Community is manifested directly through this House and indirectly through the national parliaments, which have the power to call their respective governments to account. On the basis of the experience of the French Government, with which I am of course most familiar, I know that it is a common occurrence for us to be called to account by our own parliaments on subjects on which a different standpoint has been adopted by our colleagues in the European Parliament. Hence the need for me to refute this assertion that the resolutions and positions adopted by this House have no influence on the proceedings of the Council of Ministers.

President. — Question No 50, by Mr Papaefstratiou (H-546/83):

Having regard to the provisions of Articles 117 and 118 of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community and its resolution of 21 January 1974 — laying the foundations of a social action programme, which has been implemented in certain sectors only — can the Council of Ministers state how it is dealing with the question of harmonizing social legislation in the Member States for the benefit of the peoples of the EEC countries?

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(FR)* The Council has taken many decisions in the field of harmonizing social legislation in the Member States.

Following the series of directives protecting workers' rights in the event of collective redundancies, takeovers of companies or insolvency of employers, the Council adopted a further series of directives aimed at protecting workers at their place of work, namely a framework directive, a directive against exposure to lead, and a directive on exposure to asbestos. One deals with workers' right to information and consultation, the other with protection against the hazard of exposure to noise.

These various directives have been introduced in pursuance of the objectives of Article 117 of the Treaty which, as we all know, is aimed at improving workers' living and working conditions, so that they may be harmonized whilst progress is being made.

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE). — *(GR)* I would like to ask the President-in-Office whether the Council also intends in the very near future to look into the need for it to issue a decision or a directive to safeguard the rights of workers in the Member States. Because it happens, unfortunately, in some countries, Greece among them, that those in government have completely overthrown employment and social legislation, have taken away the right to strike, have interfered inadmissibly with union organizations and have abolished long-entrenched social security rights of working people.

I think that these are matters of fundamental importance concerning which the Council should issue a directive giving protection to workers in the Member States.

Mr Cheysson. — *(FR)* The Council follows the procedures laid down in the Treaty, in other words its deliberation are based on proposals received from the Commission. It is currently examining two proposals concerned with the field mentioned by the honourable Member. One deals with arrangements for informing and consulting workers, to which they are entitled. The second is on protection against the hazard of exposure to noise, another right for workers. As I mentioned earlier, a number of other rights have already been covered by past directives.

Mr Lomas (S). — Is the Council aware that when Britain joined the EEC its people were promised the higher social welfare benefits provided in most other countries? Whilst I accept what he said about certain improvements, particularly in industrial matters, it has certainly not happened with social welfare. Would the Council consider laying down a minimum pension level for instance, and minimum related fringe benefits such as free transport throughout Europe?

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) A number of matters discussed in past years, which I recall from my days as a Commissioner, gave rise to some commotion. In the case of the United Kingdom itself, I recall the instance of heavy goods vehicle drivers' working conditions. But that was an industrial matter. In order to make further progress, as I have said, a proposal from the Commission is required. Speaking now as head of the French delegation, I would add that we attach very great importance to the progress which would be made in these areas during this period of crisis, taking the view that, although improvement of workers' living conditions admittedly does not compensate for the economic deterioration, there are in a way opportunities for progress, even at times of strict budgetary restraint and general stagnation.

President. — Perhaps if the President-in-Office would allow me to interject, I should like to say how much many of the British citizens benefit from and enjoy the *Carte Vermeil*.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Perhaps I ought to start by apologizing to the President-in-Office for having, on Question No 48, asked the wrong question for the answer I was given.

Perhaps I could move on to Question No 50 and ask whether the President-in-Office, rather than go off into the byways of odd schemes like free public transport, would concentrate on taking decisions in the Council on matters of social security which have been before it for many years? I mention two, the system of paying family benefits — a matter which has been before the Council for a very long time — and the extension of the regulations on social security payments for migrant workers to the unemployed moving between Member States.

I want a pledge from the President-in-Office that the Council will attempt to adopt two matters already before it, one concerning the payment of family benefits and the other on the extension of social security payments for migrant workers to workers who are unemployed.

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) Honourable Members are aware of Council procedure. In particular, they know that informal meetings are held during which,

although no decisions can be taken, very free exchanges of views can take place among the ministers concerned and the appropriate Commissioner. At the last informal meeting of ministers responsible for labour or social affairs, which was held on 7 November 1983 in Athens, discussions were held, under the conditions just stated, on the problems arising in connection with social security, social expenditure, and welfare cover and protection for workers in the current period of economic stagnation. This is a subject to which they will undoubtedly return and in connection with which I should not be surprised if the Commission were invited to submit more specific proposals which could provide the basis for directives or recommendations on harmonization.

Mr Estgen (PPE). — (FR) I thank the President-in-Office for the replies that he has given on this Question No 50. I should nevertheless like to ask him for more specific details regarding the trade unions in Greece. Can he tell us whether this issue, and especially the prohibition of the right to strike and the position of the trade unions in Greece, has been or will shortly be discussed in the Council?

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) No, Mr Estgen, it has not.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 51 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 52, by Mr Hutton (H-376/83):

In view of the difficulty of obtaining both oral answers to questions to the Council and information on action taken by the Council, will the President-in-Office now agree to report at every session — or periodically — to Parliament's opinions, on the amendments it has made to Commission proposals, and on its own initiative resolutions, on the lines of similar information given by the Commission?

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) With regard to resolutions stating opinions of the European Parliament, the Council, in its letter of 6 April 1982, rehearsed the contents of the letters of 20 March and 22 July 1970 received from Messrs Harmel and Scheel. In so doing, it confirmed its willingness to inform Parliament either in writing or orally of its reasons for occasionally departing from Parliament's opinion each time that it is asked to do so by Parliament. There are also occasions on which the Council acts on a European Parliament resolution which comprises no opinion. In such cases, publication of the act adopted by the Council in the Official Journal of the European Communities serves to keep honourable Members informed. May I point out that this overlaps with the subject discussed earlier?

¹ See Annex.

Mr Hutton (ED). — It does seem to me that if the Presidency is prepared to answer a question in writing, or even orally, about why it has departed from our opinions, it would be possible for the Presidency to do this on a regular basis without having to be asked. Would the President-in-Office not agree with me that the Council has done very little since direct elections to help Parliament, and would he not, as a gesture to this Parliament during his Presidency, reconsider his reply and at a later date in his Presidency perhaps give this Parliament the assurance that the Council will give us a regular written report on the action it takes on Parliament's opinions?

Mr Cheysson. — (*FR*) I understand that a procedure has been established. For it to be changed, a proposal to this effect would have to be put to us, in which event I would discuss it with my colleagues. For the time being, the procedure is as I have described it.

Mr Croux (PPE). — (*NL*) I feel that a problem has arisen over this matter as a result of the solemn declaration of Stuttgart. Point 2(3) (3), which I see as a new element in the solemn declaration of Stuttgart — reads, and I will quote the French text:

... outre les procédures de consultation prévues dans le traité, le Conseil, ses membres' — political cooperation is concerned where the reference is made to the 'members of the Council' — 'et la Commission, selon leur compétence respective, répondront ...'

and point 2(2) reads:

'... répondront aux résolutions concernant des questions d'importance majeure et de portée générale sur lesquelles le Parlement demande leurs observations ...'

I regard this as a new element, and it will necessitate a procedure because the European Council said this in Stuttgart. We in fact intend to go into this in greater depth and to ask the Council on some future occasion how it intends to put this declaration of principle made in Stuttgart, which is a step forward in this area, into practice. I should therefore like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council to establish a procedure which enables this declaration of principle made in Stuttgart to be put into practice.

Mr Cheysson. — (*FR*) It is already being applied. As I have just said, when Parliament asks for observations or explanations, they are given immediately. This is fully in accordance with the text just read out by the honourable Member. But I should like to go a little further than this reply on a specific point. The opportunities for dialogue between the Parliament and the Council extend far beyond the mere communication of Council observations on opinions or resolutions, whether these are requested or not. There are many other ways of replying to questions for oral answer,

questions for written answer, questions with debate, and there are also conciliation procedures and it is in this latter area, as I indicated in my speech earlier, that, on the strength of my experience as a Commissioner, I am convinced that progress can be achieved. The conciliation procedure, as defined in 1975, is cumbersome and in effect takes place between two institutions which have already defined their positions. I believe that progress can be made. As I have said, we are hoping that the Commission will put proposals to us.

Finally, there is the Council's provision of information in the field of external policy, which is compulsory under the Luns-Westerterp procedures in the case of a number of agreements. This is an area in which we can perhaps make improvements by dint of more frequent meetings with the Political Affairs Committee. I should be pleased, during the period of the French Presidency, to be able to keep the Political Affairs Committee informed whenever I come upon topics which are debated in the context of political co-operation, in other words a number of topics about which it is not compulsory to consult Parliament.

President. — Question No 53, by Mr Cousté (*H-396/83*):

What is the Council's view regarding compensation to be sought following the unwarranted imposition of quotas on American imports of special steels?

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Council. — (*FR*) In July 1983 the United States Administration adopted certain protective measures in the special steels sector. These measures took one of two forms, according to the type of product: tariff increases or quotas. In view of the injury suffered, the Commission initiated consultations with the United States under GATT Clause 19 with a view to obtaining compensation. Although the right of the Communities to obtain compensation was recognized in principle by the United States, the two sides differed very widely on the extent of the injury and accordingly on the amount of compensation.

In the circumstances, the Council drew up a list of retaliatory measures at its meeting of 29 November last. It authorized the Commission to lodge this list with GATT in the event that subsequent negotiations with the United States did not secure appropriate compensation by 15 January.

No satisfactory improvement had been offered by the United States by that date. The Community accordingly notified GATT of the countervailing measures that it intended to take, in accordance with that organization's procedures.

These Community measures consist of tariff increases in the plastics sector and on sports goods, and the application of quotas for other chemicals and security systems.

Mr Cousté (DEP). — (FR) In thanking the President-in-Office of the Council, I should like to ask him when in fact these retaliatory measures will be applied, bearing in mind the GATT procedures, since these measures are apparently relatively modest. They should not be delayed for too long if they are really to have an effect on the American Administration, persuading it to rescind the imposition of quotas or to return to the former customs arrangements.

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) According to the GATT procedures, a period of 30 days is required, 30 days from notification. The measures to which I have referred will therefore be applied from 15 February 1984.

Mr Rieger (S). — (DE) The countermeasures announced by the European Community will shortly come into force, if no agreement is reached. Mr President-in-Office, do you think we can still reach an agreement with the Americans and if not, do you think the countermeasures proposed are at all adequate in view of the Commission's estimates of the damage caused by the American measures?

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) I cannot prejudge the future. It is really calamitous to have to be talking about retaliation, countermeasures, in such a case. We were left with no alternative. Parliament has given invaluable support. In my opinion, its resolution of 15 December was very clear in this respect. And this contributes greatly, believe me, to the strength of our case, and will be helpful in our efforts to persuade the United States. I shall therefore be hoping until the last minute that the Americans will do what is necessary to prevent these retaliatory measures having to be applied. But they must be in no doubt that if they themselves do not desist from discriminating against us, we are resolved to apply the measures of which I have spoken with effect from 15 February.

President. — Question No 54, by Mr Pearce (H-455/83):

How many new advisory and management committees, involving Council and Member State staff, have been set up during 1983?

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) The Council did not set up any advisory and management committees during 1983.

Mr Pearce (ED). — While welcoming the news that the President-in-Office has given, could I ask him whether he will now begin a process of reducing the number of these committees, a great number of which are having the effect of slowly strangling the powers of initiative of the Commission and the future development of the Community?

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) No, Mr Pearce.

Mrs Boserup (COM). — (DA) Since that is a field with which I have been concerned, not in relation to

the Council but in relation to the Commission, I should like to ask the Council if I may be permitted in my report to quote the President-in-Office in order to draw attention to the Council's moderation in this area, in contrast to what is the case in the Commission?

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) I should be most pleased to be able to impart secrets to the honourable Member, but this is not a case in point. Consequently, my reply can be quoted, most certainly.

(Smiles)

Mr Moreland (ED). — I am sure that the President-in-Office will know the Community is often accused of being over-bureaucratic, particularly the institutions of the Commission and the Council. Does he not feel that his answer of 'no' to the supplementary from Mr Pearce about reducing the number of such committees is perhaps a little inadequate and that all the institutions ought to look for economies where possible to get round and meet this criticism of over-bureaucratization?

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) I have been asked whether or not the Council intends to reduce the number of committees, and I have answered that it has no such intention.

(Smiles)

President. — Question No 55, by Mr Galland (H-495/83):

Does the President-in-Office of the Council intend during his term of office to propose the introduction of the 35-hour week in the ten Member States of the Community?

If so, is he not afraid that, as a result, the Community's competitive position *vis-à-vis* its major industrial competitors, particularly the United States and Japan, will be weakened, thereby exacerbating the Community's unemployment problems?

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Council. — (FR) On 16 September 1983 the Council received a proposal from the Commission on the setting of objectives in the area of reducing and rescheduling working time. The Council has already laid down guidelines in this field. These are concerned, *inter alia*, with the need to safeguard the competitiveness of our businesses. They are to be found in the resolution of 18 December 1979 concerning the scheduling of working time and the conclusions of the joint Council meeting of 16 November 1982 of ministers responsible for economic, financial, labour and social affairs.

Mr Galland (L). — (FR) I thank Mr President of the Council for his answer. Bearing in mind that it is essential for our various economies to converge and taking account of the timescale to which he has

Galland

referred, when, in his view, will the Community as a whole be ready to reduce working time? Can he tell us which countries in the Community are currently prepared to reduce the working week to the bracket between 35 and 39 hours so that this convergence can be translated into reality?

Mr Cheysson. — (*FR*) The debate is in progress. As the Honourable Member is aware, the positions of the national delegations are not yet in complete alignment. That of my own delegation is fairly close to what he would apparently like to see. However, a number of delegations are not yet in agreement with the Commission's proposals. It is I think not within the conventions for the nationalities of the delegations expressing dissenting views to be revealed in this House, at least not by the President-in-Office of the Council.

I would nevertheless make the point, in connection with the Honourable Member's comments, that the Commission's proposal, which has been worked out in great detail, calls for a differential approach according to the country and circumstances and that, although the Commission recommends a reduction in working time throughout the Community, it envisages arrangements under which this could be done on the basis of the working week, the working year of the individual's whole working life.

As you know, the proposal also covers other aspects of the rescheduling of working life, notably the problem of overtime. Here again, a considerable measure of flexibility is envisaged. We are therefore talking about harmonization, adoption of a common general course by our governments, not about the imposition of constraints on all the governments, particularly since, in some countries, these matters are dealt with exclusively at the level of the economic and social parties directly concerned without government intervention.

Mr Patterson (ED). — I would be interested to know whether the Council has had any evidence presented to it that a reduction in the working week or, indeed, a reduction in working time overall, would actually produce new jobs, and whether it has taken account of the comparative study done by the Council of Europe which shows that the working time of our industrial competitors is actually already longer than in Europe, and that those countries with the longest working week actually have the lowest rates of unemployment?

Mr Cheysson. — (*FR*) The honourable Member is aware that very many studies have been carried out on this subject. Moreover, as I was pointing out a moment ago, the Commission's proposal and the draft recommendation that it has presented to the Council are very carefully worked out documents. In the proposal from the Commission, for instance, the point is made that measures in the field of reducing working time must accompany action to bring about a recovery

in economic activity, to improve competitiveness. At all events, it is most important to work towards more efficient and more flexible use of capital investment. It is clear that, in highly capital-intensive industries, the fullest possible use of plant and equipment is an absolutely vital part of the productivity equation. I could quote many other points from this draft recommendation demonstrating how carefully the subject was studied before the Commission reached the stage of submitting a proposal. There was of course every reason for taking care, and the Commission was aware that it was dealing with an area which is very sensitive — sensitive in different ways in different countries of the Community.

Mr Herman (PPE). — (*FR*) Since we are discussing convergence of economic policies, is it the Council's intention to give greater support than in the past to the Commission's recommendations on convergence of budgetary and monetary policies and policies on credit?

Mr Cheysson. — (*FR*) This topic seems to me to be a rather remote extension of the subject of Question No 55, but I am pleased to refer the honourable Member to my earlier speech outlining our programme, in which I spoke at some length on this topic. This allows me to reply in the affirmative to the honourable Member — without giving details, for details, of time.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (*GR*) I want to ask the President of the Council whether any reduction in working hours will be accompanied by a reduction in the incomes of employees and, if so, whether this will then lead to a reduction in their purchasing power, to under-consumption that is and, consequently, to greater unemployment?

Mr Cheysson. — (*FR*) As I said earlier, the Commission's recommendation which, I repeat, currently enjoys the approval of the great majority — but not yet all — of the Member States stresses that the specific situation in each Member State must be taken into consideration. In fact, this actually applies to the specific situation in each branch of economic activity. This at least is the lesson that we have learnt from experience in this field in France. Moreover, the criteria on this point are very precise since it is stated that increases in unit production costs are to be avoided. Are there any cases in which unit production costs can be held down when working time is reduced and wages maintained? In highly capital-intensive industries, with very heavy overheads, probably, otherwise no. I do not think it reasonable to expect a single answer on this problem to be given for the Community as a whole. I do not even think that a single answer can be given for one Member State. This, at least, is the conclusion that we have reached on the basis of experience in this field in France.

Mr Van Miert (S). — *(NL)* Do you not think, assuming, of course, that the objective referred to in the question cannot be achieved in the short term, that this is none the less an inevitable trend as we approach the 1990s and that it is also more than desirable that there should be coordination among the Member States, because some Member States might want to press ahead more quickly in this direction, on condition, of course, that others are also prepared to involve in this direction? Can the French Presidency not take any additional, specific initiatives in this connection over the next four weeks?

Mr Cheysson. — *(FR)* As honourable Members may have realized, France is not among the countries which as yet do not accept this draft recommendation. In other words, in common with the honourable Member — evidently — it believes that this approach should be adopted at the earliest possible opportunity.

I would add that this matter will be taken up again at the next relevant Council meeting, which is due to be held within two or three months.

Mr Nordmann (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, do you not consider it dangerous for a country to pursue a policy of reducing working time unilaterally and in isolation?

Mr Cheysson. — *(FR)* First of all, I have the impression that this has been done, in one way or another, in virtually every country in the Community, in one branch of industry or another. It has also been done by a number of multinationals, in technologically highly advanced sectors therefore, and they have done so in all their companies in Europe and elsewhere.

I would make one final comment: to imagine that the Community should arrogate to itself the right to prohibit social progress in one or other country or such and such a branch of the economy of a country strikes me as taking our ambitions for the Community to extremes, and in the wrong direction.

President. We turn now to the questions addressed to the Foreign Ministers.

Question No 69, by Mr Moreland (H-385/83):

Do the Foreign Ministers believe that their protests to the Government of Nigeria on assaults on shipping by pirates off Lagos will have any beneficial effect?

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs. — *(FR)* During the first eight months of 1983 there was a fall in the number of attacks on vessels belonging to the European Community. These, I would remind the House, are acts of aggression committed at sea off the coast of the Nigerian capital. On the other hand, in those incidents that have still been occurring, there has been something of an increase in the scale of aggression

and, I am informed, brutality. The Ten are watching these developments very closely. Where they consider it necessary, they will continue to call for action by the competent authorities, namely the Nigerian authorities. We know that they are anxious to put an end to these activities. Indeed, it may be that the recent events in Nigeria will strengthen the resolve of the central Government to maintain order.

Mr Moreland (ED). — I am grateful to the President-in-Office for his answer. Perhaps I could say to him that the statistics that he read out ought to be taken somewhat with a pinch of salt because many of the incidents are not actually reported since shipping companies are often a little scared about the effect on insurance and so forth.

Could I ask the President-in-Office whether he can give us an assurance that he will press this matter, as did his predecessors, with the Government of Nigeria? Can he tell us, if, because of the change in the situation in Nigeria, this in any way impairs the Community's links with Nigeria and its ability to press these issues upon the Nigerian Government?

Mr Cheysson. — *(FR)* We have detailed information of what is happening in the port of Lagos and we know that these incidents declined in number, even though they may have increased in seriousness, during the period to which I referred a moment ago.

As for attacks in Nigerian territorial waters, it is certainly possible that some may not have been brought to our attention. Nevertheless, the report that I have to hand is quite clear that there has been an overall reduction.

As you will be aware, the new Government in Nigeria has begun to establish contact with the governments of the Member States. A number of Community Governments — those of the United Kingdom, France and the Federal Republic of Germany — have received visits from a mission sent by the new Head of State, General Boutari.

We in the Community of course intend to maintain close contact with the Nigerian authorities. The commitment to law and order evinced by the new authorities will not have been any surprise to you, and my feeling, therefore, is that we should wait for a while to see how they manage their affairs, and security problems in particular. Further representations at this stage would be inappropriate, since we would be talking about their predecessors. We therefore place our confidence in the Nigerian authorities on this matter.

Mr Marshall (ED). — Would the President-in-Office confirm that piracy is wrong wherever committed, and would he condemn the hijackings of lorries in France which have been illegal, destructive of Community feeling and counterproductive?

Mr Herman (PPE). — ... it's rather far removed from Nigeria!

President. — I think that question is a bit wide of the mark.

Question No 70, by Mrs Ewing (H-390/83):

In view of the political assassinations by agents of the Yugoslav Government of Croats living outside Yugoslavia, some of which have occurred in Community Member States, will the Foreign Ministers, within the framework of contacts with the Yugoslav Government concerning the EEC-Yugoslavia Trade Cooperation Agreement, seek the cessation of such actions by the Government of a State, which, like the Community, is a signatory of the Helsinki Final Act 1975?

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs. — (FR) The matter raised in the honourable Member's question has not been discussed in the context of European political cooperation.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Will the Foreign Ministers not act in political cooperation against the terrorism practised by the Yugoslav Government in view of their successful joint action to combat *Rote Armee Fraktion* in West Germany and *Brigate Rosse* in Italy? Surely the Ten are bound by the Helsinki Final Act to do all they can to see that signatory governments respect human rights.

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) The honourable Member is fully entitled to her point of view, which I do not share.

President. — Question No 71, by Mr Seligman (H-460/83):

After the disunity in Foreign Policy displayed on the South Korean Boeing 747 air disaster, what have the Foreign Ministers been able to achieve in restoring the former close cooperation on Foreign Affairs?

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs. — (FR) The Ten consult on all important areas of foreign policy which are of common interest. In these consultations, they take one another's views into consideration so as to arrive at a common position, if possible. On the matter of the shooting-down of the Korean airliner, my predecessor as President stated the common position of the Ten when addressing the United Nations General Assembly on their behalf.

Mr Seligman (ED). — I think the Foreign Minister will agree that that was a major setback in an area where the Community has really been cooperating on foreign policy and really speaking with one voice. That is a major achievement of the Community. I hope he will regard it as a priority to reestablish the progress that was made before the Korean episode. Can he confirm that in Stockholm this week and in the Middle East, which Sir Geoffrey Howe has just

visited, the Community will be working together to achieve progress. Is it true that Sir Geoffrey went as a representative of the Community rather than simply as Foreign Minister of Great Britain and did he, in fact, achieve anything? We would be very glad to hear what was achieved on that visit.

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) There are three points in this supplementary. On the first, the Korean airliner, I have already recalled that my predecessor, speaking as President of the Community, deplored this action which caused the loss of many innocent lives. He also announced that the Ten were supporting the proposals submitted to the International Civil Aviation Organization aimed at preventing any repetition of such an action. I regret to have to tell the House that these proposals no longer command unanimous enthusiasm and it is to be feared that they will not in the end be adopted. This would be exceptionally grave, since it would mean that the international community and our Community, which protested at the time of the shooting-down of the Korean Boeing, would be incapable of taking the steps needed to condemn this type of action definitively and ensure that there can never be any recurrence.

The next part was concerned with the conference in Stockholm. I myself spoke on behalf of the Ten in Stockholm yesterday, delivering a speech which was drafted jointly. This was a laborious process, but the entire text was jointly drafted.

On the other hand, when I visited the Near East, at a time when I was not President of the Council of Ministers, I made no attempt to indicate that I was there on behalf of the Community, and I do not think that any of my colleagues would claim to be acting in such a representative capacity other than during a period of office as President of the Council of Ministers.

Mr Kallias (PPE). — (GR) The question fell within the context of the common foreign policy.

I would like to ask the honourable President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers if he believes that a durable common foreign policy would be an enormous boon for the Community?

The second question I would like to ask is as follows. Does he not think that, within the framework of this unity on foreign policy, the Community has a duty to take action on a matter which must be of concern to European public opinion, namely on the new provocation perpetrated in Cyprus by Turkey, and that it should make some move to help bring about a solution to this lingering and tragic problem?

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) Please excuse me for referring to what I said earlier on in my speech on our programme.

Cheysson

I do indeed believe that the Ten must try to define common positions whenever possible. This gives them a stronger voice so that they have a better chance of being heard, which is not only good for those who wish to see matters develop along these lines but also enhances the authority of each Member State.

In the case of Cyprus, the Ten immediately condemned what an elementary breach of international law, an attempt to divide a country recognized by the international community, an attempt to violate international agreements which remain entirely valid. This condemnation was both immediate and categorical. There are many other cases in which the Ten can take up a joint position in this way. But, as I was saying earlier, we should not have aspirations beyond our capabilities.

The Ten cannot have a common policy in all fields, because their geographical locations and past history are different, so that there are also differences in the constraints within which they have to operate in the area of external affairs. The relationship of the Federal Republic of Germany with the German Democratic Republic is of a particular type, different from the relationship of Greece or Ireland with that country. The same can be said of certain problems affecting Greece, which, in the nature of things, are seen from Athens in a way which cannot be shared or fully appreciated from Copenhagen or even Paris.

Let us establish common positions whenever we can, then, but let us not attempt to do so on every subject, since if we did we would be wasting our time in issuing declarations riddled with contradictions. I repeat that this does not apply to Cyprus, where there was a fundamental breach of international law, a breach which was very justly, very firmly and immediately condemned by the Ten.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) The Minister's last answer also answered my question. There is therefore no need for me to put a question.

President. — Question No 72, by Mr Israël (H-475/83):

Have the Ministers considered the dangers implicit in the Libyan Government's present policy as a result of the Libyan occupation of part of Chad (a signatory of the Lomé Convention) and its scarcely concealed support of practices condemned by the European Community and the entire international community?

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs. — (FR) The situation in Chad is being followed closely by the Ten: that is what I have been briefed to say. You will not be surprised that, coming from the French Minister for External Relations, those words have special meaning. The situation is therefore being followed closely by the Ten, who

are deeply concerned at the external intervention in Chad. They firmly support the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country, and have stated their opposition to all interference in its internal affairs.

The Ten are of the view that the problem of Chad must be resolved by the Africans themselves. In this connection, they have stressed and still stress the role which can and should be played by the Organization of African Unity, although without excluding action from other quarters, such as the appropriate organs of the United Nations.

Mr Israël (DEP). — (FR) Does the Community support the French intervention in Chad? More generally, does it have an overall policy in regard to States which not only invade foreign countries but also engage in terrorism all over the world?

Mr Cheysson. — (FR) As far as I am aware — and this is a matter on which I am bound to be fairly well informed — France has not asked the Community to support it in Chad. On the other point in Mr Israël's question, to my knowledge the Community has condemned invasion by foreign forces, occupation by foreign forces, wherever it has occurred in the world. It has condemned such occupations everywhere, whether in Namibia, Cambodia, Afghanistan, the territories occupied by Israel, or anywhere else. The Community has adhered consistently to the same position: occupation by foreign forces is to be condemned.

President. — Question No 73, by Mr Rieger (H-528/83):

What is the form and underlying purpose of the Member States' contribution to the preparations for the European disarmament conferences due to begin in January 1984? What do they expect to emerge from this conference?

Mr Cheysson, President-in-Office of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs. — (FR) The question refers to the conference on disarmament and security in Europe, the Stockholm conference, which is an integral part of the process started by the conference on security and cooperation in Europe, which began with the Helsinki Act, on the meetings for which there was always very active cooperation among the Ten. There have already been consultations among the Ten at various levels in advance of the preparatory meeting held in Helsinki on 25 October and the opening of the Stockholm conference, as I was saying earlier.

The importance that Member States of the Community attach to the Stockholm conference does not of course mean that there has been a decline in political cooperation interest in the other aspects of the process initiated in Helsinki, notably the meetings for which dates were set at the Madrid conference and action to

Cheysson

be taken on the basis of the commitments entered into in the Final Act and in the document drawn up on the conclusion of the Madrid conference.

Turning to the prospects for Stockholm, the Ten are convinced that the objectives of the conference will be attainable only if the terms of reference drawn up in Madrid — with no little difficulty — are adhered to. During the first phase of the conference, the aims can be achieved by the adoption of a series of measures to strengthen mutual confidence and security. The second phase of the conference could then be devoted to disarmament in the conventional sphere. The Ten intend to carry on their positive, constructive role throughout the conference, as in the past.

Mr Rieger (S). — *(DE)* We have great respect, Mr President-in-Office, for your attempts to keep the CSCE process going, and in particular your efforts towards arranging this Stockholm conference. On the other hand the public is not sufficiently informed that the European Community, as a signatory to the CSCE Final Act in its own right, can and does play an independent role. Are you prepared, Mr President-in-Office, during your period of office, to highlight the role of the European Community at the conference by special Community initiatives and will you take the appropriate steps to make this clear to the people of Europe?

Mr Cheysson. — *(FR)* I would remind the House that the original idea for the conference on disarmament in Europe came from France, and that it was taken up immediately by the Ten, and I can safely say in this Chamber, without fear of being contradicted by anyone, that it was the pertinacity and unity of the Ten which brought this idea to fruition. Some of our partners in the Atlantic Alliance were not convinced at first that it was a good idea. They came round to it, however, and thereafter proposals could be presented among partners in the Atlantic Alliance, that is among the Sixteen. But the conference would not have seen the light of day without the determination displayed by the Ten over a period of weeks and even months.

Once it had been decided that the conference would go ahead, it was important to set the right tone for its opening. Would it begin simply as a meeting of experts, attended by officials who would be highly qualified but would not provide any demonstration of political will? Once again, I maintain that it was because of the determined efforts of the Ten that this conference opened in Stockholm at ministerial level. This is not to suggest that ministers are better negotiators or orators than experts, but that their presence in Stockholm was physical evidence of political will. Such was the weight of this evidence that the countries of Eastern Europe, which were in two minds during the period of great tension at the end of last year about whether or not to attend, finally came to

the conclusion that it would not be possible for them to display political indifference when, thanks to the Ten, the Atlantic Alliance members, the neutral and non-aligned countries were demonstrating their political commitment. And so it was not until a very late stage, shortly before the conference was due to start, that we learnt that all the delegations would be headed by ministers.

Now we have to go further, by which I mean that we must demonstrate to our peoples that it is possible to make tangible, concrete, comprehensible progress in building confidence, so as to avoid situations in which military measures are misinterpreted, threats are resorted to, or rumours and disinformation are used as means of intimidation. And, despite the apprehensions that may have been aroused by the tone of certain declarations made in Stockholm even today, we remain confident that tangible, concrete progress can be made at the conference. This will require great cohesion among the Ten. We have such cohesion, and we shall maintain it, so that we shall therefore be able to make our voice heard, either as the Ten or as members of the Atlantic Alliance with the support of our friends from Ireland, which is not a member of the Alliance.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — *(GR)* I would like to ask the Minister if the Ten are mindful of the fact that the proposals they intend to put forward jointly to the Stockholm conference lack credibility given that two out of the 10 Member States have already acquiesced in the deployment on their territory of the American missiles which are already in operational readiness?

I would also like to ask whether the Ten will respond positively to proposals made by Member States or others for this conference to discuss the question of the creation of missile-free zones such as, for instance, in the Balkans and Scandinavia?

Mr Cheysson. — *(FR)* I should be very pleased to send the honourable Member a copy of the terms of reference for the Stockholm conference approved by 35 countries in Madrid. He will find that the subjects to which he has just referred are not covered by these terms of reference.

President. — Question Time is closed.¹

President-in-Office I would like to take this opportunity to thank the staff and interpreters. I would particularly like to thank the President-in-Office and Foreign Minister, not only for replying but also for agreeing to carry on an extra quarter of an hour after a very very long and heavy day. The thanks of Parliament goes to the President-in-Office.²

(The sitting was closed at 8.15 p.m.)

¹ See Annex.

² Membership of committees and interparliamentary delegations — Agenda for the next sitting: see Minutes.

ANNEX

1. Questions to the Commission

Question No 4, by Mr Ansquer (H-531/83)

Subject: Imports of cut flowers into the Community

In its answer to oral Question No H-326/83¹ the Commission deliberately evaded the issue of imposing quantitative restrictions on imports into the Community of cut flowers from certain third countries, merely pointing out that it was still actively considering the most appropriate solutions. Can the Commission state clearly its intentions as to possible new arrangements and clarify its position with regard to the solution based on annual quantitative restrictions on imports of these products into the Community?

Answer

At the meeting of the Council of Ministers for Agriculture on 17 and 18 October 1983 the Commission undertook to submit a report together with proposals on import arrangements for certain cut flowers (roses and carnations) so that a decision could be taken before the start of the 1984-85 marketing year.

The Commission's departments are currently preparing proposals to provide greater protection for Community-grown products from imports from third countries. The purpose of these provisions is to achieve greater market understanding with regard to both production and imports. The idea is also to monitor more closely imports from third countries so that the proper measures can be taken if markets are disrupted as a result of quantities of imports which the Community market would find difficult to absorb without serious consequences for growers' incomes.

* * *

Question No 9, by Mr Wedekind (H-365-83)²

Subject: Manufacture of 'fake' recycled paper

Is the Commission aware that there are firms in the Federal Republic of Germany that are adding chemical dyestuffs to ordinary paper so that it acquires the aspect of recycled paper and can be sold for considerably higher prices? This method of profit-making is all the more irresponsible in economic terms since the paper produced cannot be reprocessed.

Can the Commission provide details showing whether this 'fake' recycled paper is also manufactured in other Member States of the Community and what share of the recycled paper market it has already obtained? Does the Commission intend to take action to stop this practice? If so, what steps does it envisage?

Answer

The Commission has no knowledge of the matter referred to by the honourable Member, with regard to Germany or any other Member State. There has been no confirmation of any such rumours. The deliberate marketing of ordinary paper as environment-friendly

¹ Debates No 303 of 14 September 1983.

² Former oral question without debate (0-45/83) converted into a question for Question Time.

paper made from 100% recycled paper is very unlikely since the relatively high level of transparency of this market is such that competitors would soon discover tactics of this kind and condemn them as unfair competition. In the circumstances the Commission can investigate the matter further only if the honourable Member can provide more information.

* * *

Question No 14, by Mr Collins (H-442/83)

Subject: Steel industry

On 29 September 1983 Mr Andriessen recommended that Ravenscraig should close. Will Mr Andriessen not agree that redundancies in the steel industry have been greater in the United Kingdom than in any other Community country and will he not agree, therefore, that his remarks were quite unreasonable especially having regard to the increase in capacity which has taken place elsewhere in the Community?

Answer

When addressing the Consultative Committee on 23 September 1983, I stated that the Commission

- seriously doubted whether BSC would return to viability by the end of 1986 and
- considered that the major obstacle to BSC's return to viability was the low utilization of its capacity for molten steel and wide-hot-rolled strip; this could only be improved by capacity reductions in the crude steel and coils sector.

I have never made any mention of Ravenscraig. It is the Commission's firm conviction that the undertakings and Member States concerned should decide themselves which plants have to be closed.

The considerable cutback in the workforce (down 59.3% compared with 1978) and the reduction in capacity for hot-rolled products (down HMP 4 m tonnes since 1980) in the British steel industry are facts that cannot be denied. However, these measures proved to be necessary to enable BSC to attain the average productivity level within the Community. In 1975, 24.4% of the total number of steel workers in the Community were employed in the British steel industry, though they only produced 14.3% of the Community's steel output. In 1982, the former figure had fallen to 14.5% of steel workers in the Community, who were responsible for 14.3% of the steel produced in the Community.

Finally, on 29 June 1983 the total production cuts or commitments undertaken by the Member States to reduce production amounted to 18 436 000 tonnes of hot-rolled products, not including Greece, which had not yet joined the Community in 1980 and for which no figures are available, and Ireland.

The Commission Decision of 29 June 1983 will yield a further cut of at least 8 300 000 tonnes.

In its final assessment of the plans for restructuring, the Commission will also have to take into account the viability of the various undertakings. Under the Decisions of 29 June 1983, viability is a requirement for the approval of aid.

* * *

Question No 15, by Mr Normanton (H-458/83)

Subject: Financial assistance from the EEC

Will the Commission include in all contracts which are placed by the Community with public authorities and companies a requirement to display publicly notices stating that Community aid has been accorded?

Answer

If Community aid is granted to large infrastructure projects Member States are obliged to advertise the fact that these subsidies are accorded from Community funds. This information must also be given to prospective recipients of productive investment aid. The ultimate recipient of Community aid is not however obliged to advertise that assistance has been given by the Community.

* * *

Question No 19, by Mr Clinton (H-479/83)

Subject: Suspension of the Farm Retirement Scheme

Can the Commission please explain the justification for cancelling the Farm Retirement Scheme during the review of Directive 160 and has the Commission any proposals on new ways and means of encouraging ageing farmers to retire and to provide an opportunity for well-trained young farmers to start a career in agriculture?

Answer

In its proposal for improving the efficiency of agricultural structures (Doc. COM(83) 559 of October 1983), the Commission did not provide for the further application of Directive 160 concerning measures to encourage the cessation of farming and the reallocation of utilized agricultural area for the purposes of structural improvement. This was essentially because of the modest success of these measures in promoting land mobility over a relatively long period.

At the present time the Commission has no plans to submit other proposals to encourage elderly farmers to retire, beyond those already proposed in the context of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes for some regions of the Community where, under certain circumstances, these measures could be appropriate.

The abovementioned Commission proposal does, however, provide a new incentive for young farmers, who could qualify for an installation premium on taking over their first farm, on condition that they have the requisite occupational skills.

As regards the acquisition of occupational skills, the Commission proposal would widen the scope of the existing measures, particularly to benefit young farmers.

* * *

Question No 21, by Mr von Wogau (H-516/83)

Subject: Discrimination against nationals of other Community Member States by German insurance companies

Mr Michelangelo Di Pierro, a national of another Member State of the Community, has lived in the Federal Republic of Germany since 1961, in Hamelin. He is employed in the public service. Since 1961 Mr Di Pierro has driven without accident. His motor insurance company, the Württembergische Feuerversicherungs AG, requires him to pay a foreigners' risk surcharge of 60% of his motor insurance premium.

Does the Commission consider that the levying of a foreigners' risk surcharge equivalent to 60% of the insurance premium in respect of nationals of another Member State of the Community resident in the Federal Republic of Germany is compatible with Article 7 of the EEC Treaty and, if not, what steps does it consider should be taken to abolish discrimination of this kind?

Answer

The Commission considers the imposition in respect of the nationals of other Member States resident in the Federal Republic of Germany of a foreign drivers increased risk supplement amounting to 60% of the motor insurance premium to be incompatible with Article 7 of the EEC Treaty.

As regards the action already taken by the Commission, the honourable Member is requested to refer to the answer given to the oral question by Mr Ouzoundis (H-445/83).

* * *

Question No 23, by Ms Quin (H-542/83)

Subject: Proposed tax on oils and fats and its effect on developing countries

What discussion with developing countries has the Commission had concerning the proposals for a tax on oils and fats? In particular what has been the reaction of Asean countries?

Answer

The fact that the Commission has had no direct consultations with the majority of the developing countries regarding the proposal to introduce a tax on certain oils and fats does not mean that the Commission is unaware of those countries' views on the subject.

In recent years, the possible introduction of a tax on oils and fats by the Community has been the subject of debate in international forums: the tax has been discussed many times at meetings of the FAO Intergovernmental Group; as recently as October 1983, the developing countries were able to state their views at the 54th session of the FAO Products Committee. The Commission is represented at all these meetings and has been able to take note of the views expressed by the developing countries.

As regards the Asean countries, the Commission's proposal to introduce a tax on certain oils and fats was raised by the Asean representative during the meeting of the EEC/Asean joint Committee last October. The Asean representative expressed concern as regards the scope for exports of vegetable oils to the Community.

In his reply, the Commission representative pointed out that what is involved at present is a Commission proposal, on which the Council has not yet taken a decision. He added that the level of the proposed tax is unlikely to affect imports from Asean countries into the Community, these being high-quality oils which the Community is unable to produce itself.

* * *

Question No 24, by Mrs Boserup (H-548/83)

Subject: Access to the Commission's files

In Chapter I, section 7, of its Twelfth Report on Competition Policy the Commission states that it now permits the undertakings involved in a procedure to inspect the file on their case. Why does the Commission believe that the above rules should apply only to undertakings involved in a case? Does it not think the above rule should be extended to cover applicants, plaintiffs and other parties in cases that are being or have been dealt with under the Community system?

Answer

When the matter of who should have access to the Commission's files is considered, such access must be seen as one of the aspects of preparing a defence against the objections raised by the Commission. It is therefore available only to undertakings which are affected by alleged infringements of Article 85 or 86.

Those who have notified agreements pursuant to Articles 4 and 5 of Regulation (EEC) No 17/62 are not involved in defending themselves against the Commission's objections until such time as the Commission gives formal notice of its objections. It is only at this stage that access to the file is allowed. An undertaking which has notified an agreement in respect of which the Commission intends to give an exemption or a negative pronouncement is not involved in defending itself against the Commission's objections; there is no question therefore of access to the file.

Although plaintiffs do not have an automatic right to examination of the file while the complaint is being investigated by the Commission, in practice the Commission sees to it that the plaintiff receives the answers and comments — albeit at times in a condensed form — of the undertaking or undertakings against which the complaint has been lodged. An undertaking must be informed of the contents of the Commission's file because it receives, at the same time as the letter in which a complaint is rejected, a list of all the documents contained in the file. The documents or parts of documents to which the undertaking has access must be indicated.

* * *

Question No 25, by Mr van Aerssen (H-566/83)

Subject: 'Underground' economy in the Community

The 'underground' economy has developed into a well organized economic sector in the Community. A study by the ILO in Geneva and another by Professor B.S. Frey of Zürich indicate, for example, that the 'underground' economy accounts for

- 25-33% of GNP in Italy;
- 8-10% of GNP in Great Britain;
- 13-15% of GNP in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Is the Commission systematically looking into the causes and effects of the phenomenon of the 'black' economy and, if not, is it prepared to take firm action on this problem as part of its efforts to ensure that the common market becomes a reality?

Answer

The Commission is aware that the development of the 'black' economy distorts competition at local, national and Community levels, as well as undermining respect for legal and fiscal systems, depriving the State and social security schemes of income, upsetting the official labour market and distorting the statistical bases on which economic policy is formulated.

Assessment of the parallel economy is by definition difficult. It has only recently become the subject of thorough research and methods of estimating it are being developed. However, since in some Member States the 'black' economy has reached a scale of some significance, the problems it raises are taken into account in the Commission's regular analysis of the economic situation.

There are complex reasons for the development of the 'underground' economy. In any case, major factors in its development are the excessive inflexibility of various kinds and the general increase of the tax burden which have emerged in the last few years.

In this connection, the phenomenon of the 'underground' economy should be steadily reduced as a result of the economic policy guidelines which have been evolved by the Commission for some years and which concern an improvement in the broad sense of competitiveness and a strengthening of productive structures within the Community, together with a reduction of deficits and a cut in public spending on production.

With regard to the more specific problem of 'black' work, this is a matter of constant concern to the Commission which outlined its views on the subject in the answers to the written questions No 1619/81, by Mrs Fullet, and No 1683/80 by Mr Croux, Mr Malangre and Mr Notenboom.

In this regard, mention may be made of two proposals for directives which the Commission has forwarded to the Council and which seek to harmonize the legal provisions concerning temporary and part-time work.¹ These are sectors of the labour market which are particularly open to the encouragement of undeclared employment.

Finally, the Commission plans to have a study made of the performance and behaviour of the labour market during the recession, with particular emphasis on the role of the 'underground' economy. This proposal is still to be confirmed by the budgetary authorities.

* * *

Question No 26, by Mr Fich (H-571/83)

-Subject: Conference on the Community and the education system

Recently the Commission organized a conference in Videbaek, Denmark, on the Community and the education system. Under what heading of the Community budget was this conference funded and what was the legal basis?

Answer

The cost of the conference to which the honourable Member refers was borne by the Commission under Item 2720 (Expenditure on the dissemination of information and on participation in public events). There is nothing in the EEC Treaty which prevents the Commission from organizing conferences designed to spread knowledge in the Community. Indeed, the European Parliament itself has often stated that this is the task of the Commission.²

* * *

Question No 27, by Mr van Rompuy (H-573/83)

Subject: Fabelta-Zwinaarde

On what grounds does the Commission prohibit the granting of State aid to Fabelta-Zwijnaarde?

Answer

The Commission examined thoroughly the Belgian intention to grant aid to Fabelta-Zwijnaarde and on 30 November 1983 gave a final ruling, pursuant to Article 93(2) of the EEC Treaty, to the effect that this aid was incompatible with the common market.

¹ Proposal for a Council Directive concerning temporary work (OJ C 128, 19. 5. 1982, p. 2) and amended proposal for a Council Directive on voluntary part-time work (OJ C 18, 22. 1. 1983, p. 5).

² See for example the report, drawn up by Mr Beumer on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on the information policy of the European Communities for the 1984 direct elections (Doc. 1-1058/82 of 14 January 1983).

The Commission's findings can be summarized as follows :

In an industry where there are continuing and undeniable problems of over-capacity and where competition in the Community is extremely keen, the proposed aid to save the bankrupt Fabelt-Zwijnaarde synthetic fibre company would distort competition and result in an unfair advantage over other Community producers. It would also result in shifting the problems to other manufacturers in this sector.

Moreover, this aid must be regarded as going beyond the arrangements which applied in Belgium in 1983 to the textile and clothing industry. The Commission could find no reason to grant a derogation under Article 92(3) of the EEC Treaty and to exempt this aid from the rule that such aid is incompatible with the common market.

* * *

Question No 28, by Mr Nordmann (H-576/83)

Subject: Textile and clothing industry

On 12 July 1983 the Commission forwarded a questionnaire to the Member States concerning aids to the textile and clothing industry. The aim of the questionnaire was to draw up an overall table illustrating such aids, the legal bases for them, the intervention bodies granting them, the procedures for granting them, the appropriations utilized and the scale of the projects and investment involved, in order to improve the transparency of the various forms of support enjoyed by the textile and clothing sector in each country.

Can the Commission provide Parliament with a preliminary summary of the findings of essential investigation, given that the Member States' answers to this questionnaire were to be forwarded to it by 15 October?

Answer

Unfortunately it is not yet possible at this time to give Parliament any information regarding the Commission's analysis of the questionnaires on forms of support for the textile and clothing industry which were sent to the Member States. In the middle of 1983 the Commission asked the Member States to forward the information. It is hoped that all the necessary data will have been submitted by the end of next month. It is in any case the intention of the Commission to publish the information after it has been processed.

* * *

Question No 29, by Mrs Salisch (H-580/83)

Subject: Visa requirements for Turks in the Federal Republic of Germany

Is the Commission aware that the undertaking originally made by the Minister for the Interior of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr Baum, to authorize the issue of free one-year visas has evidently been retracted by his successor as Federal Minister for the Interior, Mr Zimmermann, since such visas are currently not being issued for movements across the German-Dutch border, and what does the Commission propose to do about it?

Question No 30, by Mr Van Minnen (H-582/83)

Subject: Visa requirements for Turks in the Federal Republic of Germany

Does the Commission recall the undertaking it gave during the debate on the report on visa requirement for Turkish workers, which was adopted in July 1982 (Doc. 1-387/82), that it would ensure that the call for a free one-year visa would be put into practice in the Member States?

Combined answer to Questions Nos 29 and 30

The question of visa requirements for Turkish workers in possession of residence and work permits does not fall within the competence of the Community. Each Member State has the sovereign power to take those measures it deems necessary as regards the entry of Turkish migrant workers into its territory. In such circumstances, the Commission is not officially informed of changes made by Member States to their rules governing visa requirements for Turkish workers.

In the debate on Turkey in July 1982, when the draft resolution of Mr Van Minnen on visa requirements for Turkish workers was introduced, the Commission's stance was the same — this matter falls within the competence of the Member-States.¹

* * *

Question No 31, by Mr Pearce (H-585/83)

Subject: The totally anti-'communautaire' situation

What effective steps has the Commission recently taken to end the totally anti-'communautaire' situation where British-based insurance companies cannot operate in Germany and British-based auction houses cannot operate in France? Would it support moves to prevent German-based car manufacturers and French-based wine producers selling their wares in Britain?

Answer

The Commission takes the view that an insurance company whose head office is situated in one Member State is entitled under the EEC Treaty both to set up branches or agencies inside another Member State and to cover risks situated there directly, without making use of a branch or agency in the country concerned.

The right to open branches or agencies can in fact already be freely exercised, in Germany as in other Member States, making use of procedures set out in Directive 73/239/EEC.

German legislation, like that of many other Member States, does however contain provisions which make it impossible in most circumstances to cover risks there except through an establishment situated in that country, a situation which in the view of the Commission is contrary to Article 59 of the Treaty. A proposal for a Directive intended to facilitate the exercise of the right of freedom of services in insurance has been under discussion in the Council for many years. The failure of the Council to adopt it, however regrettable, does not exonerate the Member States from their duty under the Treaty to abolish provisions requiring insurers covering risks in their territory to be established there. The Commission has therefore undertaken a number of legal actions. It draws attention in particular to the complaints it has brought before the Court of Justice against France and Denmark for incorrect application of Council Directive 78/473/EEC of 30 May 1978 (coinsurance) and an infringement procedure which it has commenced against the Federal Republic of Germany, which is intended to remove that country's existing requirements for insurers to be established.

Other considerations apply to the public auctioning of goods and chattels, which in France, unlike the United Kingdom, is an activity which is debarred to private traders and can be carried on only by publicly authorized officers, such as for example 'commissaires-priseurs' (public auctioneers), 'notaires' (notaries), and 'huissiers' (officers of the courts). A regulation of this type, found in other Member States besides France, is not contrary to Community law, and in particular to Articles 7, 52 and 59 of the EEC Treaty. In the

¹ See draft resolution (Doc. 1-387/82) of Mr Van Minnen and relevant section of Verbatim Report of Proceedings (7 July 1982).

first place, the prohibition on holding public auctions is just as much applicable to French nationals as to those of other Member States ; and in the second place, under Articles 55 and 66 of the EEC Treaty, where the holding of public auctions is reserved by law to publicly authorized officers it does not have to be opened up to nationals from other Member States, since it is an activity connected with the exercise of official authority.

Furthermore, the Commission does not intend to make proposals to the Council for the adoption of harmonized rules laying down which economic activities should be open respectively to private persons and to publicly authorized or ministerially appointed officers who traditionally exercise powers derived from official authority.

* * *

Question No 33, by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-592/83)

Subject: Proposals amending for the fourth and fifth time the directive on cosmetic products

At its plenary sitting of 14 October 1983 the European Parliament adopted by a large majority an amendment tabled by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection to Article 10 of Directive 76/768/EEC¹ on cosmetic products. In this amendment the European Parliament called on the Commission to transmit any proposed amendments to the annexes of the directive on cosmetics to Parliament by the normal consultation procedures.

Bearing in mind that the Commission had referred the proposals amending for the fourth and fifth times the directive of July 1976 to Parliament for an opinion — these in fact being amendments to Annexes II, III, IV and V of Directive 76/768/EEC and dealing in particular with toothpastes and hair tints — does the Commission not consider, in view of the above vote, that the two directives in question ought to be referred to Parliament for an opinion again, especially as the debate had already been started by the committee responsible ?

Answer

I had occasion to comment on the matter raised by the honourable Member at the meeting of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection on 29 September 1983. The Commission has been guided by the following considerations :

It was after a great deal of effort that the Commission succeeded in persuading the Council that the amendment of Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of laws relating to cosmetic products could be carried out with the help of a Committee on the Adaptation to Technical Progress and in the form of directives proposed by the Commission. There were three important aspects :

— Firstly, the amendments to the annexes of the Directive on Cosmetic Products are simply technical amendments to legislation passed by the Council and Parliament to bring it in line with technical progress and there is no change in substance to the legal content of the directive.

— Adaptation should then be carried through quickly in view of the fact that it is important to maintain and if possible to expand the technical advance on world markets ; adaptation is possible within a few months thanks to the Committee on Adaptation to Technical Progress.

¹ OJ L 262, 27. 9. 1976, p. 169.

— Thirdly, the Commission has a role to play with regard to economic policy. The cosmetics industry is in the forefront of technical progress and is a major employer providing about 130 000 jobs. The performance of the industry depends to a very great extent on our ability to adapt to technical progress.

Also, there are several possibilities I should like to mention by way of satisfying Parliament's desire for more information on measures regarding adaptation. Firstly, it must be pointed out that the Commission can consult the Council of Ministers and therefore also the European Parliament if the amendment to a directive is of particular political significance. The Commission has amended Annexes II, III and IV of the framework directive on a number of occasions, most recently on 29 June and 22 September 1983. The Commission viewed these as being technical amendments relating to toothpastes and hair dyes.

After the European Parliament had delivered its opinion, the Council on 26 October 1983 approved Directive 83/574/EEC, as a result of which Directive 76/768/EEC was amended in some points. The House was consulted on these measures of some political bearing. I have moreover given instructions that there should be regular information about any amendments. A report is being prepared and will be submitted to the House in the next three months.

* * *

Question No 34, by Sir Peter Vanneck (H-594/83)

Subject : Arabus-Airbus

Following the proposal for Egyptian collaboration in the Airbus Industry Project,¹ what steps is the Commission taking to promote collaboration between interested firms in all Member States and Arab partner firms so that the European Airbus might be an Arab-European Airbus ?

Answer

The Commission is not aware of any existing or proposed Egyptian collaboration in the activities of Airbus Industry.

* * *

Question No 35, by Mr Blaney (H-595/83)

Subject : Cost of the CAP

Does the Commission agree with the estimates of the Court of Auditors, in its report in response to the European Council of June 1983, about the costs to the EAGGF of Community non-preference, the burden of compensatory measures, and the aggravating effect of MCAs, and will it propose measures to reduce these costs ?

Answer

The Commission has noted with interest the special report by the Court of Auditors which was requested by the European Council in June 1983. It shares the general view taken concerning the burden on the Guarantee Section of the EAGGF of the various factors mentioned, and the scope for achieving savings by reinforcing Community preference, abolishing or reducing certain aids and gradually eliminating monetary compensatory amounts. It is unable to comment on the high figures cited by the Court, however, since these are not accounted for precisely.

¹ *Financial Times* of 6 December 1983, p. 5.

The Commission draws attention to the proposals submitted in July 1983 for the adaptation of the CAP (COM 500), followed in recent months by implementing proposals. In addition, it has just submitted its price proposals for the 1984/85 marketing years, accompanied by various measures directed towards savings.

* * *

Question No 37, by Mr Kyrkos (H-604/83)

Subject: Economic aid for disaster-hit regions

The disasters which hit Vasilika in Thessaloniki prefecture and Ormilía in Halkidiki prefecture, two regions whose main crops are out-of-season vegetables, caused damage to 10 hectares of hot-houses, i.e. to 100% of the farms. The damage to permanent structures and crops, which varies between 30% and 100% in extent, falls exclusively on the farmers as there is no insurance coverage. The setback to crop-growing in such a vulnerable sector will have serious repercussions on producers' incomes, which are going to come under a still heavier burden from excessive borrowing from banks.

Since the people in the region are in a terrible economic position and are in debt to the banks for loans which they took out in the past to rebuild their houses destroyed in the 1978 earthquakes, is the Commission thinking of giving any economic aid to the farmers in those regions, and would it object to the farms in question being brought within the scope of Directive 72/159/EEC, application of which recently began in Greece, with derogations relating to development project and comparable incomes?

Answer

It is possible for the Commission to help people who have been hit by disasters but it must be pointed out that the budget resources for this are very limited. This means that there must be a thorough examination of each application by a Member State to see if such action by the Commission is justified and the information given by each Member on any national action that may be taken must also be considered carefully.

As from 1 January 1984 the Commission can no longer act on the basis of Directive 72/159/EEC but in October and December last year Commission proposals were put forward which should replace the development project and comparable income scheme with another more flexible aid scheme regarding investment in agricultural holdings. If the Commission plan is adopted, the Greek Government will have the possibility of approving improvement projects, including those drawn up by farmers who have been affected by disasters.

* * *

Question No 38, by Mrs Dury (H-605/83)

Subject: Breastmilk substitutes

Can the Commission say what action it has taken on the European Parliament's resolution on the code of marketing of breastmilk substitutes?

Answer

The Commission's work in this area is nearing conclusion. It comprises several elements. On the one hand the Commission had to consider the different areas of competence of the Community and the Member States and on the other we had to avoid any measures which went beyond the Community. I went into detail on these points during the sitting of 11 April 1983. The World Health Organization was advised in a similar fashion in May 1983.

1. With regard to the interior market the Community is responsible for binding regulations on the composition and labelling of breastmilk substitutes and certain aspects of advertising these products. A relative draft directive has been drawn up.

Information and education, health arrangements, employment in the health sector and relations between producers and their staff are matters for the individual Member States. The work of the Commission in this respect must be limited to coordination measures. Complementary to this is a voluntary agreement on advertising. The latest version of this reached the Commission recently and it covers areas which cannot be dealt with by any formal legal provision on the part of the Community.

2. In connection with third countries and in particular with developing countries in which this is a particular problem, measures are envisaged which are not legislative in nature — since this is not possible legally — but which nevertheless can help to bring about the aims of the WHO. You are aware that the Commission has delegations in many countries outside the Community, especially in developing countries. The idea is that through these representatives we can cooperate on these problems with the countries in question and in specific cases we shall see what measures can be taken. The Commission feels that a pragmatic approach of this kind can get round the legal problems which exist and that also there will be no overlapping with the work of the United Nations, especially Unicef and WHO.

3. We are currently bringing together these various elements in a Commission communication which will be submitted to Parliament. The House will thus have a further opportunity to discuss the matter.

* * *

Question No 39, by Mr Ephremidis (H-608/83)

Subject: The forthcoming EP elections

As is well known, there are in many EEC countries — and particularly in Greece — broad political and popular movements that oppose their countries' accession to and continued membership of the EEC. Why is the Commission engaging in a series of propagandistic 'informative' activities, and do the latter not constitute interference in the election context?

Answer

It is the job of the Commission and its information service to provide information on the activities of the Community. In no instance do they engage in activities which can be regarded as 'propagandistic activities'.

* * *

Question No 40, by Mr Adamou (H-610/83)

Subject: Destruction of citrus fruit in Greece

Since Greece's accession to the EEC thousands of tonnes of citrus fruit have been thrown on to tips and buried because markets could not be found for them in due time. Specifically, of the 1981-82 harvest 75 600 tonnes of oranges and of the 1982-83 harvest a total of 137 500 tonnes of citrus fruit were disposed of on tips. The 1983-84 crop is expected to be smaller. However, owing to delays with exports — they were supposed to have started in November — and the obstacles which the EEC puts in the way of Greece's trade with third countries, there is a danger that, this year too, large quantities of citrus fruit will have to be destroyed.

What steps does the Commission intend taking so that markets will be found in good time for this year's crop of citrus fruit and that the incomes of Greek producers will be protected?

Answer

In accordance with the approximation arrangements under the Act of Accession, all the measures regarding other Community citrus fruit apply also to Greek citrus fruit. In the case of lemons, the intervention prices and the minimum prices to be paid for processing have since 1 January 1981 been at the same level as those in the other Member States of the Community. With regard to the export of citrus fruit from Greece to third countries, it should be remembered that since 1 January 1981 export refunds for oranges, mandarins and lemons have been set at the same levels which apply to these fruit in other producing countries of the Community. It should be noted that since 16 December 1982 export refunds for fruit going to eastern Europe, Greece's main customer for citrus fruit, have increased considerably.

* * *

Question No 41, by Mr Adam (H-616/83)

Subject : Esprit

Agence Europe reports that at the research Council on 13 December 1983 the Commission gave an assurance that the necessary appropriations could be mobilized by making savings in other sectors of the Community research policy.

Will the Commission please inform Parliament of the nature of these savings ?

Answer

The Agence Europe report as quoted by the honourable Member is slightly inaccurate in that the Commission said that :

- (a) it, the Commission, is not responsible for the budgetary decision ; it must execute what is decided by the Council and the European Parliament
- (b) payment appropriations earmarked for Esprit in the 1984 budget are of the order of 45 million ECU. The Commission agrees to give the necessary guarantee to manage in such a way as to make available this amount.

* * *

Question No 42, by Mrs Castle (H-617/83)

Subject : Exclusive Purchasing Agreement

In their answer to Oral Question No H-503/83¹ by Mrs Castle, the Commission indicated a refreshingly tough determination to ensure that tenants of tied houses were not victimized for exercising their rights under Regulation No 1984/83.

Will the Commission write directly to the brewing companies in the UK to reiterate the warning contained in their excellent reply ?

Answer

It would be inappropriate for the Commission to write directly to brewers in the UK to warn them against a particular violation of the rules of competition.

The appropriate channel for the Commission to follow if it wishes to bring its views to the attention of the parties concerned is via public statements, such as the Commission Notice concerning the Regulations on a block exemption for exclusive distribution and purchasing agreements, published in Official Journal C 355 of 30 December 1983, and the publicity given to written and oral questions from Parliament and the answers to these questions.

¹ Verbatim report of proceedings of 16 November 1983, p. 230 (prov. edition).

The particular instance of abuse referred to in Mrs Castle's Oral Question No H-503/83 only represents one example of the way in which economic or other pressure can be brought to bear on tenants and is therefore not specifically considered in the Notice. The Commission's standpoint is however made completely clear in its answer to Oral Question No H-503/83.

* * *

Question No 43, by Mr Harris (H-618/83)

Subject : Fishing

Is the Commission aware that a number of bulk catchers are fishing for mackerel inside the South West 'box', and will it carry out an urgent investigation of the position in conjunction with the United Kingdom authorities?

Answer

As the honourable Member knows, the original mackerel box established by Regulation (EEC) No 171/83¹ was modified in November 1983 to form an extended conservation area, closed throughout the year to vessels fishing for mackerel with specified types of gear, i.e. trawls, danish seines or similar nets and purse seines.

The Commission has been informed that, notwithstanding this prohibition, a small number of fishermen have been able to use the permitted gear in such a way that it may result in the depletion of the stock, which the prohibition seeks to prevent. In so doing, they are undermining the intention of the conservation measure.

The enforcement of the provisions of Community legislation is of course the responsibility of the Member States, but in this particular case some difficulties arise in applying the provisions of this rule.

It is, however, not fully clear at this time how widespread is this abuse and to what extent it may lead to further more serious breaches.

The Commission therefore has arranged to carry out a detailed investigation on this matter by its own Fisheries Inspectorate in conjunction with the United Kingdom authorities. This inspection is taking place this week.

In the light of the results of this investigation it will be decided if further measures or amendments to Article 15 of Regulation (EEC) No 171/83 are required.

* * *

Question No 45, by Mr Petersen (H-622/83)

Subject : Computers

Is the Commission aware that the aim of the Japanese research programme concerning fifth-generation computers is to develop a computer which can carry out 1 000 million LIs (logical inferences) per second, where the best conventional computers today can carry out between 30 000 and 100 000? Is the Commission aware of the qualitative leap in the whole field of data processing which the Japanese programme will entail if its aims are achieved?

Will the Commission also state what specific plans are contained in the Esprit programme on the development of fifth-generation computers, and whether these plans comprise an integrated programme based on an overall plan — aimed at producing a qualitative/revolutionary leap, or whether the programme is more on an *ad hoc* basis?

¹ OJ L 24, 27. 1. 1983.

Answer

The honourable Member has asked if the Commission is aware of the Japanese programme to develop logical inference computers and how that area is covered in the Esprit workplan.

The Commission and all the industrial and academic experts who have participated in the definition of the Esprit workplan are, of course, well aware of the Japanese research programme concerning fifth generation computers. It is true that this Japanese programme could lead to a real qualitative leap in the practical application of knowledge processing techniques.

The Esprit programme is a programme for precompetitive collaborative Research and Development. While Esprit does not aim at supporting product development, the Esprit workplan contains all the necessary scientific work, both in hardware and in software, to establish industrial base technologies for knowledge processing systems, including inference machines referred to in the honourable Member's question.

The area 'Advanced Information Processing' in Esprit is concerned with the tools and techniques needed for knowledge engineering, expert systems, advanced interfaces for processing and interpreting signals, for knowledge storage and, in computer architecture, for inference machines. The work in the field of microelectronics will provide the basic hardware components technology. These together form the industrial technology needed for fifth generation computers.

As can be seen from the above, Esprit is based on a comprehensive integrated plan to achieve the breakthroughs required for a revolutionizing leap.

* * *

*II. Questions to the Council**Question No 47, by Mr Lalor (H-432/83)*

Subject: Strengthening the EMS

Is the Council satisfied that the Community is making every effort to comply with one of the priority goals of the Copenhagen Summit of December 1982, namely the strengthening of the European Monetary System, and when is it hoped to have all 10 Member States embraced into the system?

Answer

The operation of the European Monetary System and the possibility of strengthening it have often been the subject of exchanges of views prepared by the Monetary Committee and the Committee of Central Bank Governors, at meetings of the ECOFIN Council. The Council has noted at these meetings that the EMS has operated well in its present form and has contributed to monetary stability both in Europe and worldwide. The strengthening of the system remains a priority objective of the Community.

Allowance was made for the non-participation of Member States in the exchange and intervention mechanism when the system was set up, and it is for the Member States concerned to decide if and when they wish to join it.

* * *

Question No 51, by Mrs Lixin (H-556/83)

Subject : Draft Belgian legislation on immigrants

Does the Council consider that draft legislation currently under consideration in Belgium which seeks to prevent the reunification of families and the right of recent immigrants to live or take up residence in certain districts of Belgium is compatible with Community law ?

Answer

The Council would point out that it is for the Commission to ensure that the provisions of the Treaty and the measures taken pursuant thereto are applied.

* * *

Question No 56, by Mr Ephremidis (H-553/83)

Subject : Council of Ministers on Social Affairs

According to press reports on the Council of Ministers for Social Affairs held in Athens in November, proposals were put forward and discussions held on restrictions of workers' rights at European level. Can the Council state if this information is correct, exactly what topics were discussed and what decisions were taken ?

Answer

The Council does not comment on press reports. As the meeting of the Ministers for Social Affairs in Athens was of an informal nature, no decisions were taken there.

* * *

Question No 57, by Mr van Miert (H-568/83)

Subject : European cultural centres

Does the Council not think that its plan to designate a new European capital every year as the European Cultural Centre will consolidate or strengthen State centralism rather than break it down ? Does it not consider that it would be generally preferable over the long term to have cities of artistic and historical merit selected on the basis of well defined criteria and designated in accordance with a rota system, as I suggested in my motion for a resolution of 21 February 1983 ?

Answer

Under the last Presidency the idea was put forward, at the informal meeting of Ministers for Culture of the Member States of the Community on 28 November 1983 in Athens, of designating each year a town in a Member State as a centre for exhibiting works of art or for artistic events representative of the Community's cultural heritage ; these works of art and events would be selected by common agreement among the Member States.

Proposals have already been made in this connection regarding two capital cities — Athens and Amsterdam — but there has been no question of ruling out the possibility of choosing towns which are not capitals.

Of course, no decision has been taken on the proposed system for annually designating a town as a centre for exhibiting works of art and for artistic events representative of the Community's cultural heritage.

* * *

Question No 58, by Mrs van Hemeldonck (H-569/83)

Subject : Supervision and control of transfrontier shipment of hazardous wastes within the European Community

In its resolution of 8 June 1981¹ on this subject, the European Parliament called on the Council to take a rapid decision. On 15 June 1983, the Commission submitted a revised proposal for a Council Regulation (EEC).

However, the Environment Council of 28 November 1983 has once again ended without result, although a working party was charged with the problem.

What precise problem areas does the Council propose that the working party consider? When is the working party to submit its findings to the Council? Will the Council take a final decision on the proposal submitted by the Commission at its meeting of 16 December 1983 — is it aware of the European public's enormous interest in this problem and the high expectation of a prompt and binding solution?

Is the Council willing to bear the political responsibility for possible accidents and disasters in the event of a failure to reach a rapid decision?

Answer

The work carried out by the Council at its meetings on 28 November and 16 December 1983 on this proposal for a Regulation enabled some progress to be made on a number of problems still unresolved without, however, making it possible for agreement to be reached.

The Council noted that certain provisions of this proposal still required further detailed preparation.

These primarily concern the conditions to be fulfilled for transfrontier shipments of waste to be able to take place. In this connection, the Council considered that a period of time to consider the matter was necessary, particularly so as to enable the Commission to evaluate certain fundamental problems concerning the system of supervision and control which were raised at the meeting on 16 December 1983.

The Council also considered that a number of other provisions proposed by the Commission were not ready for adoption. These involve important questions such as the producer's civil liability and obligations regarding insurance; most delegations felt that these provisions raised very complex questions and required further in-depth examination of their exact scope and possible arrangements for applying them.

In this connection, it was suggested that the Council might concentrate its attention on the provisions concerning supervision arrangements as such and examine these other provisions at a later stage.

Nevertheless, I can assure the honourable Member that the Council shares her concern as to the need to adopt rapidly a common system for controlling shipments of hazardous waste, and that it is actively expediting examination of this proposal in the hope of finding solutions to overcome the remaining problems.

* * *

¹ OJ C 184, 17. 7. 1983, p. 50.

Question No 61, by Mr Blaney (H-597/83)

Subject : Conclusions of the Court of Auditors

On the report of the Court of Auditors in response to the conclusions of the European Council of June 18, 1983 does the Council accept the conclusions of the Court of Auditors in particular about the scope for action and possible savings, and what action does it propose to take ?

Answer

The Special Council which prepared the deliberations of the European Council in Athens frequently referred to the report of the Court of Auditors in its discussions. One of its central preoccupations throughout these discussions was the need to increase the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of Community expenditure in the future. An explicit reference was made to this report in the Presidency's submission sent to the European Council on the future of the structural funds, one of the main preoccupations of the Court of Auditors.

The report of the Court of Auditors remains a focal point in further Council discussions.

* * *

Question No 62, by Mrs Phlix (H-600/83)

Subject : Use of languages

For the debate on the Council statement of 13 December on the Greek Presidency the speech made by the President-in-Office, Mr Papandreou, was available in three languages only. Can the Council explain why this speech was not available in all Community languages and can the French Presidency give an assurance that documents will in future be distributed in all Community languages ?

Answer

The lapse of time between the forwarding of this speech by the President-in-Office of the European Council to the European Parliament and its delivery was extremely short. Moreover, the Council's translation services were overloaded during that period, as the Council met in four different compositions during the first three days of the European Parliament part-session in question. For these reasons it was unfortunately not possible to prepare the translations of the speech into all the official languages of the Community before it was delivered.

The French Presidency will endeavour, as far as possible, to have the translations of its statements to the European Parliament distributed simultaneously with their delivery in all the official languages of the Community.

* * *

Question No 63, by Mr Del Duca (H-606/83)

Subject : Less-favoured farming areas

With regard to the proposal for a Council directive amending Directive 75/273/EEC¹ concerning the Community list of less-favoured farming areas within the meaning of Directive 75/268/EEC (Italy)² — COM (83) 424 final — approved by the European Parliament on 14 October 1983,³ could the Council state why at its meeting of 14 and 15 November 1983 in Brussels it failed to approve the Community list set out in the above-mentioned document ?

¹ OJ L 128, 19. 5. 1975, p. 72; OJ L 206, 5. 8. 1975, p. 14.

² OJ L 128, 19. 5. 1975, p. 1.

³ OJ C 307, 14. 11. 1983, p. 102.

Answer

The Council bodies have examined in detail the proposal to which the honourable Member refers. The aim of the proposal is to make certain corrections to the demarcation of less-favoured areas in Italy. It should be noted in this connection that this proposal was submitted by the Commission together with two other proposals relating to less-favoured farming areas in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands respectively.

Agreement on this proposal is not possible at the moment since the Council is about to start in-depth discussions on the general review of the agricultural structures policy.

* * *

Question No 64, by Mr Alavanos (H-607/83)

Subject : Application of VAT in Greece

At its part-session in December 1983 the European Parliament approved the Rogalla report, which reduced postponement of VAT application in Greece from the two years proposed by the Commission to one year. What position will the Council of Ministers adopt and does it envisage the possibility of further postponing the application of VAT in Greece, having regard in particular to the negative effects such application will have on the country's economy and on its workers ?

Answer

In a directive adopted on 19 December 1983 the Council postponed the deadline for the implementation by Greece of the common VAT system for two years. This postponement, which is in any case in line with the Commission proposal, was necessary because of the technical difficulties raised by the Greek Government, which it will take more than one year to overcome.

* * *

Question No 67, by Mr Adam (H-615/83)

Subject : Esprit

It is reported that the Research Council failed to approve the Esprit programme at its meeting on 13th December 1983, because of the question of financing.

How does the Council justify this delay in view of the fact that the Budgets Council had already approved the appropriation in its draft budget for 1984 ?

Answer

Some delegations were not yet able to adopt a position, at the meeting of the Research Council held on 13 December 1983, on the financial resources to be allocated to the Esprit programme.

As the programme involves expenditure over a period of five years, the question of financing is not linked to the appropriations in the Community budget for 1984.

With respect to the approval of the Esprit programme, it is expected that the Council will decide in the near future. This item will be on the agenda of the General Affairs Council scheduled for 23 and 24 January 1984.

* * *

Question No 68, by Mr Croux (H-620/83)

Subject : European Union

In the solemn declaration made at Stuttgart on 19 June 1983 the European Council stated in point 2.1.4 that it would submit each year a written report to the European Parliament on the progress achieved on the road towards European Union. It was further stated that this report would be the subject of a debate in Parliament, on which occasion the European Council would normally be represented by its President or one of its members. When will the European Council be submitting the said report for 1983 ?

Answer

The Council and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation submitted a draft annual report on progress towards European Union to the European Council at its meeting from 4 to 6 December 1983. However, it proved impossible for this report to be formally approved at that meeting. The report will be approved shortly and then forwarded immediately to the European Parliament.

* * *

III. Questions to the Foreign Ministers

Question No 74, by Mr Ephremidis (H-439/83)

Subject : Extradition of Turkish democrats from the Federal Republic of Germany

There is a danger that the Federal Republic of Germany is about to comply with a request for an extradition order made by the Turkish junta to Mr Zimmermann, the West German Minister for the Interior. In view of the political oppression and persecution practised by the Turkish junta towards its political opponents, what specific measures do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intend to take to prevent Turkish and Kurd democrats being extradited to the Turkish junta ?

Answer

The expulsion of foreign nationals is a matter for each country and for this reason it is not discussed as a topic of European political cooperation. On numerous occasions, however, the Ten have stressed the importance they attach to the respect of human rights and they have drawn the attention of the Turkish authorities to this point.

* * *

Question No 75, by Mr Lagakos (H-354/83)

Subject : Proposal of the Greek Government to postpone the stationing of cruise and Pershing missiles

Given that the recent initiative of the Greek Government to postpone for six months the stationing of cruise and Pershing missiles objectively promotes peace, détente and disarmament and given that both European and international public opinion is sensitive on this point and is favourably disposed to initiatives of this kind, what position do the Ten intend to take with regard to this proposal, the aim of which is to prolong the negotiations in Geneva and to increase the chances of arriving at an agreement which reflects the aspirations of the people of Europe ?

Answer

The matter raised by the honourable Member concerns an initiative taken by the Greek Foreign Minister at national level and not in his capacity as President of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation. The Ten have not discussed his decision.

* * *

Question No 76, by Mr Adamou (H-408/83)

Subject: Proposal to defer deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles

There are three months left before the end of 1983, the deadline set by the USA and NATO for the deployment of the Pershing II and cruise missiles, an act which would bring our whole continent to the brink of nuclear disaster. Could the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation state why, despite the Greek Presidency's proposal for a six-month deferment of the deployment of the American missiles while the Geneva negotiations are continued, they remain silent on the number one problem exercising the peoples of the Member States of the Community, though most of the national governments in the Community indeed support the installation of the missiles in the face of manifest opposition of the people within the Community, as demonstrated by the recent polls in the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium and Holland?

Answer

The matter raised by the honourable Member concerns an initiative taken by the Greek Foreign Minister at national level and not in his capacity as President of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation. The Ten have not discussed his decision.

* * *

Question No 77, by Mr Kyrkos (H-478/83)

Subject: Reiteration of the statements by Mr Denktash concerning an 'autonomous Turkish-Cypriot State'

Do the Ministers propose to condemn unequivocally the threats reiterated by the Turkish-Cypriot leader, Mr Denktash, to declare an 'autonomous Turkish-Cypriot State'? Have they considered the exceptionally dangerous complications which would arise were this threat carried out, and what decisions have they reached with a view to discouraging categorically any support for Mr Denktash from the Ankara Government, without which the Turkish-Cypriot leader would undoubtedly be more restrained?

Answer

The 10 Member States of the European Community have rejected the declaration seeking to establish a 'Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus' and have called on all interested parties not to recognize this move which creates a very serious situation in the region. The Ten have reiterated their unconditional support for the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of the Republic of Cyprus. It is still the view of the Ten that the only legitimate government of the Republic of Cyprus is the government led by President Kyprianou. The Ten approve Resolution 541/83 of the UN Security Council which must serve as a basis for the restoration of the territorial integrity and unity of the Republic of Cyprus. The Ten also support the UN-Secretary-General in his efforts in connection with the Security Council resolution.

* * *

Question No 78, by Mr Wedekind (H-572/83)¹

Subject : Consular agreement between Greece and the GDR

Is it true that Greece and the GDR have initialled a consular agreement under which refugees from the GDR who escape over the Bulgarian border to Thessaloniki or arrive in Athens from the East German ship *Völkerfreundschaft* are extradited to the GDR ?

How can Greece reconcile the conclusion of such a consular agreement between it and the GDR with European political cooperation which unites the Member States of the European Community or with the principles and spirit of the ECSC Final Act ?

Answer

This matter has not been discussed by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation.

* * *

Question No 79, by Mr Tyrrell (H-509/83)

Subject : Agreements on the prevention of terrorism

Will the Ministers state what progress has been made in making agreements to facilitate the capture and extradition of those perpetrating terrorist crimes in one Member State and seeking sanctuary in another ?

Answer

This matter has not been broached in the context of European political cooperation but the 10 Ministers for Justice have discussed it.

* * *

Question No 80, by Mrs Van Hemeldonck (H-541/83)

Subject : Detention of a number of former Zairean MPs

According to press reports, during the night of 12 to 13 October a number of former Zairean MPs belonging to the UDPS opposition party (Union pour la Démocratie et Le Progrès Social) i.e. Mr Kibassa Maliba, Mr Ngalula Mpandajila, Mr Tshisekedi wa Mulumba, Mr Makanda Mpinga and Mr Lusanga Ngiele and all members of their family at home at the time were brutally carried off to an unknown destination by paratroopers and agents of the Zairean State Security Service.

These former MPs had been detained and imprisoned earlier but were set free during President Mobuto's so-called political reconciliation.

What steps have the Ministers for Foreign Affairs already taken to find out from the Zairean authorities where these people are being held and what has already been done to secure their release ;

Are the Ministers for Foreign Affairs not going to urge the Zairean authorities to respect human and political rights ?

¹ Former oral question without debate (0-104/83) converted into a question for Question Time.

Answer

1. The press reports to which the honourable Member refers were confirmed by the President of Zaire himself when he made a statement to Agence France-Presse on 28 November 1983. President Mobutu stated that eight of the thirteen former MPs belonging to the UDPS party were affected by 'administrative measures for removal', which meant that they were under house arrest in their home towns. It was reported that four had been transferred to the region of Kasai Oriental, one to Kasai Occidental, two to Shaba and one to Kivu. It would seem that none of the former MPs has been badly treated since they were affected by this measure of internal exile on 13 November 1983.

2. There has been no initiative by the Ten as of yet. The Presidency intends to place the matter on the agenda for discussion in political cooperation.

* * *

Question No 82, by Mr Balfe (H-575/83)

Subject: Tamil minority in Sri Lanka

Further to my oral question No 42 (H-490/83),¹ can the Foreign Ministers be asked to state what reply they have received from their representations to the Sri Lankan Government on 3 August, and in view of the continuing violation of human rights will they now make their public representations?

Answer

The Ten are continuing to monitor the situation in Sri Lanka closely. As the situation in that country now appears to be returning to normal, the Ten do not intend to make renewed representations for the time being.

* * *

Question No 83, by Mrs Duport (H-577/83)

Subject: Situation of women in Rwanda and Zimbabwe

On 29 April 1983 and 21 July 1983, *Le Monde* published two articles revealing that young women in Rwanda who were regarded as vagrants had been sentenced to terms ranging from 6 months to 3 years in 'work and re-education camps.' Rwanda's Minister for the Interior acknowledged that unfortunate mistakes had been made during the massive raids carried out in February and March.

During the weekend of 12 and 13 November 1983, several thousand women were arrested in Zimbabwe during a large-scale anti-prostitution operation.

Women who were unable to prove that they were not prostitutes were sent to rehabilitation camps to learn how to become what the government called 'useful members of society'.

The European Community welcomed the advent of democracy in Zimbabwe and its independence.

Are the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation aware of the violations of these women's rights, and can they make representations to the Governments of Rwanda and Zimbabwe to ensure that these re-education camps are closed and that these raids are stopped?

¹ Verbatim report of proceedings of 16 November 1983, p. 214.

Answer

The press reports to which the honourable Member refers have not been discussed by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation. As a result, the Ten have made no representations to the governments in question. A number of countries have nevertheless acted on a bilateral basis with regard to the events referred to by the honourable Member.

* * *

Question No 84, by Mr Pearce (H-584/83)

Subject : Vietnam

In their dealings with Vietnam, do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation accept estimates that some 100 000 people are imprisoned in Vietnamese prisons for indoctrination purposes (including a quarter of those committed to such prison camps in 1975-76) and what view do they have about this situation ?

Answer

The Ten have not publicly expressed an opinion on this matter to date. They are however giving attention to the situation in that country in the context of European political cooperation.

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 19 JANUARY 1984

Contents

1. Topical and urgent debate

<i>Stockholm conference — Motions for resolutions by Mr Haagerup (Doc. 1-1282/83), Mr Penders and others (Doc. 1-1291/83) and Mr Fanti and Mr Piquet (Doc. 1-1301/83)</i>	
<i>Mr Haagerup; Mr Penders; Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mr Hänsch; Lady Elles; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Israël; Mr Ephremidis</i>	208
<i>Intra-Community trade — Motions for resolutions by Mr Møller and others (Doc. 1-1284/83) and Mr Marck and others (Doc. 1-1286/83)</i>	
<i>Mr Møller; Mr Marck; Mr Woltjer; Mr Kirk; Mrs Le Roux; Mr Prout; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	212
<i>Athens summit — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1281/83) by Mrs Scrivener</i>	
<i>Mrs Scrivener; Mr Croux; Mr Ortoli (Commission)</i>	214
<i>Airbus — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1279/83) by the European Democratic Group</i>	
<i>Mr Moorhouse; Mr Herman; Mr Prag; Mr Galland; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	215
<i>Angola — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1294/83) by Mr Gérard Fuchs</i>	
<i>Mr Gérard Fuchs; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Pearce; Mr Enright; Mr Pearce; Mr Martin; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Gérard Fuchs; Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Chambeiron; Mrs Baduel Glorioso</i>	217
<i>Iran-Iraq conflict — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1298/83) by Mr Jaquet and Mr Glinne</i>	
<i>Mrs Charzat; Mr Barbi; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	219

<i>Maltese National Party — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1292/83/rev.) by Lady Elles</i>	
<i>Mr Fergusson; Mr Schmid; Mr von Hassel; Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mr Barbi; Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mr Brok; Mr Richard (Commission)</i>	221
<i>Chile — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1296/83) by Mr Enright and Mr Glinne</i>	
<i>Mr Enright; Mr Israël; Mr Fergusson; Mr Enright; Mr Israël; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Enright</i>	223
<i>Natural disasters — Motions for resolutions by Mr Provan and others (Doc. 1-1280/83), Mrs Ewing (Doc. 1-1283/83) and Mr Pedini and others (Doc. 1-1288/83)</i>	
<i>Mrs Ewing; Mr Provan; Mr Pedini; Mr Gautier; Mr Hutton; Mr Richard (Commission)</i>	225
2. ACP-EEC — Report (Doc. 1-1143/83) by Mr Israël	
<i>Mr Israël; Mr Ziagas; Mr Waurzik; Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr Sablé; Mr Eisma; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Pearce; Mr Ortoli (Commission)</i>	227
3. International Development Association — Report (Doc. 1-933/83) by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli	
<i>Mr Bersani; Mr Gérard Fuchs; Mr Deschamps; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Ortoli (Commission)</i>	233
4. Community financing of research and industry — Report (Doc. 1-1110/83) by Mr Saby	
<i>Mr Saby; Mrs Nikolaou; Mr Purvis; Mr Aigner; Mrs Théobald-Paoli; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Purvis; Mr Aigner; Mr Purvis; Mr Saby; Mr Aigner</i>	236

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>5. <i>European Charter on the Rights of Patients — Report (Doc. 1-970/83) by Mrs Pruvot</i>
 <i>Mrs Pruvot; Mrs van den Heuvel; Mrs Krouwel-Vlam; Mr Ghergo; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Ewing; Mr Eisma; Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mr Richard (Commission) . . .</i> 241</p> <p>6. <i>Combating of acid rain — Report (Doc. 1-1168/83) by Mr Muntingb</i>
 <i>Mr Muntingb; Mr Petersen; Mrs Weber; Mr Mertens; Mr Sherlock; Mr Jürgens; Mr Nyborg</i> 246</p> <p>7. <i>Votes</i>
 <i>Mr Seligman; Mr Saby; Mrs Walz; Mr Purvis; Mr Aigner; Mr Beazley</i> 252</p> <p>8. <i>Combating of acid rain (continuation)</i>
 <i>Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Eisma; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Kirk; Miss Brookes; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i> 253</p> <p>9. <i>Radiation protection — Report by Sir Peter Vanneck: (Doc. 1-1128/83)</i>
 <i>Sir Peter Vanneck; Mrs Phlix; Mrs Schleicher; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i> 256</p> <p>10. <i>Safety and health at work — Report by Mrs Scrivener (Doc. 1-1082/83):</i>
 <i>Mrs Scrivener; Mrs Weber; Mrs Schleicher; Mr Fernandez; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Ortoli (Commission) . . .</i> 258</p> <p>11. <i>Protection of workers — Report by Mr Sherlock (Doc. 1-1127/83):</i></p> | <p><i>Mr Sherlock; Mr Patterson; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Ghergo; Mr Kirk; Mrs Boserup; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Nyborg; Mrs Hammerich; Mrs Weber; Mr Moreland; Mr Muntingb; Mr Moreland; Mr Frischmann; Mrs Desouches; Mrs Boserup; Mr Sherlock; Mr Ortoli (Commission); Mr Moreland; Mr Ortoli; Mr Sherlock; Mr Ortoli; Mr Moreland; Mr Ortoli</i> 261</p> <p>12. <i>Pollution of the North Sea — Report by Mrs Maij-Weggen (Doc. 1-1173/83):</i>
 <i>Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Muntingb; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Muntingb; Mrs Schleicher; Mr Provan; Mr Jürgens; Mr Muntingb; Mr Turner; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Muntingb; Mr Narjes</i> 271</p> <p>13. <i>Safety of holidaymakers and other travellers — Report by Mr Protopapadakis (Doc. 1-1149/83):</i>
 <i>Mr Protopapadakis; Mr Moreland; Miss Hooper; Mr Battersby; Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i> 278</p> <p><i>Annex</i>
 <i>Mrs Viehoff; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Beazley; Mr Veronesi; Mr Wurtz; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr Pearce; Mr Denis; Mr G. Fuchs; Mrs Poirier; Mr Kellett-Bowman; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mrs Schleicher; Mrs Pruvot</i> 281</p> |
|---|--|

IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)¹

1. TOPICAL AND URGENT DEBATE

Stockholm conference

President. — The next item is the joint debate on three motions for resolutions on the Stockholm conference:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1282/83), tabled by Mr Haagerup on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the Stockholm conference on disarmament and confidence-building measures;

¹ Approval of minutes — Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council: see Minutes.

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1291/83), tabled by Mr Penders and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the Stockholm conference;

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1301/83), tabled by Mr Fantì and Mr Piquet on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the opening in Stockholm of the conference on confidence-building measures, security and disarmament in Europe.

Mr Haagerup (L). — (DA) Mr President, this amendment on the Stockholm Conference does not really require a detailed introduction or explanation. The conference has just started in the Swedish capital and, as we all know, represents the first time that negotiations have been reopened not only between East and West and this is particularly important, but between the two superpowers.

Haagerup

I am tabling this joint amendment by three groups in the hope that groups other than those behind it will be able to lend their support. We cannot, however, really expect the Stockholm Conference itself to produce substantial results. It is no substitute for the atmosphere of mutual trust which we should like to see between East and West, but it may well serve a whole range of useful purposes and, apart from expressing the hope of a general improvement in the international situation, the motion stresses how important it is for the Ten Community Member States to stand together at the Stockholm Conference in a constructive way that will achieve results. This is particularly important in view of the role our Member States have played in terms of political cooperation during the previous long negotiations in Helsinki, Madrid and Belgrade. We therefore attach the utmost importance to this joint initiative, and the unity of the Ten, and are delighted that the French Foreign Minister said only yesterday that he was speaking on behalf of the Member States in Stockholm. This is an encouraging start to the Conference.

We should also like to stress that prospects of detente will be improved by the strengthening of confidence between the Allies on both sides of the Atlantic. I am sure that, to all intents and purposes, we are all in favour of this, and I would therefore ask Parliament to give this motion the broadest possible approval so that we can show our support for the united approach of our ten countries at the Stockholm Conference.

Mr Penders (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, the Stockholm conference on security and confidence-building measures and disarmament began the day before yesterday, and it would be a good thing if the European Parliament came out with a positive statement on it. The fact is that the conference is about our own security, and in recent years the security of Europe is something which this House has been more and more concerned with. Of course, it is easy to take a sceptical line and say 'just another conference with interminable speeches' but there a few points which merit some attention, Mr President, and I want to mention five.

Firstly, the conference is the result of pressure from France in particular. It was an idea of the former French President, Mr Giscard d'Estaing, so it was something which we all expressly wanted.

Secondly, any measures agreed upon will concern the whole of Europe, right through to the Urals. The whole of European Russia is included, and not just a 250 kilometre strip along the Soviet western border, as was agreed in the Final Act of Helsinki. This is a gain to my mind.

Thirdly, the conference is an integral part of the multi-lateral process which began with the first conference in Helsinki. I want you to think about the words *integral and process*. *Integral* means that there is a link between this conference and all the countries which

signed the Final Act in Helsinki, and that the issue of human rights is also involved. The word *process* indicates that arms control and security are ongoing concerns that constantly require renewed dialogue and where no short cuts are possible.

Fourthly — and this is something that I think is important, Mr President — now that the Start and INF talks in Geneva and the MBFR negotiations in Vienna have been broken off by the Soviet Union, Stockholm is in fact the only place apart from the UN disarmament commission where East and West are at least talking about security. I think this is of vital importance at a time of mounting tension.

Finally — and this is my fifth point, Mr President — Stockholm is at any rate providing an opportunity for Mr Schulz and Mr Gromyko to talk to each other, even if yesterday's meeting was somewhat frosty. The Stockholm conference may be able to create the climate in which the talks on arms control can be resumed shortly, with regard to conventional as well as nuclear weapons. There have been interesting press reports speculating about this, and it has been rumoured again that the INF talks are not going to be resumed again in a separate forum. This makes it an even more complicated matter to work out measures. Precisely to increase the chances of success, it was decided at the time to have separate INF talks. The advantage of this will now be lost. On the other hand, bringing together the various talks gives Moscow a chance to drop its preliminary demand for the dismantling of the Pershing and Cruise missiles that are already in place. Against this background it is a good thing that we have Stockholm and that the European Parliament is about to deliver a positive opinion on it.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso (COM). — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Stockholm conference and the resumption of the dialogue between the two major powers, has rekindled hope in everyone. President Reagan did not fail to reveal the truth in a speech he made two days ago when he finally declared his real intentions: 'Now that we are stronger' — i.e. now that the Euromissiles have been deployed — 'we can negotiate'. One wonders what mandate the American delegation had at Geneva during the two preceding years of formal negotiations.

Although this statement disappoints us somewhat, we are convinced that in Stockholm where, unlike Geneva, the European governments will be present, more active and incisive steps must be taken than in Geneva where, as I have said, we were not present, steps which would aim to obtain a reciprocal, balanced and controlled reduction of the armaments deployed in, or aimed at, Europe, with a view to an eventual agreement on negotiations to dismantle nuclear arms, create nuclear-free zones on the European continent and to freeze research into, and the production and deployment of nuclear, chemical or bacteriological weapons.

Baduel Glorioso

Europe's contribution to these negotiations would help in obtaining *détente* and a balance between the various forces involved in this negotiated, controllable and controlled disarmament. In this way we can put into practice our declared intention of acting as a peace-keeping force.

I would here mention the proposal put forward by the Italian Communist Party requesting that at least one western European government should make a significant gesture. For example, since the missiles in Italy have not yet been deployed in Comiso, but are only in storage at Sigonella, the Italian Government should follow this proposal by preventing the missiles from being deployed as planned in March and should, at the same time, request that the Soviet Union match this by dismantling the SS 20s.

We believe this to be a serious proposal from a European political party which fights positively for peace so that the same charade, of which our peoples have clearly shown they are sick and tired by taking part in peace demonstrations and thereby clearly showing their will, is not repeated in Stockholm.

Mr Hänsch (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. On the initiative of the Socialist Group, in Mr Rumor's report on the CSCE conference in Madrid a call was made for a European disarmament conference. At that time, the European Parliament backed this call and thus helped the Foreign Ministers of the Ten and the French Government in Madrid to bring this conference into being, despite the initial resistance of the United States and the initial reluctance of the Soviet Union. And so the Socialist Group today emphatically welcomes the fact that the Stockholm Conference is actually underway, and we thus support also the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Haagerup and others.

At the moment, the Stockholm Conference is the only remaining forum for East-West dialogue in Europe. I should like above all to point this out to those whose attitude towards the CSCE Conference was at first very sceptical or even downright disapproving. The Conference is now the only place where East and West can talk together. Who would have thought that two or three years ago! The Socialist Group called for a European stance and a firm commitment from the Ten both to Madrid and, today, to Stockholm.

In Stockholm, the French Foreign Minister spoke on behalf of the Ten, and the European Parliament ought to support him in this rôle and function. The Ten must define their own interests within the Western Alliance more clearly and more positively, and then represent those interests outside the Community, and that is why the Socialist Group supports the call made to this effect in the motion for a resolution.

I should, however, like to express a reservation on the part of our Irish colleagues. We all know that Ireland

has problems when it comes to statements such as are made in this motion, since Ireland does not belong to the Atlantic Alliance, and therefore I should like to state here quite frankly that my Irish colleagues are unable to lend their support to this paragraph in the motion.

The European Parliament ought to be involved in some appropriate way in the Stockholm discussions. Therefore, I am pleased to support the suggestion made by my colleague and friend Rolf Linkohr a few days ago, namely that the European Parliament ought to send a delegation to the Stockholm talks as observers, with a view to bringing back information. Together with the Commission and the Political Affairs Committee, we ought to seek a way in which the European Parliament can join in the Stockholm talks, either by sending its own delegation or joining with the Commission's delegation; there are, after all, American examples, namely in Congress, of how such things can be done, and I beg you, ladies and gentlemen, let us pursue these ideas. As long as there is still hope and talks are being held between East and West, there is still hope that we can achieve disarmament and confidence in Europe, and we therefore join with the other groups, in supporting the motion before us today.

Lady Elles (ED). — Mr President, the European Democratic Group wholeheartedly supports the motion for a resolution which is before the House. We hope for a unanimous vote on this resolution by Parliament speaking as the voice of Europe and supporting the efforts of 35 countries. Let us remember those countries which are not yet members of this Community but which, in the distant or not so distant future, we hope to see sitting with us in this Parliament.

The Helsinki Act was not always considered by the West to be helpful to the Western cause. It was felt that while it offered *détente* for the West, it provided a period of rearmament for the Soviet Union. I think that sometimes Western powers have not used this vehicle to their own advantage to serve our own cause. I think we can be grateful to the French Government for taking the initiative at Madrid of proposing a disarmament conference. The President-in-Office said yesterday in this House that what made it possible to hold this conference in Stockholm was not only the efforts of the French Government but the wholehearted support given to the initiative by the Ten.

As other speakers before me have said, it is the only forum at the moment at which East and West can sit round a table and discuss the subject which is of vital concern to the whole world, i.e. multilateral and balanced disarmament, which is also controllable and verifiable. It provides the opportunity, within the Helsinki Act, of discussing confidence-building measures and ensuring progress in the recognition of

Elles

the human rights of citizens throughout Europe. Together with our European allies I think we can see Stockholm as a field of progress for better relations between different parts of Europe and the USA and a means of ensuring that the stability and security which we all must aim at are achieved.

Let us finally remember that this is only a step towards disarmament. This in no way stops or should impede the possibility of the Geneva discussions resuming within a short period of time. I think that the Stockholm Conference must be regarded as a great step forward in international relations and in the easing of East/West tensions. On these grounds my group, I repeat, strongly supports both the motion for a resolution and the Stockholm Conference.

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, the French Communists and Allies believe that dialogue should replace confrontation, and for this reason they welcome the opening of the Stockholm conference.

In a situation characterized by rising tension and danger, and following the breakdown in the Geneva negotiations brought about by the German decision to deploy American missiles, we welcome the fact that the spirit of Helsinki and Madrid has prevailed. We hope that this Conference will result in measures which can restore confidence and pave the way for a policy of peace and disarmament.

The resolution put forward by our Group contains a certain number of proposals which, if adopted, could pave the way for a reduction in arms, and particularly medium-range nuclear missiles, to the lowest possible level.

We mentioned just now that the President-in-Office of the Council spoke in Stockholm on behalf of the Ten, and it would be difficult not to share the viewpoint he expressed at the opening of the Conference when he said that the governments had heard the call of their peoples, all the peoples of Europe, for peace, security and cooperation. Indeed, we believe that all peoples should have their say in a debate which concerns them directly. Experience has shown that the large demonstrations which took place throughout Europe recently have not been in vain since the governments have heard the voice of these millions of men and women who proclaim their wish to live in a world free from the anguish of war and open to peaceful cooperation.

Having said that, we will not vote in favour of the compromise text, which does not even mention Parliament's desire to see positive measures arise out of the Stockholm Conference, which attributes no responsibility for the increase in international tension and which is rendered unilateral by an Atlantic bias while at the same time implying the eclipse of Europe of the Ten as an autonomous force for proposal and conciliation.

(Applause from the far left)

Mr Israël (DEP). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in the final analysis the idea of trying to link negotiation on disarmament to the so-called 'Helsinki process' turned out to be a good one.

I readily acknowledge that we were sceptical at the outset, that human rights activists feared that negotiations on disarmament might divert attention somewhat from the Conference on Safety and Cooperation in Europe, in particular the human rights aspect of this.

We welcome also, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the fact that the USSR agreed to these negotiations. In view of the contempt with which it broke off the negotiations on nuclear disarmament, this small sign, whereby it agrees to negotiate on conventional disarmament, is encouraging. Conventional arms are of major importance. This problem is too often judged in relation to the First World War or even to the Second World War. Today conventional weapons present a deadly threat to humanity. The advent of electronics has virtually transformed conventional arms into terrifying weapons which could trigger the greatest tragedy humanity has ever known. However, the first phase of this Stockholm Conference concerns confidence-building measures. And this is where our doubts begin to emerge, because after all the joint examination of opposing positions, exchanges of information about military manoeuvres, are not really confidence-building measures.

May I say that true confidence will begin to be established the moment the USSR agrees to settle the problem of human rights. If, finally, we felt that this regime was becoming a little more human and that people were free to leave that country just as they can leave any other, then we would perhaps enjoy a new confidence, which is of capital importance for us.

It must be understood, ladies and gentlemen, that the enormous Soviet superiority in conventional weapons obliges us, obliges the West, to have recourse to nuclear weapons. Consequently, before starting major negotiations on nuclear disarmament, there must first be an end to the imbalance in conventional arms. It is for this reason, ladies and gentlemen, that we must encourage the Conference on Disarmament in Europe. After all, Helsinki is of peculiar value. It remains our last line of negotiations on human rights, because we have no faith in the negotiations on human rights within the UN. At Helsinki, some small progress was made in this field as a result of keeping the human rights situation constantly under review. Well, where arms are concerned, a small area of negotiations on disarmament was also defined. Let us pay homage to the originator of the idea, Mr Giscard d'Estaing, and regard ourselves truly as being at a sort of crossroads. Let us welcome, finally, what perhaps amounts to a reciprocal goodwill which exist today.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — (GR) Mr President, I will support the proposal of the Communist Group concerning the Stockholm Conference, not for reasons of ideological egotism but because I side with the millions of Europeans, with the overwhelming majority of the peoples of Europe who in the opinion polls which were conducted in your countries opted for peace and disarmament generally and especially for preventing the deployment of Pershing and Cruise missiles in the Community. This is not by chance, as it was precisely this deployment which provoked the breaking off of the Geneva and Vienna negotiations. From this point on the situation started to become exceedingly dangerous and since then — for the first time since the end of the Second World War — we have been on the brink of a catastrophe. Consequently, support for our resolution, whose aim is to promote these topics in Stockholm, topics which concern the underlying causes of this dangerous situation, will contribute to something which all our colleagues — including myself — aspire to, i.e. that the deadlock in Stockholm can be broken and that the discussions can begin again, so that we can achieve mutually controlled disarmament until such time as nuclear weapons finally disappear from Europe.

Mr President, I cannot agree with the other resolutions, because they are one-sided, misguided and untimely.

Naturally I cannot agree either with those who embrace human rights so eagerly that they threaten to smother them. Neither of course do I share Mr Cheysson's view, who in reply to the question we put yesterday said that the missiles topic was not on the agenda at Stockholm. This is the question. If the Ten want an independent Europe they must not submit to the dictates of American policy, whose aim is to steer clear of this issue at Stockholm. On the contrary, they must promote this kind of topic because only if the deadlock is broken on this issue will it be possible to adopt measures of mutual confidence. Mr President, measures of mutual confidence cannot be adopted at Stockholm when the missiles are poised to strike their goals, when you have the gun at your opponent's forehead and say 'let's talk about mutual confidence.' The missiles already installed must go, no further missiles should be deployed, and we must make progress in the Geneva negotiations in order to insure that we achieve the objectives which I think all of us desire: disarmament, peace and peaceful coexistence.

(Applause from the left)

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote¹

Intra-Community trade

President. — The next item is the joint debate on two motions for resolutions on intra-Community trade:

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1284/83) by Mr Møller and others on assault and theft on trucks carrying goods throughout the Community;

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1286/83), tabled by Mr Marck and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the obstruction of intra-Community trade.

Mr Møller (ED). — (DA) Mr President, it is quite clear that a prerequisite for a free common market such as the one we have set up in Europe is the free movement of goods, not simply across borders but also within the various countries. There should be no risk of being held up either by the officially-appointed customs authorities or by groups of people demonstrating against legal imports into a given country — imports in accordance with our Community agreements or free trade arrangements. This motion has been tabled because this obvious condition for a common market has recently been violated on a number of occasions in various parts of Europe; the authorities must take it upon themselves both to protect the drivers of the lorries in question and to ensure that goods reach their destination in good condition. I do not know whether the day will come when we shall see a European police force responsible for ensuring that this sort of rule is respected, but for the time being the national police forces must themselves guarantee freedom of transport in the various countries. This is their job, and this is what our motion is about.

Mr President, Mr Marck and I are in agreement about one amendment, and if it is carried my amendment will of course be dropped; I assume that the same applies to Mr Marck's amendment.

(Applause)

Mr Marck (PPE). — (NL) Last week saw another series of incidents at Franco-Belgian frontier crossings. Incensed French pig farmers perpetrated acts of violence against trucks and lorry drivers, carrying mainly pigmeat, from various countries of the European Community. There was damage to goods and persons. This is not the first time we have seen incidents like these, and although I don't want to point the finger at France in particular I must say that this has become a bad habit in France.

No one here will fail to appreciate the disappointment and even the anger of pig farmers and other groups about the extremely serious situation of their market, but it is wrong for them to take it out on colleagues from other Member States whose situation is more often than not just as critical. It is irresponsible to assault lorry drivers physically and to destroy their loads. I assume that no one is going to approve such acts, but it makes you really angry when you see

¹ See Annex.

Marck

that the measures taken by the Member States to avoid such incidents are insufficient or non-existent. It shows a lack of European will when obstruction of the free movement of goods is condoned or, what is more, when there is inadequate protection for people.

Let me say again that I am not attacking France in particular, because other countries have been guilty as well, but a country such as France with its massive farm exports to all the other Member States should be aware of the need for trade in these goods and should promote the free movement of agricultural products. We can only condemn the laxness which was apparent in earlier and also in the more recent incidents.

In the motion for a resolution, and especially in the amendment to it which I have tabled together with Mr Møller and which we have deliberately kept impartial, we urge the governments of the Member States to take the relevant preventive measures to ensure that traffic moves without hindrance and above all to guarantee personal safety. Excuses or vague promises are not enough when something happens; in the end we need some action by the governments involved. I hope therefore that Parliament will adopt this amendment which Mr Møller and I have tabled in connection with our two motions for resolutions.

Mr Woltjer (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group let me congratulate Mr Marck and Mr Møller on their excellent work. We are right behind their amendment and we are very glad that they have brought this matter up here. In our view there has to be a stop to the way in which the interests of others are being harmed. We are ready to understand what people do, but there comes a time when they have to realize that there is a limit. In this case they have clearly overstepped it. Admittedly, incidents of this kind can occur in other Member States as well. It is our job as Parliament to set limits. We have to put pressure on the authorities, the national governments as well as the Commission, to put an end to things like this which can bring Europe down.

In many instances it is action by people, but governments as well often disrupt European trade. There is something else we have to talk about, and I mean the closing of frontiers because of plant health regulations. Things like that are just as interminable and harm the interests of others. I can well appreciate certain Member States closing their frontiers for the sake of plant health regulations, but such regulations must not have the semblance of some kind of protectionism.

The action by the French that we are discussing now began initially because there were reports of foot-and-mouth disease and swine fever in the Netherlands, and the idea was to seal our frontiers. The fact of the matter is that farmers are now beginning to use the same arguments that have been used by the govern-

ments. The awful consequences can be seen as well. I want to make it quite clear that we as a Parliament, now more than ever before, have to draw attention to the fact, and we have to ensure that such actions are opposed. Once again, on behalf of the Socialist Group I welcome this initiative by Mr Marck and Mr Møller, and it gets my heartfelt support.

Mr Kirk (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, I should also like to compliment Mr Marck and Mr Møller on their motion for a resolution. In recent weeks I have been telephoned by a great many lorry drivers; it is not only lorry drivers driving in France, but also those driving in Italy who are unhappy about the situation which has been developing in the Community's market. The effect of this situation is that many drivers are now saying that they no longer dare to drive to the countries in question; what kind of Community is it where people are actually afraid of moving freely with goods for distribution to consumers? The Community must therefore put a stop to the developments we have been witnessing recently. I hope very much that Parliament will be able to show the public that we have the strength and the will to call a halt.

We should also be aware of the cost involved for the individual firms transporting goods. Enormous additional premiums now have to be paid in order to get into the Italian market, and this trend is also likely to affect France. We must therefore, in the interest of both consumers and producers, stop this here and now. After all, we have seen how effective the French police can be here in Strasbourg, and I am sure that they are equally effective in other parts of France. In other words it is possible to ensure that incidents of this kind do not happen again. I am therefore glad that the French President has today taken the authorities involved to task and said that all this must stop now. In my view this is really essential.

I should, however, also like to see the relevant national authorities demonstrating their solidarity with the Community by agreeing to compensate the firms and drivers so that they can cover their losses. This will really show that the Community is not simply something we talk about at grand meetings but something we are determined to implement.

Mrs Le Roux (COM). — *(FR)* By demonstrating at the borders and temporarily blocking the traffic, French farmers wished to express their dissatisfaction and frustration. We do not approve certain forms of action, such as the ransacking of public buildings or kidnapping which moreover have an advance effect on public opinion, but we understand and support the farmers when they set out to correct the distortions in competition of which they are victims. They cannot accept that freedom of movement within the Community should develop into a steam roller crushing their incomes and ousting them from their farms.

Le Roux

Together with them, we demand the reform of intra-Community trade, with priority for the abolition of monetary compensatory amounts. These have quite artificially encouraged the transfer of certain livestock production to the north of Europe where some countries today succeed in producing more than 300 % of their consumption. This is the situation which must be remedied; this is the condition for improving the moral standard of Community trade and for respecting the interests of French farmers.

Mr Prout (ED). — I would like to associate Neil Balfour, Member for Yorkshire North, with my remarks. The two British lorry drivers hijacked last week are constituents of ours. Mr President, we deplore the incident. Unless Member States enforce the ordinary law of the land in the territories for which they are responsible, the European Community has no future. What is the point of allowing people and goods to cross freely from one side of a frontier to another if their security cannot be guaranteed once they reach the other side? Free trade is valueless in the absence of public order. We understand the uncertainties that currently afflict the farming sector throughout Europe. We know that the enforcement of law at political disturbances can pose severe difficulties for the authorities. But not to enforce the law in such circumstances imperils the whole fabric of our democracies.

I understand that the French President has now taken disciplinary action with regard to the local authorities concerned. We applaud his reaction. We urge him also to ensure that appropriate compensation is paid immediately. If these incidents are repeated, international traffic in goods will become uninsurable commercially and the modest ground that we have gained so painfully in our Community will all be lost.

(Applause)

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, the Commission thanks the authors of this motion for their initiative. It condemns all arbitrary measures restricting the free movement of goods, and, whilst understanding the farmers' concern for the health of their livestock, considers it inadmissible that the guarantee laid down by the Treaties in respect of the functioning of the internal market should be violated by disturbances of public order or by acts of so-called self help, with the familiar consequences for people and property.

The Commission has, for its part, isolated the areas that have been hit by foot and mouth disease by its decision on 9 January, which also covers swine fever. On the Commission's initiative, the Council of Agricultural Ministers, meeting on 8 and 9 January, took the necessary decisions based on the current directives concerning live animals and pigmeat.

The Commission has repeatedly made representations to the French Government. It raised virtually the same problem at the session of the Agricultural Council on 8 and 9 January, as I have just mentioned. Since, despite the positive reaction of the French Government, there has as yet been no major improvement in the situation, my colleague Mr Dalsager, in a telex to Mr Bocard, urgently requested that additional efforts be made. As regards the question of compensation, the authorities of all Member States are obliged to afford to all citizens of the Community, the legal protection required by Community Law. It is well known that, under French Legislation, it is the duty of the State to compensate people and property in such cases. I refer you to Article 92 of Law No 83/3 of the French Republic, dated 7 January 1983.

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote*¹

Athens summit

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1281/83), tabled by Mrs Scrivener on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the risk of deadlock in the Community following the failure of the Athens summit.

Mrs Scrivener (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in presenting this motion for a resolution, we do not wish to open a new debate on the failure of the Athens Summit, because we have had ample opportunity to discuss this at last December's part-session. However, the object of the text before Parliament is to highlight the grave dangers which would be inherent in bringing all areas of Community life to a standstill in paralysing, so to speak, the daily work of the institutions, pending agreement at future European Council meetings.

In a way, this would be paramount to agreeing to just wait for something to turn up. However, let there be no misunderstanding. It is not a matter here of re-examining the whole content of certain basic matters which constitute what has come to be called the 'Stuttgart mandate.' Parliament has, on several occasions, and quite correctly — drawn attention to the link between these subjects. On the other hand, we insist on the application of the usual procedures laid down by the Treaties for the adoption of the various proposals under examination by the Council. Indeed, it is up to the specialized Council meetings to resume work on questions for which they are responsible, on the basis of proposals put forward by the Commission. Here we would particularly like to draw attention to two questions which we regard as being of paramount importance: the trade negotiations which must be

¹ See Annex.

Scrivener

held between the Community and the United States and the rapid implementation of the Esprit programme.

Those are, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, very briefly, the reasons why we present this motion for a resolution today. In short, each party must assume its responsibilities. The Commission must continue to submit proposals and the Council must discuss the proposals submitted to it.

Mr Croux (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my Group, the European People's Party, supports the initiative taken by Mrs Scrivener. I believe that one of Parliament's tasks is to ensure that decisions of principle are applied wherever this is financially or legally possible.

I would like to underline this point by making two brief observations. In the latest quarterly survey of the Community's financial situation of August last year we were struck by the frequency with which it was pointed out in the explanatory statement that certain funds have not yet been used. This is a long-standing problem, one about which Parliament is very concerned, and we shall be exerting pressure to ensure that the funds are used. The example of the Esprit project is highly significant since it is of pressing importance from the point of view of the new technologies and the combatting of unemployment.

We therefore call upon the French President and the Commission to apply themselves to this question, and we regret that the President is not at the moment present to discuss this important issue raised by Mrs Scrivener. Our second comment is this: in its official statement at Stuttgart the Council said that it would in future keep Parliament better informed of how it responded to Parliament's requests. I find this most gratifying and would ask the Council to inform us at the earliest possible opportunity in its outline report on matters which are still outstanding and the reasons for the delays. We receive information on such issues from the Commission, but the Commission often has to say that it is sorry, but the Council has not yet reached a decision or taken the necessary steps. We therefore call upon the Council to devote particular attention to this matter during the French presidency.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I welcome Mrs Scrivener's request for an urgent debate. While, of course, it follows the numerous discussions we have had in the aftermath of Athens, I believe it is useful for Parliament to confirm a certain number of policies. Two in particular are essential. First: the failure of Athens must not prevent us from making progress wherever possible and above all wherever necessary. This obviously applies to the Esprit programme, and to certain international negotiations, such as the continuation of our discussions with our American part-

ners. But, over and above this, we have a duty to ensure that the Community lives, and that its life is dynamic, even at times when discussions of a wideranging nature are fraught with major problems.

In my view this is equally important. The lack of results at Athens was perhaps due, in part at least, to the procedures followed. We could not know this, and they had been decided. However, once again the value of what has become a Community tradition is borne in upon us, namely that generally we work better when remaining within the framework of the Treaty and respecting all its provisions. This is the position adopted unambiguously by the Commission following the Athens discussions. It called for a return to the usual course, the usual management of the Community, both in matters of major and lesser importance.

On this basis, I can only support Mrs Scrivener's demands, adding that, in the preoccupations expressed by the Commission on 7 December after Athens, on 13 December through the voice of its President and on 22 December in a letter to the President of the Council, we also asked that the resumption of Community life and Community procedures should not exclude the necessary degree of ambition when preparing the grand design.

Apart from this, there is the need for a solution to the problems facing us. This solution must be sought with the revival of the Community in mind and not just as a means of bringing outstanding matters to a perfunctory and rather sad conclusion.

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote*¹

Airbus

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1279/83) by the European Democratic Group on the European Airbus industry.

Mr Moorhouse (ED). — Mr President, one of the great success stories of recent years is the combination of expertise and technology of the French, German, British, Spanish, Dutch and Belgian aerospace industries cooperating as Airbus Industry — a truly European cooperative venture.

Airbus Industry has designed and built two highly successful wide-bodied essentially medium-range airliners — the A300 and the A310. These two models have been sold all over the world including the United States of America, that most difficult of all markets. Indeed, the Airbus family of aircraft are the only real competitors to Boeing aircraft. If Europe does not stay in the business of producing a viable alternative, European airlines will be put at the mercy of one single expensive product.

¹ See Annex.

Moorhouse

Mr President, this motion seeks the political support of the House for a third new project — the A320 150-seat airliner — and future airbus projects. We firmly believe the market is there. Indeed, both Air France and British Caledonian have already placed orders. We consider that the A320 is a well-calculated risk which fully deserves political support and practical backing from the Council of Ministers. We know all too well that individual national aerospace industries cannot go it alone, they need Airbus Industry to survive in civil air transport. The success of Airbus is a tangible example of what Europe can do together, and we ask for the support of the House.

IN THE CHAIR : MR KLEPSCH

Vice-President

Mr Hermann (PPE). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Airbus represents one of the rare examples of successful European industrial cooperation with Airbus industry products being sold on the most difficult of all markets, namely the American market. This it could do despite competitors who enjoy a market advantage, financial power and tradition. Thus it is Europe's last chance to retain production capacity in a sector with a future, where numerous jobs are involved : 250 000 persons working in the various sectors and subsectors involved in the production of Airbus. It is an advanced technology, with obvious repercussions on the other advanced technology sectors. For this reason, it is very important that Europe retain this capacity and this opportunity. If we were to abandon the Airbus, we would be open to the influences of a world monopoly held by the United States in this area. And goodness knows, whether, then, the United States might not be tempted to increase its prices and thus make the rest of the world carry and increase its costs which would be undoubtedly advantageous for the American economy, but certainly not for our European economy.

This is why I consider it important that all parties in Parliament support this resolution, because it is evident that, in a sector with such high investment the support of the governments is necessary. It is one of the rare sectors where such government support is perfectly logical. Furthermore, in the United States, we know that the Boeing models are often models derived from products ordered by the American army. Thus it is important that there is a consensus in all States here in Europe. In addition, the Commission must be able to back up Parliament's efforts to guarantee the future of the Airbus. It is a risk — as we have just said — but a calculated risk. It is not without difficulties, it is difficult, it is costly, but it is a risk which will certainly pay off in the long term.

Mr Prag (ED). — Mr President, this matter is of deep concern to Europe, to our Member States and — if I

may be permitted to add — to my constituency. For it is there, at Hatfield, that the wing of the A300 and the A310 was designed and where Hawker Siddeley, now British Aerospace, had overall design consultancy for the Airbus. The A300 and the A310 already employ 23 000 people in Europe. The A320 would guarantee that at least this number — and probably several thousand more — continue in employment.

It may be that we can let declining industries decline to the right dimensions. And it may well be that we should let vanishing industries vanish. But we cannot let Europe be eliminated from this highest of high technology areas. If we believe in Europe, Mr President, then the Community and its Member States must ensure that the A320 is built.

Mr Galland (L). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Liberal Group welcome this motion for a resolution, since like many others our Group regards the Airbus as the symbol of what a successful Community venture can be. However, we should like to say that we regret also, that this Community success is limited both in its industrial structure and in the participating countries, and that it would have had an exemplary symbolic value and of tremendous magnitude if the Community as a whole had been the author and creator of the Airbus.

Of course, we believe that a specific commitment by the Governments is necessary to avoid an American monopoly, in view of the fact that, as the Member speaking before me pointed out, we have convincingly shown our competence in this high technology sector. And in our view, such government commitment will be repaid, because we are fully confident of the profitability of the Airbus programme.

We also regret, ladies and gentlemen, that all our national companies are not equipped with Airbus and that some of them (Air France, Air Inter and British Caledonian) continue to work with the Boeing company for reasons which we find difficult to comprehend.

We hope that the success of the Airbus, which is a wonderful example of European resources, can be the departure point for an alignment between the advanced technology industries of the Member States, and for a bold advance by Europe in this industrial sector.

For all these reasons, Mr President, the Liberal Group will vote in favour of this motion for a resolution and will try to promote the future of the Airbus as far as at all possible.

(Applause)

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The Commission thanks those who tabled this motion for their move. The Commission is aware of the impor-

Narjes

tance of the aircraft industry in that it is a branch which uses advanced technology, has a high net product, and a considerable snowball effect on related sectors of industry. Therefore, in accordance with the Council decision and recommendation dated 4 March 1975 and 14 March 1977, respectively, the Commission has endorsed every action taken in favour of the aircraft industry.

It will also support such actions in the future. It knows that the aircraft industry is the only branch of industry in Europe which has managed to create a Community-wide industrial commitment in the form of a joint production programme. In the absence of sufficient finance for direct action on behalf of the aircraft industry, the Commission has, moreover, repeatedly cooperated with the European Investment Bank in order to facilitate the financing of Airbus sales. The Member States concerned must now themselves take the necessary decision to finance the development programme for the short and medium-range 150-seater A320 aircraft.

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote*¹

Angola

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1294/83), tabled by Mr Gérard Fuchs and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, on South African attacks on Angola.

Mr G. Fuchs (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, once again, in violation of all international law, South African troops have made a deep incursion into Angolan territory. We must condemn this

Some members will no doubt try to justify this by South Africa's need to pursue the Swapo terrorists. Moreover, this is I imagine what Mr Pearce means when, in his amendment, he condemns the utilization of force, and I quote 'by any party'.

However, to these members let me say that there would not be any Swapo terrorists if South Africa was not illegally occupying Namibia. There would not be any Swapo terrorists if Namibia had gained independence under the conditions laid down by resolution 535 of the United Nations.

May I add, also, that this independence would remove any justification for the presence of Cubans in Angola, a presence which we know well the Angolans have no desire to prolong indefinitely, and which also constitutes one of the pretext put forward by Pretoria for not implementing the decisions of the United Nations.

Ladies and gentlemen, the obstinate refusal of Pretoria of any serious negotiations on Namibia, its refusal of any policy other than one of force, led as you know, the French government to withdraw from the contact group entrusted by the UN with the task of helping to implement resolution 535.

For the same reason, it is more necessary than ever today that Parliament again accept the concept adopted almost unanimously by the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly, of exercising economic and political pressure on Pretoria to make it change its attitude.

I can only regret here also, though without surprise alas, that Mr Pearce proposes withdrawing any reference to this question.

In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, how can the South African authorities fail to understand that it is not by force that a white presence will be maintained on a lasting basis in Southern Africa? How is it that South African authorities cannot understand that the current policy of domination both *vis-à-vis* neighbouring countries and *vis-à-vis* the majority of their population, can only make an already difficult and tense situation even more explosive? A giant conflagration will be the inescapable outcome of a continued policy of apartheid.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, out of respect for international law and the rights of the oppressed, in the interests of peace and of those very persons who are today pursuing an aggressive policy, I call on you to adopt without amendment the urgent motion for a resolution which we have tabled with Mr Pietro Lezzi on behalf of the Socialist Group.

(Applause)

Mr d'Ormesson (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, on behalf of the European People's Party, we support the excellent amendment submitted by Mr Pearce.

All of us here condemn violence whoever the perpetrator, but terrorism will always engender counter-terrorism. Need I recall here that at present in Namibia 6 000 white South African soldiers are fighting with 30 000 black soldiers. In Angola, 40 000 Cuban soldiers, 1 500 Soviet officers, 2 500 East German officers and 3 500 members of the Portuguese Communist Party are stationed around Luanda. All of us here want peace in Southern Africa.

There is only one means of restoring peace and I defy anyone to say the contrary. We must ask the United Nations to demand the withdrawal of all foreign forces and the dispatch to Angola and to Namibia of a multinational force composed for example, of the five mandate countries in order to help Namibia gain independence, and let us then organize free elections in these two territories.

¹ See Annex.

d'Ormesson

For a democracy, State sovereignty can only be the result of popular suffrage and this is why we support Mr Pearce's amendment.

(Applause)

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, we condemn the situation of violence and warfare that exists in this part of the world. We too want the withdrawal of military forces. We too urge independence for Namibia. To that extent there is some parallel between Mr Fuchs' original report and the amendment that I have introduced. The original resolution goes much further in condemning South Africa for all its works in a resolution which is about Angola. It fails to recognize what South Africa is trying to do to improve the situation. It fails to recognize the will of the South African Government to speed independence for Namibia as soon as this is possible. Moreover, the resolution in its original form fails to deal with the question of the Cubans there which Mr d'Ormesson has just dealt with. That is the main problem. This is a totally extraneous force there in Africa for no good purpose. It is serving the aims of the Soviet Union, not of the indigenous people of southern Africa. We think it is wrong to have a resolution about this subject without looking at the realities of the situation. Moreover, on the question of aid — aid for reconstruction, for building a new Namibia — we believe that we must stop a situation where, in its aid programme, the Community goes on as though South Africa just was not there. Geographically and in terms of natural resources South Africa is the central point of southern Africa, and we need an aid programme for rebuilding and reconstruction and for dealing with the drought in that area in a way which links what South Africa is doing with aid programmes from the Community...

Mr Enright (S). — Under the appropriate Rules of Procedure, I should like to ask Mr Pearce which of the two forces — the Cuban or South African forces — were invited into that country by the legally recognized government of Angola?

Mr Pearce (ED). — ... Mr President, the point is that it is the Cubans with their Russian advisers, who are there in vast numbers, that have persistently and regularly caused conflict and disturbance in Namibia and in that part of the world. For these reasons I am happy to present Amendment No 1 and I urge the House to accept it.

(Applause)

Mr Martin (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, despite the sharp protests of the United Nations and international bodies, the South African leaders show unusual effrontery in continuing to defy international law, violating the integrity and sovereignty of peoples.

This latest serious attack against Angola follows the long list of heinous crimes on the part of South Africa, which are still fresh in all our minds: whether

it be the murderous raids against Lesotho, the occupation of Namibia or the direct support to the armed gangs, which in Mozambique, in Zimbabwe and in the other countries on the front line, lay waste infrastructures and massacre civilians.

By openly supporting Jonas Sawimbi and using his armed gangs, the racist regime in Pretoria is spreading terror in Angola. From this point of view, I welcome the fact that the French authorities refused to grant Mr Sawimbi a visa.

Let me remind you that some right wing Members of Parliament, among them Mr d'Ormesson, had the audacity to invite him themselves.

In the face of these damning facts, it is no time now for further protests which only serve to salve our conscience, while the Community continues to have commercial relations with Southern Africa and many European banks continue to support the apartheid regime financially. Practical measures are now called for, and, with this in mind, we support Mr Fuchs' resolution which calls for economic and political sanctions to be applied against the regime in Pretoria. In any event — and I will conclude with this — this is the view held by the Joint Committee and the Consultative Assembly for years now on the basis of documents often drawn up on the initiative of our Group.

We hope that in the course of its Presidency France will help to see to it that the Ten finally implement these sanctions, which are supported by the whole international Community.

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — *(FR)* May I ask Mr Martin if he approves his Government's decision to permit the installation of ANC offices when the ANC is the organization we know it to be, engaged in the activities known to us?

President. — Mr Beyer de Ryke, you did not have the floor. That interjection was somewhat too long.

Mr d'Ormesson (PPE). — *(FR)* May I reply to Mr Martin in a word, to the effect that the French Government has never had so much trade with South Africa?

Mr G. Fuchs (S). — *(FR)* Two remarks: one to Mr Beyer de Ryke, one to Mr d'Ormesson.

Mr Beyer de Ryke, let me say that there will be no need to have an ANC Office in Paris when black people have the right to vote in South Africa, and, to Mr d'Ormesson, may I say that French foreign trade with South Africa fell in 1983 compared to 1982, and that he knows this quite well.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, in my personal capacity I am tempted to intervene in this debate at greater length than I otherwise would have done. However, I will restrain my personal inclinations and give the view of the Commission only on those aspects of this resolution which are part of the Commission's competence.

Richard

We have consistently held the view that political conflicts between countries can and must be resolved without resorting to violence. Holding this view, the Commission, therefore, condemns any violation of national sovereignty wherever it takes place and, indeed, without regard to who undertakes it.

Regarding the invasion of South Africa into Angola, the Commission condemns this action just as we have always condemned the *apartheid* system in South Africa which, indeed, generates such actions. Whilst Angola is not a member of Lomé, the Commission has ongoing contacts with that country. It is of course a member of SADEC, which is helping to coordinate and hasten the development of the region and with which the Commission is substantially involved. Indeed I am informed that early in February Commissioner Pisani will be having contacts with the SADEC countries in Lusaka on these points. The Commission has also on various occasions supplied to Angola humanitarian aid in the form of emergency food aid.

I therefore, on behalf of the Commission, reiterate our condemnation of the action of the South African Government and in so doing call upon South Africa to complete the withdrawal of its troops immediately and to refrain from similar activities in future.

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote*¹

Amendment No 1

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — (FR) Mr President, I am just wondering if Mr Pearce's amendment is admissible because I was led to believe, when we had our recent debate on changes to the Rules of Procedure, that we had retained Rule 54 which states that no amendment shall be admissible if it is tantamount to a motion of rejection of the text to which it relates.

In this instance, the amendment by Mr Pearce is a rejection of the motion for a resolution which has been tabled by Mr Fuchs. It does not seek to change parts of the motion but in fact rejects it totally.

President. — Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure states that no amendment shall be admissible if it does not relate in any way to the text which it seeks to amend. That cannot be said in this case. An amendment is also inadmissible if it is tantamount to a motion for rejection of the text to which it relates. As I see it, the text is simply radically altered. There is condemnation of force by all parties and not just by one particular party. I therefore think that the amendment is admissible. That is what we have done in the past and I cannot set any new precedent in the House.

After the adoption of the amendment

Mrs Baduel Glorioso (COM). — (FR) Mr President, this amendment is in fact inadmissible. I am sure of it. Personally, I had not been aware of it but the new Rules of Procedure which we adopted in December make an amendment such as this one by Mr Pearce inadmissible. This is a replacement, and so the vote does not count.

President. — As I see the matter, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, what you said refers to ordinary reports which are submitted to the House. But we are now voting on a motion for a resolution tabled under urgent procedure and Rule 54 applies here, in the way in which we have interpreted it until now. It makes no difference whether a motion to replace a text is tabled by one group or by all the groups.

Iran-Iraq conflict

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1298/83), tabled by Mr Jaquet and Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the conflict between Iran and Iraq.

Mrs Charzat (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the motion for a resolution on the conflict between Iran and Iraq, tabled by Mr Jaquet and Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, aims to promote the conditions for an immediate ceasefire between the two warring parties. Two basic principles inspire the present resolution: first of all respect for the principle of human rights. The war which broke out in September 1980, which involved terrible offensives in Iran and which continues today in Iraq, would appear to be one of the most deadly wars which the Middle Eastern region has ever experienced. Hundreds of thousands of persons, in particular children, have been sacrificed uselessly.

In Iran, as well as in Iraq, most families have experienced bereavement, and while the war continues, while new offensives may develop again in spring, the uneasiness of the peoples of the region is increasing; it is against this background that the resolution which is based on recent debates on this question in the United Nations, calls for an immediate ceasefire, with in particular the return of refugees and persons expelled from both countries, and a declaration granting a general amnesty.

To coincide with the meeting of the Islamic Conference, allow me, on behalf of the Socialist Group, to express the wish that the Conference succeeds in the task it has set itself, namely that of drawing up the charter of human rights.

For my part, I hope that it will not forget to concern itself likewise with the rights of the child. It is of great urgency that the life of children be respected and protected, that children should not be enlisted and that they should cease to participate, by the gift of their blood, in the conflicts in the Middle East.

¹ See Annex.

Charzat

The second principle is that of respect for international law, respect for the territorial integrity of states. It calls for the peaceful resolution of disputes between the two warring parties by means of direct negotiations, based on the territorial integrity and total independence of states.

In 1980, there was no justification for not respecting the Treaty of Algiers concluded after so much difficulty in 1975. As at the battle of Syphine, it is time that copies of the Koran be attached to the tips of weapons to silence them so that the fratricidal struggle may cease.

To conclude, let me quote a phrase from the Koran: 'No! But you show no kindness to the orphan, nor do you vie with each other in feeding the poor. Greedily you lay your hands on the inheritance of the weak'.

Let the Ministers of the ten Community countries, united in political cooperation, combine their peace and mediation efforts with those of the Islamic Conference so that the terrible war between Iran and Iraq may cease as soon as possible.

Mr Barbi (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, the Group of the European People's Party supports the motion tabled by Mr Jaquet and Mr Glinne and will vote for it because, first and foremost, we are against any sort of war and secondly, because we see dangers inherent in any situation where there is a war such as in the Middle East and, specifically, in the struggle between Iran and Iraq; thirdly, because we see the risks — why not be frank? — which threaten our own Community economic interests: most of our energy supplies originate from the Persian Gulf and this war jeopardizes free trade in that area.

We will also support this motion because we agree with the proposal for 'an immediate cease-fire' and the following proposals. However we must admit to a certain scepticism and pessimism. These two countries have a totalitarian regime, or at least not a democratic one, in which the governments do not pay heed to their peoples' wishes. Iran in particular is governed by a regime of fanatics which has made the 'holy Islamic war' an instrument of political action which has repercussions on the Middle East and even Europe. We therefore fear that our appeal will fall on deaf ears — unfortunately.

Nevertheless we believe that it is the duty of the Community and the Ten, to act to put an end in the most realistic way possible to this lethal, bloody, useless, stupid war so that peace can return to the Middle East and to Iraq and Iran.

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, I have just heard Mrs Charzat quote the Koran and for my part I cannot refrain, if not from quoting, at least from invoking Cervantes and regarding the authors of the resolution, Mr Jaquet and Mr Glinne, as Don

Quichotte, but very nice Don Quichotte, who have put forward a proposal which for my part I will certainly vote in favour of, — there will be freedom of vote in my group —, but I fear, alas, that the force of persuasion of this text will have little effect on the reality.

And what are these realities? Well, a few colleagues and I were at the Iraqi front some time ago and we learnt that in fact Sadam Hussein, who physically resembles the famous French entertainer Francis Blanche, is a tragic and not a comic figure. It is he who started the war. He started the war because Iran, wearing the boots of the departed Shah, encroached on Iraq territory, namely in the Kurdistan. He thought he could profit from the bloody chaos in Iran to bring Iran to its knees and then he got bogged down. At the same time, he became involved in a policy of major works, leading to bankruptcy. And today, despite efforts at mediation, Iran does not want to let go and Iraq finds itself waging a double war; a military war conducted by Iran on its own territory and an economic war conducted by Syria. As regards the big powers, the American and the Soviets there is confusion. We sometimes find the Soviets and the Americans in the same camp, which does not facilitate the analysis of the situation. The fact remains that today at Casablanca, the majority of the Arab countries will try to throw a lifeline to Iraq, and the proposed resolution, while being balanced, aims at the same thing in practice, and I can only subscribe to this. However, like my fellow member Mr Barbi, I can only express my scepticism. However, even if the only effect of this resolution was to ruffle the hairs of Khomeini's beard, I think that that alone would undoubtedly be enough to gladden some of us.

That, Mr President, is what I wished to say and, with your permission and in that case as a point of order — because I believe that that is what the procedure dictates — I should like to go ahead without waiting for a motion for an urgent debate to be tabled here according to the rules of Parliament, and mention in another field the emotion which seizes many of us at the announcement of the assassination of the rector of the American University of Beirut. Assassination, terrorism are despicable acts which we cannot condone.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, the Ten have repeatedly expressed their anxiety at the continuation and intensification of the conflict between Iraq and Iran since it represents a real threat to the stability of the area and to world peace.

As long ago as 24 May 1981, they published a statement in which they expressed their concern about this protracted conflict and stated that they were prepared, as Member States to offer their services. I might add that the European Communities have at no

Narjes

time had any treaty with Iran and that the trade agreement with Iran was broken off by that country in 1973. Negotiations for a new framework agreement were broken off by the Iranian revolution.

On 22 March last year, the European Council expressed its concern for a second time and urged the warring parties to conclude an armistice. In the light of the two decisions of the European Council and of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, the Commission supports the European Parliament's appeal to the Member States of the Community. They can initiate action to help bring the two countries to an immediate truce and restore peace between them.

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote*¹

Maltese National Party

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1292/83/rev.), tabled by Lady Elles on behalf of the European Democratic Group and Mr von Hassel and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the ostracism of the Maltese National Party.

Mr Fergusson (ED). — Mr President, it is depressing indeed that we have to return so soon to the issue of democracy in Malta. We do so, not because we had any illusions about our former protests, about gerrymandered elections, about harassment of certain citizens, and about the freedom of information, or that the leaders of the Maltese Government would cease to threaten the fundamental freedoms that Europeans believe in; but we did hope that it would be harder for them to do so.

The new resolution before you reflects new and deep concern for the survival of Maltese pluralist democracy at all. We are outraged at the attempts to discredit an opposition party which is in no way revolutionary and is rapidly gaining more and more support throughout the country. We are appalled at having to draw the unavoidable conclusion, fully backed by medical evidence, which I have seen, that Maltese police have, for the first time, resorted to torture to extract confessions implicating the Nationalist Party in the discovery of hidden arms stores. All this under a government which has signed a treaty with North Korea to obtain police weapons, and a government whose senior Deputy Prime Minister was reported last week in the *Maltese Times* as saying that democracy and freedom itself could be subordinated to other policies.

Lady Elles's amendment withdraws the reference to Community aid to Malta, because that is not helpful here and would not help the Maltese people. Otherwise, we would have the resolution stand as it is tabled.

Mr Schmid (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. Our Group cannot support this motion since, politically speaking, it's got things all upside down. We also regret that you refer to the resolution of 10 March, but not to Mrs Van den Heuvel's well-balanced report of 8 June 1983, which at that time was supported by a large majority in this House. There's one thing I find rather odd: the Maltese government is being condemned for a police raid on the headquarters of the Nationalist Party. Why do you not also add that arms were found there? Why are you keeping quiet about the other arms finds?

(Interruption)

Why are you keeping quiet about the other arms finds? Submachine guns, hand grenades, radio transmitters — all things associated with civil wars.

(Interruption from Mr Barbi! It is not true!)

Instead of expressing disapproval of these arms stores, you are condemning the police, who are simply doing their duty to maintain law and order.

(Interruption from Mr Barbi)

If you were to make your interruptions in English, Mr Barbi, I could understand. I don't know Italian.

But I am grateful to you for this debate, which means that public opinion in Europe finds out prior to the elections who in this House does not condemn this grey area of criminality and potential terrorism, but condones it. The proposers of this motion must also explain why they are trying to discredit the Chairman designate of the Maltese Labour Party, Dr Bonici, with quotations taken out of context. It is in fact the Nationalist Party, your friends, who are creating a one-party system with a systematic boycott of parliamentary business!

(Interruption from Mr Brok)

They are not forbidden to take part in the proceedings of the Parliament! They just don't go, Mr Brok. That is the difference between them and you.

(Interruption from Mr Brok)

If they talked only half as much as you go on here, I should be very happy. Then we should have more democracy in Malta. They are allowed to do so, but they just don't!

Dr Bonici stated at a meeting — I now quote from the *Times of Malta*, a conservative newspaper, and from the English original —: 'He would repeat, however, that if the Nationalist Party continued in its present policy not to take part in Parliament's work, the time would come when the people who question the use of the two-party system were one of the parties who did not give its contribution'. It is not the

¹ See Annex.

Schmid

Labour Party that wants a one-party system, but your friends, who are, in fact, overthrowing the party system by boycotting the work of the Parliament.

(Interruption: Hear, hear)

Why does your Group have people table motions who have nothing directly to do with Malta? Why don't members of the Malta delegation do this? Why is Mr von Hassel speaking for you, when he personally hates the country, ...

(Interruption)

... someone who considers that what is going on in Turkey is democracy?

(Interruption: Hear, hear — Applause)

Why is Mr Fergusson speaking here, when he doesn't know the country, rather than, for example, Sir Peter Vanneck, who goes to Malta several times a year and is a member of the Malta delegation? I can tell you why: you are not concerned with an objective foreign policy. Far from it. You are not concerned with Community policies. What is happening here is that a right-wing clique in Parliament is tabling a motion dictated by the Nationalist Party in Malta!

Why don't you introduce something similar in the British Parliament? Why don't you introduce it in the German Parliament? They are both parliaments with conservative majorities. The reason is quite simple: those parliaments have responsible Foreign Ministers, who would put a stop to any such thing, regarding it as ridiculous meddling in the internal affairs of another country. You only dare to do such things here because we have no responsible Foreign Minister who can put an end to such nonsense.

(Interruption)

What I find most disturbing in this whole business is that, unfortunately, it discredits our Parliament. What we have here is not a Party Congress, and that is something that you have not yet understood. This is not a Parliament with responsibilities for external affairs. And it is about time you realized that!

(Applause from the left)

Mr von Hassel (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I protest at the tone that is being introduced into this debate, a tone which Parliament can no longer tolerate.

(Applause from the centre)

The attacks by Mr Schmid, who is setting himself up as a defender of the Socialist system in Malta and dismisses anything else as a right-wing clique, should, to my way of thinking, make the President consider whether he can allow such things to be said in Parliament.

My dear Mr Schmid, we debated Malta here in Parliament a year ago. We described the difficulties facing that country. We discussed the undemocratic electoral

system, and we showed how a minority in Parliament is, today, a majority and how this majority in Parliament is treating the opposition undemocratically in a way which we really must oppose.

Mr Schmid, at that time, when we in the Political Affairs Committee were discussing Mrs Van den Heuvel's report, you were the one who built a bridge for us to cross. What you said at that time made us accept that the Maltese Socialists were prepared to reconsider whether a common democratic path could be found between government and opposition. At that time you said all kinds of things, for example that democracy had been restored in Malta. Since the Van den Heuvel report was adopted, conditions there have not improved — they've deteriorated. You, too, ought to admit that and not set yourself up here as a defender of Dom Mintoff.

The way in which the opposition party there was assaulted, its leaders ill-treated, the way in which they are excluded from radio and television, the way in which things are made difficult for them wherever possible, ought to make you stop and think whether the Socialist International and its Chairman should not at long last step in and say to its member, Dom Mintoff, that a way must be found to return to democracy in Malta, so that it can win the trust even of non-Socialists. If the Chairman designate of the Maltese Labour Party, whom you defend here and whom you quote out of context, can continue to act as he has done up to now, we can predict here and now without being prophets, that Malta is heading for one-party rule. Then we shall meet again, Mr Schmid, and I shall remind you that today you defended conditions in Malta. Then you will agree with us that the situation cannot be allowed to continue.

And so we urge the Commission to consider how Europe and the Maltese Government, and the Maltese Socialist leadership, can bring about a reconciliation between the Maltese governing party and the Opposition.

(Applause from the centre)

Mrs Baduel Glorioso (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, Malta is a country which is very near to and has close ties with Europe. This ferocious struggle in Parliament between the centre-right and left, this slander of Malta and interference with a country with which we should on the contrary reinforce and make clear our economic and financial ties, should stop and we should re-establish a tradition of loyalty and sincerity. This is what should be done and what we wish for so that effective negotiations can be resumed with the Maltese government.

We cannot keep on slandering them: it is not good enough to repeat what has been said concerning an alleged agreement with North Korea, without proof. It

Baduel Glorioso

is a very serious affair for such a statement to be made in this Parliament. My own country, Italy, has signed a convention with Malta guaranteeing neutrality. Caution should be adopted before making certain statements, Mr Barbi, as you well know!

Mr Barbi (PPE). — *(IT)* There are Korean instructors in Malta!

Mrs Baduel Glorioso (COM). — *(IT)* But what action has been taken by the Italian government which is basically composed of your party and not mine? However, what I wanted to say, Mr von Hassel — although it was really Mr Fergusson who has been responsible for this deterioration in the general tone — is that we should try to discuss Malta without meddling in its affairs as we do all too often. We should discuss Malta bearing in mind the facts and should try to re-establish a relationship of loyal friendship with this country which is obviously on our side: one has only to think of the significance of Malta in strategic terms for the Mediterranean. Who would bring about radicalization in Malta? Obviously not Mr Schmidt with his statements, but rather other forces which do not even recognize English electoral law which is, quite frankly, a consequence of English imperialism. Maltese law does not support proportional election, but if we accept this type of law in the case of the European elections in Great Britain, we can accept the same law for a territory which has been an English colony and which is trying to free itself from its past in its own way and using its own methods.

Mr Brok (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President I should like to refute the assertion that I am talking rubbish, as Mr Schmid has accused me of doing, when I point out in an interruption that the present Maltese government has managed, by using undemocratic methods, to manipulate the constituencies before an election in such a way that with a minority of votes a Party gets a majority of the seats in Parliament, in order to perpetuate in this way its own Government against the will of the majority of the population. This was the reason why for a time the Nationalist Party did not take part in the work of the Parliament. Mr Schmid gives the impression that he would rather work with anti-democratic Socialists than with anti-Socialist Democrats, an indication that as far as he is concerned socialism is a more worthy cause than democracy. I should like to condemn that view.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, since the draft resolution asks the Commission to express its attitude, may I say on behalf of the Commission quite simply that the Commission regrets that the divisions in Malta's political life are creating tension on the island, which is, of course, in association with the Community. The Commission must remind honourable Members, however, that as a

matter of principle it never intervenes in problems of domestic policy. I am bound to say, having heard the briskness of this debate, that I am delighted that that principle should still be so.

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote¹

Chile

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1296/83), tabled by Mr Enright and Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the arrest of opposition leaders in Chile.

Mr Enright (S). — Mr President, Mr Israël has pointed out to me that he is in the process of preparing a report on Chile and cannot therefore support paragraph 4 and that his vote against that paragraph in no way prejudices the report that he will ultimately make. I accept the honourable way in which he has drawn this to my attention and I therefore withdraw paragraph 4 pending the report that Mr Israël will produce.

This motion for a resolution seeks to give notice to the Chilean Government that, though it may suppress democracy in its own country, elsewhere in the world democracy flourishes and will bring to the light of day any arrests they make within 24 hours of their being made. This Parliament has a long and honourable tradition of defending human rights. I hope today it will show its consistency by clearly telling the world that nowhere can democratic politicians have their rights infringed and be secreted away without it being brought to the attention of the world. In this I hope I have the backing of all groups.

One Member State, I am sorry to say, is giving this Fascist junta backing in a very specific and particular way, as once it gave backing to Argentina before its return to democracy. Mrs Thatcher has just invited Admiral Marino of Chile to take tea with her in order that she can sell to him HMS Antrim. That is a disgrace. I hope that on some future occasion she does not find herself compelled to sink that as once she sank the Belgrano. In short, if some groups are to show themselves consistent, particularly after that vote on Malta, which will also soon be the subject of a report, they should feel morally bound to support this resolution.

I appeal to the Tories in the figure of Mr Fergusson to show that they are not just the friends of South Africa, as they proclaim themselves to be through Mr Pearce's statement this morning, that they are not just the friends of the armed opposition groups on the right, as they have just proved in Malta, but that they support the rights of democrats everywhere.

¹ See Annex.

Mr Israël (EPD). — (*FR*) Mr President, we are in rather a delicate situation. A few months ago Mr Glinne tabled a motion for resolution on behalf of the Socialist group, which dealt with Chile. The motion for resolution reached the Political Affairs Committee, and it was my honour to be appointed rapporteur. I have spent a great deal of time on the motion for resolution, consulted a great many people. My report is now ready, Mr President, and it is to be considered by the Political Affairs Committee on Wednesday next and, I trust, approved by consensus.

Under the circumstances I do find myself somewhat harried by Mr Enright's initiative. To submit a motion for resolution to us now with a request for urgent debate, on the case of two or three individuals who have been arrested under unacceptable circumstances is, I find, a little regrettable, since Mr Enright has not limited himself to his subject. He is not content merely to state the facts. He is asking the Commission to take certain measures, and the Council to take others. He has been kind enough to tell you straight away that he withdraws Paragraph 4 of the motion for resolution, which calls on the Commission to assume its own political responsibilities. However he is maintaining paragraph 5, which calls upon the Council president to discuss this question at the next political cooperation meeting. You will agree that this puts me in an impossible situation.

What I would recommend to Mr Enright is that he remains patient for a few weeks more, so that this House may in February, or at the latest March, discuss and vote a comprehensive proposal, a broad-based resolution on Chile which covers all the questions. I do not think Mr Enright will be disappointed by what we shall be offering him.

Mr President, I shall not go so far as to say that we should vote against Mr Enright's proposal. I dare not say, either, that we should abstain. Mr Enright is quite right. But as far as our working procedures are concerned he is creating considerable difficulty for me and, I believe, for the Assembly.

May I, Mr President, make one last appeal to Mr Enright to withdraw his motion for resolution, in the knowledge that we shall have a major debate on Chile in February or March, during which he will be able to speak at length.

President. — Mr Israël, your objections would undoubtedly be justified if Mr Enright had not been quite clear in withdrawing paragraph 4 of the amendment, in which the Commission was called upon to assume its proper responsibilities by suspending economic and commercial relations with Chile. We are therefore considering a topical matter and there is consequently nothing more that can be said against its admissibility.

Mr Fergusson (ED). — Mr President, perhaps I am saying what Mr Enright is indicating. I am not quite clear. May I formally propose that this resolution be referred to committee and not voted on now? Is that possible?

President. — That is not possible in the case of urgent procedure. Anyone who preferred this course should not have voted in favour or urgency.

Mr Enright (S). — Mr President, the whole point of the resolution lies in paragraphs 1 and 2, containing requests on which we should take as immediate action as possible. I can see no reason whatsoever why that should not go forward and why the Council of Ministers should not consider it. So I would ask for those two particular paragraphs to go forward, and I ask for a separate vote on each item.

Mr Israël (DEP). — I thank you for the ruling you have just given, Mr President, but there is a point you have forgotten. I should like Mr Enright to withdraw paragraph 5 as well. This paragraph in fact urges the Presidency to raise the matter in the context of political cooperation. This is a proposal which should come from the actual rapporteur and it is not something you can add just like that. If Mr Enright is willing to keep the recitals and paragraphs 1 to 3, my advice to the House will be to vote in favour; otherwise, I shall ask Members to abstain.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (*DE*) Mr President, the Commission has always worked hard to defend human rights, which in Chile are still being disregarded by those who wield power in defiance of the wishes of the majority of the population, despite the assurance of the Government that it wishes to restore a democratic multi-party system. In the case under discussion, the Commission is basically of the opinion that men should not be persecuted because they exert what should be taken for granted as a civil right, the right to criticize. If the circumstances of these arrests were confirmed, the Commission could not but share the feelings of outrage which these events arouse. The Commission has been pursuing the same policies with respect to Chile ever since the coup d'état of 1973.

Mr Enright (S). — Mr President, I think it is important out of courtesy to Mr Israël that I explain this. In paragraph 5, where I urge the Presidency of the Community to raise this matter, I am talking about paragraphs 1 and 2 and not about the more general and philosophical issues which he, quite clearly, will deal with in depth in his report.

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote¹**Natural disasters*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on three motions for resolutions on natural disasters :

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1280/83) by Mr Provan and others on EAGGF assistance to less favoured areas ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1283/83), tabled by Mrs Ewing on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on emergency aid for the Strath Conon area of Easter Ross, Scotland ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1288/83), tabled by Mr Pedini and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, on the earthquake in Guinea.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Mr President, it is very sad to have to stand before this Parliament because you have a disaster on your own doorstep. It is something one would rather not be doing. It is also gratifying that one always finds that the Community shows a sense of solidarity when there is a disaster.

I think my resolution sets out the nature of the disaster. It seems as though the Florida weather came to the north of Scotland *en route* — I do not know where it went after that — but on 1 and 2 January a great valley of beautiful farmland was completely flooded without warning. There was a case of drowning in front of people in a village who could not save the man, and there were others who saved their lives by climbing up a tree and staying there for four hours. I myself saw the damage on 10 January ; trees at a considerable height were all bedecked with grasses from the terrible devastation caused by the water.

It is an ongoing question, because the snow has not yet melted and this area is still in receipt of flood warnings, which are fortunately so efficient that there has been an evacuation of houses and really no great loss of life, although the houses are, of course, very badly damaged. So there has been damage to fields, ditches, bridges and drains, the banks of two rivers have broken and this is not easy land to win or work. It is land that requires much human effort and quantities of nutrients, and all this has gone for possibly a decade in front of their eyes.

The British Government is very sympathetic ; the Regional Council is also ; but no matter what they do — and they intend to help, I understand from both — they cannot meet all the costs. So the people of Easter Ross look to you for a ray of hope to support them in their plight.

I support Mr Provan's resolution, which really walks hand-in-hand with mine.

The last point I have to make is that I had to lodge an amendment — it is really one amendment though there are three bits of paper — to refer to other areas concerned, because since I framed the resolution, news of flooding of a similar type in another district has come to us. That is why I have amended it to say 'other areas'. I do hope, Parliament will adopt this resolution.

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, in introducing this resolution this morning before Parliament, I am very concerned that all the directives on less-favoured areas are not at present in place. We are, in fact in a legal void in the European Community as far as the hill-farmers and their payments are concerned. With the present occurrence — which Mrs Ewing has so rightly talked about this morning — of some extremely severe weather in Scotland, not only in her area but elsewhere, where there are now massive amounts of snow the like of which we have not seen for 25 years, the total losses to the less-favoured areas may be very high indeed. One cannot expect the European Community to step in every time there is a national disaster, but let me just hope that this Parliament will be sympathetic to the cries coming from those in Scotland who look to the central organization of the EAGGF and say to the Commission : 'For goodness sake, put pressure on the Council of Ministers to come forward and get a rollover of the funds that were available earlier but are no longer there'. When weather is difficult, when everything goes wrong with animals and there are floods and snow about, the one thing you do not want are the financial worries of not having cash coming in when it should be. That is the position that Scottish farmers are having to face at the present time. There should be cash coming in under the less-favoured-areas directive in the form of hill-ewe and hill-cow subsidies, just as much in Scotland as in every other part of the Community that is entitled to these benefits.

We must have the old provisions rolled forward into 1984 until the new structural proposals for the Community come into force.

Mr President, one last point. I wish to withdraw the pound-for-pound reference in paragraph 2 of my resolution, because I believe and hope it will then command the full support of Parliament.

(Applause)

Mr Pedini (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party we shall vote for the motions tabled by Mr Provan and Mrs Ewing.

With the support of the Group of the European People's Party, I wish to present a motion on the consequences of an earthquake which has taken place in Guinea. Approximately 500 people have been killed and many have been left without shelter and are destitute.

¹ See Annex.

Pedini

I believe that the Community should provide even more assistance than it usually does for those who are particularly needy because Guinea is one of the countries which has signed the Lomé Agreement and therefore has special ties with us.

We therefore hope the Parliament will support this motion and that the Commission, with its usual understanding, will take the necessary steps either with its own resources or within the context of the Lomé Convention.

Mr Gautier (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. We naturally support the three motions before us, but I should just like to make a few remarks about Mr Provan's motion.

We, too, recognize the problems that may occur when there is a gap in Community law and none of the Member States knows exactly whether or not it may make payments under the agricultural structural policy — in particular compensatory operations in accordance with the directives on hill farming and on other less-favoured areas. In this case, the Council really ought to close this gap in the law and at least extend the old structural directive for the next three months, until we have reached a decision on the definitive structural directives.

I therefore urge that incentives to individual producers in the milk sector be suspended if the Council decides upon a few months' extension of the structural directives which have been in force until now. There is obviously very little point in the Commission's proposing that milk production should be cut by several percent when we for our part are possibly encouraging investment. We therefore urge that the structural directives should be extended, with the exception of facilities for investment in the milk sector.

Mr Hutton (ED). — Mr President, I would like to commend the resolutions of Mr Provan and Mrs Ewing to the House. Where I live in the Borders of Scotland we did not have a white Christmas, and the hill farmers there forecast that the winter was still to come. Now it has hit the whole of Scotland with a vengeance. With the coming of the bad weather has come this extraordinary problem from Europe that there are no more hill livestock compensatory allowances in the kitty. The problem is not just that the money is not coming; it is the uncertainty that this causes to people farming in very difficult areas and the uncertainty it causes to the people who buy their produce.

I would impress most strongly on the Council that it is not just the non-payment of the money but the whole climate of uncertainty that follows therefrom that could have a deleterious effect on our rural areas if the Council does not make an effort to roll Directive 268 over.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — May I start off by dealing with the point that has just been made. As far as the question of the roll-over of the agricultural structural Directive is concerned, I would like to point out that the Commission made a proposal to this effect in good time. It is up to the Council to take a decision on this proposal and for our part, we would urge the Council to endorse it. It is aimed at ensuring that the agricultural structural policy continues to apply without interruption for an interim period pending decisions on the Commission's proposals for reform of the common agricultural policy.

As far as Mrs Ewing's resolution is concerned, may I say that as soon as it received the motion, the Commission contacted the British Permanent Representative in Brussels to obtain particulars concerning the flood damage to which the motion relates, and on which it has no precise information. Once it has obtained the information requested, it will consider whether the conditions for granting emergency aid under Article 690 of the budget are satisfied. I ought to say — and I am sure it will not come as any news to Mrs Ewing and the House — that Article 690 is intended to cover natural disasters whose consequences are recognized as being exceptionally extensive and serious for the local population. As I say, within those criteria, as soon as we get the information, we will of course, have a look at it.

Finally, I turn to the resolution by Mr Pedini. On Saturday, 24 December, the Head of State of Guinea appealed to the international community for help. In this instance the response was astonishing both in terms of speed and in terms of its scope. The first consignment of aid actually arrived in Guinea on 25 December, Christmas Day. The solidarity with Guinea shown by the African world was indeed quite remarkable. Countries either provided aid or sent delegations, more often than not with financial help — albeit modest help in some cases. Among the countries most prominent were the Ivory Coast, Mali, Morocco and Senegal. The western countries, especially Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Switzerland and the United States — they were by no means the only ones although they were the most prominent — as well as the Community itself, provided aid quickly which was indeed much appreciated by the Guinean authorities. Massive aid came from Saudi Arabia. Several cargo aircraft full of food-stuffs, plus a cheque for 5 million dollars, was followed by aid from Kuwait, Algeria and Libya. I am told that in this instance too the international organizations have collaborated and cooperated smoothly with one another.

By contrast, I have to tell the House that the countries of the Socialist bloc have been virtually unrepresented, except for one aircraft from the German Democratic Republic which, I am told, contained 700 blankets by way of a contribution.

Richard

Finally, may I stress that all the emergency aid granted by the various organizations reached the victims quickly, which, as the House will know, is of extreme importance in dealing with this type of emergency. The Community contributed 100 000 units of account in the form of emergency aid as early as 24 December itself. It will probably be approached to help with reconstruction work, and the Commission is already preparing its response to that new request.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote*¹

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

IN THE CHAIR : MR JAQUET

Vice-President

2. *ACP-EEC*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-1143/83), drawn up by Mr Israël on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the outcome of the proceedings of the ACP-EEC Joint Committee and Consultative Assembly.

Mr Israël (DEP), rapporteur. — *(FR)* The Lomé Convention is extremely original. It is an economic convention containing a provision which is of a Parliamentary nature: not content with governing the economic relations between the European Community and 63 countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific, the Lomé Convention has invented the idea of permanent negotiations being held at parliamentary level.

This report which I have to give you on the results of the work of this Parliamentary Assembly and the Joint Committee for 1983 does, I believe, Mr President, mark a turning point in the history of these consultations.

Regular intensive consultations have been held during the year. Numerous resolutions have been put to the vote. To list them would give an idea of the importance of the budget involved: hunger in the world, the industrial cooperation policy, the common fishing policy, cultural cooperation — yes, Mr President, cultural cooperation in an economic convention — sugar and, finally, negotiations on the renewal of the ACP-EEC Convention as such.

Our colleagues in the ACP countries have shown a certain amount of concern with regard to this latter point. They believe that the Community is not

doing enough and is not providing enough of the development aid which they have the right to expect. Their concern relates to quantity, and the amount of aid provided, but also relates to quality and the very nature of our relations.

Nevertheless, in spite of this rather negative aspect which I have had to point out as rapporteur, I should also like to point out that there has been a certain improvement in these structures. Our ACP-EEC Committee is becoming more parliament-orientated; parliament members are becoming increasingly numerous on the ACP side, so that the danger of the dialogue becoming the sole province of bureaucrats seems to have been avoided. New themes have appeared in our reflections: the environment, which is fundamental even in a continent as complex as the African continent, and the role of women in Third World countries.

However, it was political issues which made up the bulk of our conversations. The situation in southern Africa continues to be deeply disturbing for the Third World. The absence of any sort of significant progress in the internal situation in South Africa is of great concern to our ACP partners and it would be out of the question to try to deny this or to try to sweep it beneath the carpet of some report.

Your reporter therefore believes it necessary to maintain a permanent dialogue with the ACP countries on this particularly delicate issue, which relates to our very concept of mankind. Apartheid offends the European concept of man and the anti-racial standards which we all observe.

Having mentioned our concept of man, Mr President, I should, in the last section of this speech, like to point out that there has been an alignment in our joint ACP-EEC conception of human rights. The core of the report which I have presented today relates to the fact that, for the first time, a dialogue has been opened between the ACP States and the Member States of the EEC on human rights. This is not a theoretical dialogue, but a very practical dialogue on the situation of actual individuals caught in the trap of persecution, negligence and lack of respect for the human condition.

On behalf of all of you I should like to thank Mr Penders who has introduced the issue of human rights into our ACP-EEC relations. After what took place in Nigeria he managed to convince our friends of the need for a dialogue on human rights in ACP-EEC relations.

It is true that the ACP countries have raised certain objections: they agree with the principle of the dialogue on human rights, but believe that we should not associate the particular political regime to which we belong with our concept of human rights and should not measure out Community aid in accordance with a country's observance of human rights.

¹ See Annex.

Israël

We have much to say on this point, Mr President, but what I want to emphasize is that this dialogue has been started and, in my personal opinion, could continue, especially if we succeed at the next meeting at Brazzaville in setting up a body or working party for human rights whose task would be to pave the way for progress in this area.

To be brief, Mr President, since I am 33 seconds over the time limit, I would say that the ACP-EEC meetings have aroused a certain amount of hope in all observers during 1983 and that all Members of this Parliament, no matter what their political party, who have taken part in this dialogue deserve warm thanks.

Mr Ziagas (S.) — (GR) Mr President, as regards the results of the work of the Joint Committee and the Consultative Assembly referred to in the report, we would like to make certain observations. I will confine myself to what we consider to be the most important points approved by the Berlin Assembly which will have to be taken into consideration in the negotiations on the signing of the final convention. Starting with the institutional framework which will govern the new convention, we would like to emphasize that we fully agree with the proposals concerning the creation of a Joint Assembly and that we attach particular importance both to the economic independence of the institution and to the need for steadily expanding parliamentary representation of the ACP countries.

As regards the problem of hunger, which is becoming more urgent from day to day, it has now become clear to all of us that the policies followed so far have not provided definitive solutions to this critical problem. In our view the proposals by our colleague Mr Ferrero for the revision of the existing procedures concerning the financing of agricultural infrastructural programmes should be the pivot of the next convention.

As regards industrial cooperation, an area of major interest to the ACP countries, we agree that industrialization should not simply mean the construction of factories but should constitute part of a wider plan for the socio-economic development of the countries concerned.

We consider the enhancement of the role of the Centre of Industrial Development to be a first step in this direction.

Mr President, at a moment in which the negotiations are in their initial phase we should not forget that the basic goals of this convention will have to be economic development, the creation of effective interregional cooperation, the realization of a more just world economic order, and a new and more essential view of the human and cultural dimensions of development. The promotion of educational cooperation is of major importance for the achievement of this final goal and we hope that it will be included for

the first time in the next agreement, a wish that is also expressed in the Berlin resolution.

I would also like to mention three further points to which we attach particular significance.

In principle we welcome with satisfaction the resolution on the respect for human rights and we hope that, in a spirit of cooperation with our partners from the ACP countries, it will be possible to include the need for respect of these rights in the next convention.

Secondly, we share the Assembly's position concerning the racist regime in South Africa and we demand that every form of pressure be exercised in order to put an end both to this country's acts of aggression against neighbouring states and to racial discrimination within the country itself.

Finally, it is with great satisfaction that we welcome the initiation of closer cooperation with Angola and Mozambique and we hope that we will soon achieve concrete results of benefit to all.

Mr President, once again I would like to stress that the decisions taken by the European Parliament should not only be harmonized with those which have been taken by the joint EEC-ACP bodies, but that the thinking behind them should tally with our frequent declarations on cooperation based on equality and the creation of sincere and mutually beneficial bonds.

Mr Wawrzik (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. First of all our heartfelt thanks to the rapporteur for his report. He has managed to summarize a wide-ranging theme concisely, precisely and clearly. With many such reports which are presented to this House that is not the case at all. That is why we extend to him our special thanks. Allow me to make a few comments on Mr Israël's motion for a resolution. We consider it to be absolutely essential that the decisions of the Consultative Assembly be debated in the European Parliament. If these decisions are to be effective they need the support and agreement of the whole Parliament, and in this respect Mr Israël's request receives our full backing.

On the other hand, it is not automatically the case that all Members of the European Parliament who take part in the discussions of the Consultative Assembly fully support all the decisions of Parliament. Rather, they act as they feel inclined and simply refrain from referring to European Parliament decisions in the Consultative Assembly discussions. I very much regret that, because it means that there is a risk that, in parliamentary committee discussions, the decisions of the Consultative Assembly are not fully represented.

On the question of having only one single institution, members can take whatever stand they like, but one single body would no doubt concentrate the work that

Wawrzik

is to be done. On the other hand, it means that we cut out half the people in the Consultative Assembly and can involve fewer people therefore than hitherto in the democratic process which is part of the Lomé Convention. I regret that. I shall regret it all the more if it proves impossible to give this new body budgetary autonomy, i.e. so that this institution, according to the terms of the Lomé agreement, no longer has to go cap in hand to the budgetary authority or the Bureau, but can work out its own policies, on its own responsibility, according to the means at its disposal. This applies especially if the abolition of one of the two bodies is seen not only from the point of view of cost-saving and there will in future be something of an increase in the work to be done in committees and working parties. At the last session, two new working parties were set up, one to deal with environmental questions resulting from development policy, and another to deal with the rôle of women in the development process. These are two working parties involved with topical problems. I believe that this is a good decision, and our Group will wholeheartedly support this point.

One comment on human rights : in this case I cannot entirely share Mr Israël's optimism. I should like to state quite categorically that without the resolution on the events in Nigeria, a resolution such as Mr Penders has kindly tabled would not be possible. This Penders resolution came about — and I say this only so that there should be no illusions on this subject — because our friends on the ACP side did not take part in this vote and we therefore did not pursue any further the resolution on Nigeria but have declared ourselves satisfied with an explanation from the African side. I hope that Mr Israël is right in saying that we are taking a step forward on human rights and that the discussion will continue. However, when I look at the Lomé III negotiations, I have my doubts on this point.

One comment on the amendments that we have tabled — my Group has given me a little more time. We should have liked a somewhat more neutral text for Angola and Mozambique — especially in view of the fact that we are accepting two new member countries without increasing the overall funds available to the Lomé Convention, at the cost of the present members of that convention. If we want to accept new members, then we should, for goodness sake, increase the available funds proportionately. We are withdrawing Amendment No 3, although paragraph 12 of the report is somewhat misleading, since all countries south of the Sahara belong to the Lomé agreement. In future South Africa will continue not to belong to the Lomé Agreement, since it is not a developing country.

In conclusion, I should like once again to thank Mr Israël and confirm that our Group will support the motion for a resolution.

Mr Christopher Jackson (ED). — Mr President, on behalf of my group, I would like to thank the rapporteur for an excellent and succinct report which we shall support. I totally concur with the remarks he made concerning human rights. Following his speech there are only two points I want to emphasize at this stage. We found recent meetings of the Joint Committee and the Consultative Assembly particularly useful. I want to go first into the issue of the proposed organizational changes. We favour the idea that the Joint Committee and the Consultative Assembly should be merged into one smaller body. This will not only lead to economies but will remove a repetitive part of our proceedings and enable us to concentrate on the most valuable aspects of our joint work.

The meetings between the ACP representatives and ourselves are, I believe, of absolutely unique value. Every six months some 60 representatives of the ACP countries meet with an equal number of ourselves, and the membership of this group changes only very slowly. This results in extremely constructive relationships and discussion being established, and I have found that our deliberations over recent years have been marked by increasing understanding of each other's point of view and by very frank speaking without rancour. This is of immense benefit to relations between ACP and EEC, not least, of course, because we are better informed. So we support that organizational change.

The second issue to which I wish to refer is the Fuchs report on industrial cooperation which was adopted in Berlin. This subject, while somewhat difficult, is of outstanding long-term importance. We all know that Lomé II provided for industrial cooperation, but we also know that overall the results on the industrial side have been somewhat disappointing. My group believes that industrial cooperation with developing countries is second in importance only to agricultural development. We all know that official aid flows are under pressure and we equally know that industry is a *sine qua non* of development. Taken together, these two points mean that there is today a vital role for private investment from Europe in developing countries. Such investment has three merits. It is additional to official aid flows. Because it is based on the profit motive, it has a somewhat greater chance of success than other investment. But, above all, it brings with it training, the transfer of technology and the prospect of continued growth. I believe that European companies have enormous expertise that they can bring to bear on this. But I have to confess also that there are very considerable problems.

In our working group we discussed these at length. Many developing countries have been suspicious of European investment on the grounds that the company might not be — in the broadest sense of the

Jackson

phrase — 'a good citizen'. Other difficulties, perhaps, are now more important. In Europe and around the world companies have been hit by the recession. They are more wary of risk and concentrate on survival. To invest in a developing country often involves a disproportionate amount of management effort for an uncertain return. So against the developing country's fear that the company may be a bad citizen, one may set the company's fear that the developing country may treat it unfairly.

I am aware that there are bilateral agreements, but I hope that we shall be able to set up, through the Lomé Convention, agreements between the European Community as such and developing countries covering on the one hand codes of conduct and on the other hand investment guarantees. I recommend to the House that it should give urgent priority to the consideration of the Fuchs report as adopted in the Consultative Assembly.

Mr Eisma (NI). — *NL*) Mr President, on behalf of my colleague Mr de Goede, who has been prevented from attending, I would like to make four comments on the Israël report, to which we shall be giving our full support.

The report creates the impression that the subject of world hunger can now be given a rather lower priority, since it has recently been discussed many times. I find this unreasonable. The Court of Auditors has again sharply criticized the Commission's spending in 1982. Waste and inefficiency are apparent in many food aid projects, including those for a number of ACP countries. In my opinion Parliament should demand that the Commission should make its food aid policy more efficient and that unnecessary waste should be avoided. The present state of affairs is causing real harm to those who urgently need to be fed. I hope to be able to raise this problem again before this House in the near future by tabling an oral question with debate.

My second point concerns human rights in the third world. Mr Israël rightly points out that an increasing amount of attention has been devoted to this subject over the past year. While in the autumn of 1982 the rapporteur and my colleague Mr de Goede were among the few to raise this matter in Rome, in 1983 a large scale debate on the situation in Nigeria was held in Jamaica, and in September of last year considerable attention was focused on this subject in Berlin. We find this a most welcome development. We also feel that relations between the Community and the third world should not be constantly strained by a situation in which the violation of human rights in South Africa is discussed — and rightly so — at every meeting, while we are not allowed to mention such violations in certain developing countries. In my view any future EEC-ACP agreement should emphasize this point more than has been done in the past.

Unfortunately, no mention is made in the Israël report of the purchases of weapons by the developing countries. In our discussions in the Joint Committee over the past five years we have also noticed that there has been little interest in this subject. However, the fact is that in certain developing countries military purchases and the constant expansion of military forces are placing a fairly heavy burden on those countries' national resources. Perhaps we should in future be asking ourselves more and more why the Community should continue to grant fairly substantial economic and financial aid while military expenditure is increasing beyond reasonable bounds.

Finally, Mr President, the rapporteur rightly devotes a great deal of attention to the working methods of the Joint Committee and the Consultative Assembly. We feel that in recent years discussions have been fruitful, that worthwhile reports have been produced and a wide range of topics have been examined. The fact that all topics are discussed first by the Joint Committee and then again by the Consultative Assembly is in our view utterly wasteful and highly inefficient. Our view is that the Joint Committee should continue to exist in the new period, though perhaps in a somewhat modified form. As will be clear to you despite my criticisms, we shall be supporting the Israël report.

Mr Sablé (L). — *FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the meeting which was held in Berlin last September was of special importance since the Consultative Assembly was able to express its point of view several days before the official opening of negotiations on the renewal of the Lomé Convention.

The Parliament had expressed an opinion sometime beforehand on the future of the development and cooperation policy with the ACP States and had adopted the Jackson report on the Pisani memorandum and the Irmer report on the prospects for the new Convention.

Since I myself drew up the report in 1980 on the results of the work of the Joint Committee and the Consultative Assembly, I can say that today the progress has been made on many issues and that the introduction into the new Convention of a reference to human rights and of a chapter on cultural cooperation is beginning to be accepted thanks to meetings which have been held twice yearly with the ACP countries.

It should be noted that now that we are half way through Lomé II the Commission, the Parliament and the ACP countries agree that certain conclusions should be drawn and even that the faults which the previous speakers have mentioned should be pointed out.

Sablé

The association of the Ten with 63 Third World Countries, which are soon to become 66, is unique. It was noted in Berlin that, in spite of certain criticisms, the ACP countries are very attached to the Lomé Convention and its political implications as well as to the guarantees which it offers against the arbitrary acts of the super powers. It involves more than 600 million people i.e. half of the developing countries and half of the countries which belong to the UN. It has proved itself, especially with the Stabex system, which guarantees the ACP countries a minimum return on exports to the Community with financial aid from the European Development Fund and the European Investment Bank.

We asked ourselves whether an ACP-EEC development bank should be set up which would be modelled on the World Bank, and our group was, on the whole, in favour of this idea, in spite of some reservations. We believe that new credit institution could eventually be a branch of the European Investment Bank.

Lomé does, however, have its limits: the Stabex appropriations in 1981 and 1982 were inadequate, and the preferential treatment enjoyed by the ACP countries in their commercial relations with the Community has been eroded when, on the other hand, exports to other developing countries and 'semi-industrialized' countries are increasing very rapidly.

A more comprehensive criticism was made of the implementing procedures. The major infrastructure works which have been carried out and the selective actions which were taken to promote growth have so far only succeeded as propaganda. Europe should not only provide the tools but should also concern itself with whether these tools are in the hands of people who know how to use them. Some irrigation systems remain unused, some hydro-electric dams are only working at 30 or 40 % of their capacity, there are factories which are like empty cathedrals and hospitals which are not in operation because of the lack of qualified staff. Aid should not be frittered away at a time like this when it is becoming increasingly difficult to release appropriations because of the present economic crisis when countries are running into debt.

Efforts should therefore be concentrated on agriculture and food. These new Commission and Parliament policies are not totally accepted by the ACP countries. There is still doubt as to the usefulness of a dialogue between the Community and each one of the ACP countries and on the policies to be followed. The next Consultative Assembly at Brazzaville will, I hope, reassure the ACP countries.

To sum, up, ladies and gentlemen, although we must welcome the results of the Berlin Consultative Assembly for which our colleague, Mr Israël has written such an excellent report, for which he should

be congratulated, it is regrettable that, contrary to the hopes of the ACP countries the European side of the Assembly has decided against recommending supplying available agricultural products at preferential conditions as regards price and credit as a complement to food aid. At a time when the whole of Africa is affected by a drought of unprecedented severity I believe that the Community should have been more willing to agree to their request. The question will certainly be brought up again next month in Brazzaville. More serious thought should be given to the issue. Nevertheless our group will vote for Mr Israël's report.

Mr d'Ormesson (PPE). — (*FR*) I believe the report presented by Mr Gérard Israël to be positive in many respects. It covers the overall results of Lomé II and the prospects for Lomé III. It is particularly appropriate now that we are beginning to realize the economic and political shock which will be created by the end of the century by the population growth on the African continent. Today there are approximately 468 million people. In 17 years time there will be 828 million people.

As regards Lomé III, I would venture the theory that in the light of past experience the ACP countries will not be able to reach their objectives of increased agricultural and industrial production unless four basic conditions are met. Firstly, we must progressively increase our transfer of wealth towards these countries by giving them a fairer and more sizeable remuneration for their mineral and vegetable products and, in particular, by reinforcing Stabex. In exchange these countries should guarantee the Community security for investment whether Community or private investment, and servicing of loans, which is the only way to establish the climate of confidence necessary for developing agricultural, industrial and commercial affairs. These countries should adopt a contractual policy towards us and should give us priority when buying foodstuffs.

Finally, our main priority is to help these countries to loosen the state stranglehold which paralyses their economies, initiatives and efforts. If these conditions were to be fulfilled, Lomé III would obviously be a success.

With regard to the admission of Mozambique and Angola to the Lomé agreements, I would point out that there are some very encouraging signs as regards Mozambique. Pretoria and Maputo have set up four committees, i.e. joint committees. The first is to deal with security problems, the second with aid for agriculture, the third with aid for economic development and the fourth with aid for the construction of hydro-electric dams. All these signs are precursors of peace and lead me to agree with Mr Gérard Israël's proposal.

d'Ormesson

Nevertheless I must say that, personally, I totally disapprove of the idea of Angola being admitted to the Lomé agreements in the current situation. How could we bring our economic aid to its capital, Luanda, when there are about 40 000 Cuban soldiers camped around it at the moment, each one of which costs the Luanda Government 40 US dollars a day? Thus the Gulf Company's profits of 1 200 million are mortgaged for the next three years for the benefit of Moscow and Cuba. I will therefore vote against Articles 10, 11 and 12 of your excellent report, Mr Israël and hope that you will not hold it against me.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr Israël referred to the fact that more and more of the delegates of the ACP-EEC Assembly are MPs rather than ambassadors. He called this *'parlementarisation'*. I try to avoid spoiling the purity of the language in quite that way, but I would call it MP-ization, if I may.

I welcome this trend, and I welcome the politicization that goes with it, because now the two bodies are moving beyond discussing the details of the Convention to the political issues of the day. I am glad that Mr Israël has directed our attention to that point.

One of the issues of the day was referred to by Mr d'Ormesson: the situation in Mozambique, its possible accession to the Lomé Convention in the future and the general situation there. We shall continue this discussion in forthcoming meetings of the Assembly and of its Joint Committee. We will be looking with great interest at the talks that have been referred to, taking place this week in Pretoria between South Africa and Mozambique, which is an entirely new development.

The problems of southern Africa — drought, war, poverty, the securing of proper human rights in all of the countries of southern Africa for all the people — merit joint action. The European Community, South Africa, South Africa's neighbours, the so-called homelands and the SADEC organization should work together in the context of southern Africa towards solving the area's problems. They should work together in the spheres of finance, technology, agriculture, water management and starvation relief. We will be using, from this group's point of view, the ACP-EEC Assembly and its Joint Committee to promote discussion of these things. We want to look at the significance, good or bad that South Africa has in this context. We do not accept the general view that often comes out: South Africa must not be mentioned, except in the context of criticizing apartheid. We support calls for apartheid to be removed, but we also believe that we will achieve this by cooperation with them, by talking with them, by involving them in the problems of the area.

I congratulate Mr Israël on an excellent report. I will be supporting it wholeheartedly.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission is impressed with the quality of Mr Israël's report and of the Consultative Assembly's work. The latter provides a very useful political control over the management of cooperation between the ACP and Community executives, and the management of this cooperation is the responsibility of the Lomé system. Furthermore, the Assembly can play an important role in providing political stimulus and can also be responsible for drawing up new types of cooperation.

From this point of view many resolutions adopted last September in Berlin are of particular interest. Without mentioning them all, I would single out the general report of Ambassador Cavalevu, drawn up within the context of the recent negotiations, which is very positive as regards the human dimension of development and cooperation, Mr Fuchs' report on industrial cooperation — the first of its kind — and, lastly the resolution on the situation in southern Africa.

The setting up of specialized temporary working groups has proved effective and their work is useful for the Commission, which is the administrator, as well as for the negotiators of the Convention on behalf of the Community.

I would particularly like to mention the resolution adopted in Berlin on the parliamentary institutional system to be established under the new ACP-EEC Convention. The Commission agrees that there should be a single Joint Assembly and, as stated in the motion drawn up by Mr Israël, that an attempt should be made to generalize genuine parliamentary representation of the ACP countries. I welcome the rapporteur's comments on this point, and in particular his mention of the progress which has been made.

The Commission therefore intends to conduct the negotiation with the ACP countries in accordance with the Berlin resolution on the Joint Assembly and the motion discussed today.

We also welcome the creation of two Consultative Assembly working groups on the environment and the role of women in development. You are aware of the increasing importance which the Assembly attaches to these two issues in the implementation of Lomé II and for the new Convention. The motion being discussed today rightly emphasizes the importance of the interest shown by Angola and Mozambique in participating in the next Convention. The participation of an Angolan representative in Berlin was a positive step.

Finally, I totally agree with the rapporteur that the Consultative Assembly should hold debates of a political nature on, for example, southern Africa or human rights.

With regard to human rights, as far as we are concerned, the negotiations are well under way. It is very encouraging to see that we have made a serious

Ortoli

and useful attempt to touch upon the heart of the matter even though it is too soon at this stage to foresee how the negotiations will end.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

3. *International Development Association*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-933/83), drawn up by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the situation of the International Development Association.

Mr Bersani (PPE), deputy rapporteur. — *(II)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am deputizing for Mrs Caretoni who is indisposed, and on behalf of everybody offer her our best wishes for a speedy recovery.

Recent events make today's discussion in our Assembly particularly topical since it also covers part of the conclusions reached by the Committee on Development and Cooperation in its voting on 18 October.

I particularly refer to the conclusion reached in the long and hard-fought negotiations which took place last Saturday, five days ago, on the re-financing of the International Development Association which has for 20 years, i.e. since 1960, been one of the major sources of multilateral assistance and cooperation: This re-financing is for its seventh three-year cycle.

As we are well aware, the last Association programme, the sixth, which was for 1980, 1981 and 1982, was extended so as to cover 1983, and so for the first time was not a three-year but a four-year programme.

However, the initial financing of twelve thousand million dollars has remained the same, and this has adversely affected many programmes. The Association, which as I have said, is financed for three-year periods, grants loans which have so far extended over 50 years. Now, however, there is a tendency to review this 50 year period, since these are interest-free loans, the 1 % which is charged being used to cover the servicing of the loans.

Inflation has risen, partly because of the escalation of the dollar; more countries are requesting aid, and China has recently become one of their number, which is a major development, because of the corresponding increase in the number of demands that can be expected; many countries are destitute, partly because of natural calamities, especially in Africa; the populations of the recipient countries are increasing rapidly and the whole world is becoming aware of the North-South problem and the increasing repercus-

sions which this is having on peaceful coexistence in the world and an atmosphere of mutual support. All this would give the impression that there should have been a real increase in the amount of funds available to the largest international development association, thanks to contributions from both many industrialized countries and Eastern countries, which have so far avoided becoming involved in these urgent international obligations.

The results of the negotiations which were concluded five days ago are however, disappointing and very worrying, especially since they are particularly concerned with the poorest areas of the world which are being threatened ever more seriously and directly by hunger, illness, natural disasters and wars as mentioned previously.

The East has taken no steps at all and in the West, the United States has reduced its commitments, which have already suffered a previous reduction from 42 % to 27 %, so that the nominal total for the next cycle has been reduced from 12 to 9 million dollars. Obviously if this total is translated into real terms — bearing in mind the various indicators to which I have referred — the situation is even more serious.

It should be noted that the American Mr Clausen, who is President of the World Bank, of which the Association is the major executive authority, has repeatedly fought in Assembly for the total to be raised to 15 million dollars.

As the rapporteur has described in great detail, there are many reasons behind this and other similar American decisions such as the problems connected with the United States balance of payments and the disagreement and controversy which have arisen, especially in the past, over the distribution of funds since.

For example 70 % of the first funds were allocated to India and Pakistan which, are of all the developing countries, those which have the highest development indexes and which have always received more marked preference from the American administration for forms of bilateral policy which are very different from the multilateral policies to which our European philosophy has always been directed in various original ways.

The Member States of the Community are now faced with a difficult choice, since they need to meet the expectations of the ACP countries under Lomé III but cannot ignore the evermore pressing demands from that vast area of the world and its poorest regions. What to do? Bridge the 3 million dollar gap with European funds? This is basically what Mr Fuchs is suggesting and he also suggests — and here it would be interesting to have the Commission's opinion on the matter — that these funds could be obtained from a sort of special supply fund consisting of funds from Community countries. Should Community contributions be shared between Lomé and the Association?

Bersani

Should the Community concentrate exclusively on Lomé in the belief that the latter has much greater priority? I believe that yesterday the President-in-Office Mr Cheysson, stated clearly that the line favoured by the French Presidency was that of concentrating on the needs of the Association.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, today, five days after the agreement made on Saturday, we are faced with a difficult choice which should involve our whole commitment and responsibility. At this point, seeing that the multilateral policy cannot be disassociated from the bilateral and Community policies — we should not resign ourselves to discussing the problem of re-financing and quotas only every three years, but should find a way of discussing the problems of development and funds globally by taking an overall and consistent view of our actions.

Mr Gérard Fuchs (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli is a good one on a subject which is of vital importance for many developing countries. The principal aim of the IDA is in effect to assist the financing of projects in the poorest countries, those which are unable to gain access to the normal capital market, in particular owing to the current interest level. Unfortunately, the motion for a resolution which accompanies this report appears to me politically inadequate because it fails to mention the cause of the current crisis of the IDA, by this I mean the American attitude and the new philosophy which it reflects, a philosophy which can be summed up by the now only too famous dictum 'trade, not aid'.

In this context it must be said, ladies and gentlemen, that 32 out of 33 of the IDA donor countries were prepared to contribute up to 12 000 million dollars to replenish IDA resources, and that it was owing to the United States, and to them alone, that the figure of only 9 000 million finally had to be accepted. Furthermore it is very likely that this reduction will make it necessary for the IDA to curtail very significantly, sometimes even dramatically, a number of the envisaged programmes, which, as you know, were intended mainly for the less advanced countries of South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa.

For the most part, ladies and gentlemen, these are agricultural programmes which represent one of the very rare positive elements in the increasingly difficult fight against hunger in the world.

It must be said, also, that even purely from the point of view of our own interests, the interests of the developed countries, the American attitude is a stupid calculation, because a reduction in the resources of the least advanced countries can only lead to a further decline in world trade, which is already going through a crisis, and add further to the risk of a new world recession.

Our Community must show clearly its disapproval of the American attitude. This is what my amendment proposes to do.

Mr Deschamps (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, the Group of the European Peoples Party will obviously vote in favour of Mrs Caretoni's report and her resolution. I say obviously, because this resolution reflects in fact what has always been our objective: to give priority to the less advanced countries, that is the poorest countries, helping them to survive first of all, and then to emerge from their stagnation. We have always considered this an important objective. But now it has become a priority.

We hope to be able to convince Parliament of this and obtain a unanimous vote, as was the case in committee. In particular, we hope that an increasingly large proportion of the financial funds provided for in the sixth refinancing will be collected urgently, and likewise those funds, which, alas, are quite inadequate, entered in the seventh refinancing. It is not normal, it is not fair, it is not worthy of us not to take account of the increase in the number of countries in need at the present time. For this reason we must deplore and condemn the fact that the agreement reached on the seventh refinancing represents in effect, this must be stressed, a decline in the aid and also a substantial reduction in the participation by certain countries.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to vote in favour of this resolution, and we are going to vote in favour of amendments Nos 1 and 2 which only bring it up to date, but without for all that taking great pride in it, and in the hope that the next refinancing will finally show some true progress in this duty which we have to the more destitute.

The European Peoples Party will therefore vote in favour of this report, but not without some comments. Here are three, Mr President.

The first concerns the destination of the funds. It is true of course that the International Development Agency is a World Bank body and for this reason its scope is regarded as covering the whole world. But one must look at the proportions. I wonder how we will explain to our ACP partners and especially to the Africans, next month in Brazzaville, that almost half or in any case almost 40 % of the funds have been distributed solely in India and in China. Should we not, on the contrary, see to it that a greater proportion of these funds are allocated to Africa, which according to all the statistics truly includes the greatest number of very poor countries. My group takes this opportunity and the occasion of this debate to make a plea for this.

Second comment: it concerns the methods of collecting the necessary funds. Up to now, the IDA has simply combined the national participations

Deschamps

accorded on a gift basis. We have just shown that these gifts are inadequate. I therefore ask the question: could the IDA not consider looking for funds on the financial markets, for example in the Member States, but this time in the form of loans? This is possible under the IDA statute and has never been used or put into practice. But this is no reason why we should not start.

And now I wish to make a third comment which is rather more political, but which I think is indispensable. Mention has been made of the percentages paid to date to the IDA by each country. I recall: the United States, during the first five years: 42%; Europe: 42%; Japan: 4%; OPEC: 1% and others: 11%.

At present, since the sixth refinancing: United States, alas, 27%; Europe: 45%; Japan: 15% instead of 4%; OPEC: 10% instead of 1% and others; 10% instead of 11%. By others, I do not mean as you might think, Mr President, the USSR and the countries of the East Bloc. Of the latter, only Yugoslavia contributes to the IDA. This is unacceptable. It is even less acceptable that some persons, here in Parliament, without saying a word about this total and unjustifiable indifference on the part of the Communist countries *vis-à-vis* the poorest developing countries, once again on the occasion of the debate on this report, attacks only the United States.

Mr President, it we wish to extend blame — and we do — we must at least do so impartially. During the first five years of the IDA, let me repeat, the United States alone contributed more than 42%. During this time, the USSR paid mercenaries in certain developing countries, sold arms to others, but did not pay one cent to the most impoverished of the developing countries. This must be said before attacking, as some persons have done, the United States of America alone. And this is why, Mr Fuchs, we will not vote in favour of your amendment No 4. We must call unanimously on everybody, and including us Europeans, to make the necessary effort to provide for the needs of the less developed countries. We must demand this unanimously so that we can provide effective aid to the most destitute of the developing countries.

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — (FR) Mr President, a week ago in Washington, at the meeting of the International Development Agency, its principal member, the United States, announced a substantial reduction in its contribution, a reduction which called into question the very existence of this organization.

I think that everybody here knows that the IDA, by the nature and conditions of allocation of its loans, principally promotes agricultural or hydraulic programmes, transport or sanitary programmes, in short, anything which can give relative autonomy to the population in particularly destitute countries.

Last July, at the meeting of the donor countries in Tokyo, the management of the IDA recommended contributions of up to 16 000 million dollars for the 1984-87 refinancing. The donors only favoured the hypothetical figure of 12 000 million dollars, which already considerably reduces the scope of the IDA. However, already in April 1982, the United States announced their new approach. Their payments which, initially, were to cover three years, would now be staggered over four years. Consequently, the contributions available in 1982 were only 2 690 million dollars instead of the 4 100 million dollars planned, thus representing a drop of 35% in the American contribution, which already at that time, meant reducing IDA loans by between 1 500 million and 2 000 million dollars. However, this decrease has been confirmed and the American contribution to the IDA 7 will be only 9 000 million dollars. I believe that it is not necessary to be a great specialist on Third World questions to conjure up the havoc which the Washington decision is going to provoke in the countries of Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, which absorb 60% of IDA loans. Even on the basis of the most optimistic forecast, the World Bank indicates that the per capita income in Africa will probably be lower in 1985 than it was in 1970. This deterioration occurs at a very difficult time for very many of the recipient countries, because it coincides with increasing economic and financial difficulties. Furthermore, there is a risk of its calling into question of the development efforts of the Community or of individual Member States in the framework of bilateral aid.

Mr President, the problem is a serious one and we must consider its full implications. According to the authorities of the World Bank, the issue exceeds the framework of the IDA. In reality, they consider that what is involved is the place which the rich countries, and in particular the United States, intend to give in the future to aid to the less developed countries. On top of this, the general trend is to increasingly encourage private capital flows to the Third World, which means, in other words, to give preference to criteria of sole financial profitability and to reduce the flow of aid, that is to maintaining colonial practices in less ostensible form.

For all these reasons, Mrs Caretoni's report is more topical than ever, and I support her call to the Member States of the Community to respect their commitments, hoping that the payments can be made according to formulae which preserve and guarantee the existence and autonomy of action of the IDA.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, since October last, when the Committee on Development and Cooperation adopted the report on which you are going to vote today, the situation has changed, as several speakers have pointed out. The operations for the sixth

Ortoli

refinancing of the IDA have almost been concluded, as is also the case for the seventh refinancing of the IDA, but unfortunately the result of the negotiations is a figure of 9 000 million dollars instead of 12 000 million dollars which all the other donors were prepared to accept and concerning which the Community made formal representations to the American administration. I myself regret this all the more in that it was in the Council of Ministers for Economic Affairs and Finance that the discussion on the position to be adopted took place and that we agreed on this figure of 12 000 million dollars, which was already a compromise compared to what some of us would have liked.

It is deplorable that we could not reach this figure, and I think you are right to say so. In these circumstances, the consequences mentioned are inevitable, that is that the IDA must reduce its aid to the poorest developing countries, at a time when their needs are greater than ever.

At least we must insist that the operations under the sixth refinancing are concluded before 30 June of this year, and for our part we will make every effort to this end.

To conclude, may I say that we share, for the reasons outlined here by several speakers, the dissatisfaction of the rapporteur and the members who have spoken about the result of the negotiations on the IDA. We do not consider it satisfactory for the poorest countries of the Third World and it also interferes with the capacity for action of the multilateral financing system.

It is regrettable, as Mr Deschamps pointed out, that the East Bloc countries are not becoming involved on the necessary scale in this field in the broadest sense. It is also regrettable that despite the representations made, the United States did not wish to come along with us on a figure which, let me say this once again, was a compromise proposal, and that that country appears to be steering towards gradual disinvolvement from the multilateral financing system.

Finally, I should like to say that a number of suggestions have been made of ideas which could be taken up at Community level to alleviate the disadvantages of the present situation. Suggestions have come from more or less all speakers, among them Mr Fuchs and Mr Deschamps. While I cannot reply immediately on their substance, because the ideas put forward and which I have noted with great interest, must at least be studied, but I am quite prepared to examine them and to discuss them with you at a later date.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

4. Community financing of research and industry

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-1110/83), drawn up by Mr Saby on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on efficiency and choice in Community financing of research and industry.

Mr Saby (S), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in the last few years there has been no financial year in which the Parliament has not drawn the attention of the Community policy-makers to the need for a research policy which is linked to development and industrial applications. During the discharge procedure, i.e. during the assessment of the objectives proposed by the institutions, whether Parliament, Commission or Council, from the point of view of both accounting and policy, the Committee on Budgetary Control has deemed it necessary to present our Assembly with an initiative report which assesses the actual situation, and suggests options for a genuine policy in this field, because of the poor results so far obtained. This is what we have tried to cover in this report.

We believe that in order to emerge from the crisis once for and for all and to solve the problem of unemployment it is necessary to develop new technologies and high added value industries. This would obviously involve considerable effort in the field of scientific research and technology transfer so that the industries linked to job creation can develop in the right direction.

Efforts have recently been made by the European Commission to make Community research policy more consistent. However, much has yet to be accomplished, as can be seen from the fact that less than 3% of the budget is used for this policy. Present achievements reveal what has yet to be done to create a stable political environment and to ensure that projects — useful projects — are implemented fully, that research work is carried out efficiently and that systematic and objective assessment procedures contribute to the achievement of these objectives.

In order to do this it will be necessary to obtain a broad consensus by involving the European Parliament and also, which is even more important, the representatives of industry who may be able to use the results of the basic research. Such a consensus can never be obtained if the issue is submerged beneath a plethora of documents and a multitude of programmes, or if there is too great a time lag between the launching and completion of the programmes. The Commission should therefore follow through the proper establishment of a framework programme to its logical conclusion, so that the subsequent document can contain an exhaustive account of work under way, both direct and indirect actions.

Saby

An energetic attempt should be made to make the dates of the launching and completion of the various programmes and sub-programmes which make up the action programme coincide, so that a proper and well-documented debate can be held on all Community research activities relating to the same topic.

The Commission must be more energetic and systematic than in the past in studying the various research aspects which can most effectively be implemented at Community level, and in stating in each particular proposal the work being carried out by the Member States and the arguments in favour of Community participation. An attempt should be made to include all these efforts in the appropriate budgetary framework so that the costs and repercussions of these programmes can be better assessed.

Latterly proposals have been made by the Commission which accurately sum up the objectives, which are: to give a new boost to cooperation in the field of research, to define European norms and open public markets, to place the common commercial policy at the service of European industrial developments, to encourage links and cooperation between European firms to expand Community intervention and to launch European infrastructure projects to foster exchanges between undertakings.

Finally, the report emphasizes the great importance which we attach to the establishment of a system which can make proper use of small and medium-sized firms. We must avoid making the same mistakes as in agriculture. The challenge of the third industrial revolution must not merely find expression in the disappearance of firms. Today, small and medium-sized firms and industries represent 90% of European industry and employ 60% of the working population. This means that it is absolutely necessary for the results of research and technological transfer to be directly accessible to these small and medium-sized firms and industries in Europe.

There are also urgent measures to be taken. These small and medium-sized firms must be protected as regards industrial property. Administrative procedures must be simplified and organizations and management infrastructures created so as to make it possible for these firms to exploit export potential. It would also be advisable to encourage mobility amongst executives in industry in the various countries of the Community.

Finally, I should like to point out to our Assembly that the Community is now lagging behind in the field of basic computer research and technology transfer. The United States is at present the only country producing super-computers, and Japan will soon have followed suit. Unless the European Economic Community takes part in this race to put super-computers on the world market, which will be a key factor in defining what will happen in the future

in technology and new industries, we shall find ourselves in a position of extreme dependence and it will be more difficult to catch up to regain our independence as time goes on.

We are therefore in effect suggesting that a European research centre for advanced training in information technology be set up as soon as possible to make available to the Community as a whole the thousands of engineers and technicians of the very high standard which we need for the industries of tomorrow.

This proposal complements and is a follow-up to the Esprit programme and is a necessary step forward for the Community.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this report implicitly defines a real policy which today is absolutely necessary to meet the challenge of unemployment and of the third industrial revolution. I hope that it will be adopted unanimously and believe that Europe's interests depend upon it.

Mrs Nikolaou (S). — (GR) Mr President, the European Parliament, which represents the European taxpayer, has an obligation to control Community resources and to ensure that the best use is made of them in all fields. From this viewpoint Community policy in the field of research and industry has two dimensions.

Firstly, we must control of the effectiveness of the programmes which have been financed up to now and secondly, we must exploit this policy both within the overall framework of the Community policies and as regards the basic options concerning concrete areas of research.

My colleague, Mr Saby, who in this field combines the properties of politician and expert, has presented us today with a report which tackles the problem in all its dimensions and complexity. This is an area of vital importance. Undoubtedly, research, and in particular industrial research, should be focal point of Community policy in the future. Today this policy is at a rudimentary stage, because public financial backing is insignificant. Undoubtedly Europe today lags behind in the third industrial revolution. However, this technological lag is not due to a lack of potential but to a lack of coordination, because research in particular is the sector of activity par excellence which is characterized by large economies of scale — a sector in which the people of Europe could cooperate decisively.

Quite rightly my colleague Mr Saby has not confined himself to discussing the past with all its shortcomings and dissipation of activities, but focuses his attention on the guidelines for a common policy in the future. The challenge of the times means that the emphasis must be on areas of high technology. However, in the few minutes left to me, I would like to stress that the accelerated technological development of Community industry should not involve a

Nikolaou

great social cost and should not magnify regional and national imbalances. Of course we recognize the dilemma which exists in this connection. However, wherever the political will is present, a solution can also be found. Firstly there is a need to make full use of scientific manpower in all the Member States by ensuring a better distribution of the research infrastructure and by encouraging the exchange of scientists.

Secondly, special measures should be taken to raise the technological level of the Member States whose industrial structures have a traditional character and thirdly, effective mechanisms must be created to ensure the dissemination of technology within the Community.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, it is with some regret that I feel it necessary to intervene. I take it that Mr Saby is speaking and reporting for the Committee on Budgetary Control and not for the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, of which I am honoured to be member. I am, frankly, not unduly sensitive to committee prerogatives, but the Saby report is almost all a report on the Community's research policy such as the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology might well have produced — in fact, has produced, because it is in that committee's competence. I do not disagree with it; I doubt whether any member of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology would disagree with it; but it is mostly, repeatedly, mentioning matters of which we are quite fully aware, as is the Commission.

So it seems that the normal procedures and courtesies were not observed by the Committee on Budgetary Control when preparing this report. An opinion was not even requested from the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology. Yesterday, when I talked to the chairman of the committee about it, she was not even aware of this report's relevance to our work.

My greatest regret is for a missed opportunity. The Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, perhaps the Commission and a lot of other experts in the research field would have been very grateful for a serious study of how, in budgetary control terms, one can assess the effectiveness of our Community research expenditure. This is not easily measured in strict financial terms of cost and benefit and yet we badly need some objective criteria. Fundamental and pre-competitive research has the inherent risk of not being commercially successful, and yet it may still be quite valid to explore such possibilities.

Unfortunately, this important aspect is not clarified; in fact, it is barely confronted. I suggest to the rapporteur that he goes back to his committee and answers the question of how to carry out the recommendation contained in his paragraph 15:

Recommends that Parliament's Committee on Budgetary Control takes care to ensure in the

discharge procedures for the coming budgetary years that the budget funds released are utilized with the optimum degree of efficiency.

That is where he should have started, not finished.

Mr Aigner (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, both of our committees, Sir, are renowned for working well together and complementing each other. I have always welcomed that, and you should not forget that our rapporteur is also a member of your committee and, as he has told me, these problems have also been discussed in your committee. But in our committee and this report, which is an initiative report, we started from the premise that a verdict must be given on the efficiency of our policies by means of Parliamentary control. Parliamentary control is not, indeed, merely an audit, it is political control. Therefore I — and I may say this too on behalf of my group — am very grateful to the rapporteur who, with his knowledge as an expert in this field has taken this initiative and raised the problems involved.

On behalf of my group, I should like to say a few words on some of the key points raised in the motion. What we need is more coherence in research policies. We need a firmer, broader consensus both from Parliament and from representatives of industry. Here the Commission, as a clearing house, is in a favourable position to draw up Community policies in cooperation with industry.

We also need greater clarity, evaluation of efficiency, coordination and the integration of joint research programmes. But there are also all matters where political control plays a part and therefore we should not set ourselves up in competition with one another but should pool our knowledge and our work.

What we need, above all, is a stricter evaluation of the social and economic effects of the various programmes. We need to promote cooperation between European firms and a joint European infrastructure project.

Anyone reading this report will find a wealth of suggestions. I hope, Mr Commissioner, that we can discuss this problem in greater depth in the future, in order to use the few appropriations at our disposal to encourage cooperation and the exchange of ideas. Inventions and innovations are possible when dialogues reach across boundaries. The Commission can help to bring this about, and this too was one of the concerns of the rapporteur and your committee.

Mrs Theobald-Paoli (S). — (FR) Mr President, my dear colleagues, I note that the author of the report under consideration is sensible and has kept to the point, since he shares my views in every respect. I recognized in his text the very terms of the resolution which, as a member of the Committee on Energy and

Theobald-Paoli

Research, I tabled in March 1982, asking for an increased budget appropriation for Community research.

I was not as successful as I had hoped but we nonetheless made some progress. This excellent report also contains the gist of my two propositions concerning the creation of a European programme for industry, this being Parliament's answer to the memorandum submitted to the Council by the French Government. Without a European industrial and research programme, the Ten cannot hope to jump on the TGV — train à grande vitesse (high-speed train), for the benefit of the interpreters — of the industrial revolution, which has already set off of full tilt on the American and Japanese tracks. Mr Linkohr, a member of the Committee for Energy and Research, has already paid me to complement of including in his first-class report some suggestions which — Mr Purvis please note — I made, as a member of the same committee, with a view to obtaining improved appropriations for science and using these to the best possible effect.

All that remains is to hope that the brilliant memoranda, first-class reports and carefully thought-out resolutions will not remain in the realms of lofty thoughts but will be translated into concrete action.

Europe must stop wasting its grey matter, its money and its time in this heartbreaking fashion, while others are using their time profitably and will overtake us once and for all if we do not ask promptly.

However, there is a glimmer of hope already, because we have Esprit, Esprit, our current No 1 project, an excellent venture by the Commission in a key strategic sector: information technologies and their industrial applications.

I should like to add just one thing to what the rapporteur's excellent piece on the small- and medium-sized businesses and the small- and medium-sized industries, and that is that they also create jobs.

So, let us offer the young people of Europe something concrete, constructive and progressive, and they will in turn help us to build the institutions of Europe.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, Mr Saby's initiative report, for which I most sincerely thank him, is different from the usual run of reports presented by the Committee on Budgetary Control in that in analysing the management of research appropriations it also subjects the Community's research policy as a whole to critical analysis. All industrial countries have to carry out such an analysis periodically, and it should cover all aspects of budgetary control as well as of energy and scientific policy and of economic policy, which is also involved.

In this report, the Commission finds important points of view and numerous ideas for the Community's research strategy, and it is pleased to note that the

report, in principle, approves of the research strategy that has been followed up to now. After considering the matter thoroughly, the Commission, as is well known, has introduced important innovations in this field, and they must be viewed as a whole. Among them are the framework programme, the summary of action programmes in the field of research, and the programme for research evaluation, together with notification of the use of research results. The framework programme for the scientific and technical activities of the Commission is an instrument which is intended to guarantee a consistent Community strategy in the field of research and development in the coming years. It indicates overall objectives and lays down priorities, scientific and technical aims and the selection criteria for the corresponding Community actions.

The summary of action programmes in the field of research complements the framework programme and forms an essential part of its operation. In each action programme, the research activities for any particular research area will be summarized, whereas in the past these activities were comparatively independent of one another.

Lastly, the action plan for research evaluation should make it possible to gather together information for the implementation and adaptation of programmes that have already been approved and for the introduction of new programmes, and the cycle will be completed with the use of the research results, i.e. they will be transmitted to the user.

Amongst the many ideas which need to be considered are those which concern economic policy. I should, therefore, like to support in particular the plea for realism which is characteristic of this report, realism which is called for especially when it comes to product-orientated research. And product-orientated research is always the kind which right from the start is concerned with the problem which is expressed in English as: who picks the winner? Who in the end chooses the product which will be successful on the market? Where can and must selection process of the market be replaced by official, autonomous, public actions? Connected with that is the question as to where the boundary lies between direct and indirect research promotion a boundary which must be of particular interest to those in this Parliament who observe small and medium-sized undertakings and craft trades with research policies in mind and wish to promote them.

Mr Saby's report underlines the importance of the Community's scientific and technical activities, especially in the current crisis situation, and quite rightly emphasizes the need to improve the competitiveness of industry by R & D projects. Everyone is trying to use the available budgetary appropriations as efficiently as possible. We share this aim. As far as

Narjes

later developments are concerned, I should like at this point to refer to an aspect of Japanese competition which is perhaps not clearly understood in Europe. I mean the intense competition which invariably exists in Japan and which affects all those involved as soon as the product-orientated basic research is concluded. From that point on, there is intense competition in Japan, and we in Europe should be careful not to let cooperation in the field of research and applied research extend beyond the circle of those engaged in research on the same topics and turn them into a cartel of producers. That would be a sure way of preventing the development of exactly that ability to complete for which we are striving.

The Commission will examine carefully all proposals. I should like to point out that a new overall R & D strategy, seen as a long-term project, means that we shall continually update our existing strategy in the light of this report. We are looking forward to receiving the contributions of the other committees in this Parliament.

IN THE CHAIR : MR NIKOLAOU*Vice-President*

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, this is an own-initiative report initiated by the Committee on Budgetary Control. It is entitled 'On efficiency and choice in Community financing of research and industry'. Could I have your ruling under Rule 94 (3)? This rule reads :

Should two or more committees be competent to deal with a question, one committee shall be named as the committee responsible and the others as committees asked for opinions.

Is this title of a report not of some relevance to the committee that is expressly entitled the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology? I should like to have your opinion and your ruling on this point.

Mr Aigner (PPE), chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control. — (DE) Cooperation with the competent committee has so far been excellent. There were no difficulties at all. Now, for the first time, there is some jealousy creeping in and I cannot understand it. Adopt the suggestions of the rapporteur and consider them further in your committee if you have a different opinion on a point. I can point out, moreover, that every own initiative report has to be authorized by the Bureau and that the proper competence has been gone into. Control is far more than just budgetary control. Parliamentary control includes the consideration of political efficiency as well, and that means looking at the effect of the measures to be used.

President. — Thank you for your support, Mr Aigner. Mr Purvis, the agenda was drawn up by the Bureau. What you are doing now you should have done on Monday when we drew up the agenda.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, it has nothing to do with the agenda. I am not questioning the agenda, and I do take exception to Mr Aigner's insults to me. We have consistently tried to cooperate, but we are suddenly landed with a report which we in the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology had never even heard of and which deals very fully with all the policies and competencies of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology. Despite all our willingness to cooperate in every conceivable way with the Committee on Budgetary Control, I do find it surprising that no opinion was ever requested. It was never even referred to us, we never even knew it was happening until this week. It is nothing to do with the agenda, Mr President. It is just a question of whether it would not have been better for us, when producing a report dealing with the Community's research policy, to have had some input from the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology. It seems incredible that it has none.

President. — That is a matter for the Bureau, Mr Purvis. I have already stressed that.

Mr Saby (S), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, I am really surprised at the reaction from Mr Purvis. I deny the truth of what he has just said. In the discharge procedure for 1981 which went through Parliament Mr Purvis, along with everyone else, voted in favour of the own initiative report on the impact and effectiveness of industrial and research policy in Europe. Now he tells us that he has just found out about it. The report was finished two and a half months ago. I personally contacted representatives of the *ad hoc* committee and discussed these problems with them. I would humbly put it to Mr Purvis that in my report I do not encroach upon the prerogatives of the Committee on Energy and Research since what I have done is to bring together the result of these essential reports and my only initiative, which is the job of the Committee on Budgetary Control, is to take stock of the use of Community funds and thereby draw the political lessons which are now available to all the parliamentary committees.

President. — Thank you, Mr Saby. I note that there is agreement in the Chamber. The only thing I can do, Mr Purvis, is to inform the Bureau and the enlarged Bureau of your concern.

Mr Aigner (PPE), chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control. — (DE) During the discussion on discharge we wrote to all the relevant committees so

Aigner

that they could help us with their expertise and a rapporteur of their own and so that they could make their knowledge available to us. I do not know why we are being criticized now. Everything is done on the part of the Committee on Budgetary Control to incorporate the other committees fully into our work. I hope this will be seen really as a sign of good intentions and not as an attempt to poach on other people's preserves.

5. *European Charter on the Rights of Patients*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-970/83), drawn up by Mrs Pruvot on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the European Charter on the Rights of Patients.

Mrs Pruvot (L), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, my dear colleagues, the draft resolution which has been drawn up by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection underlines the main points which the European Charter on the Rights of Patients would encompass. The implementation of this Charter within the Community should provide a basis for national legislation on the rights and duties of the individual with regard to illness and its treatment.

The first right of every patient is to receive treatment that is appropriate to the nature of his illness, assuming of course that the state of the art permits. Moreover, as far as possible, treatment must be available at the right time, in the right place and in the right form.

On the subject of time, treatment may be needed urgently, depending on the condition of the patient. Patients whose condition is such that they need immediate attention or urgent treatment must be guaranteed some priority of treatment. This priority may be vital to the survival of the patient and be an added guarantee of the effectiveness of the treatment.

On the subject of place, patients should also be entitled to be treated wherever the know-how and equipment are such as to afford added guarantees as to the therapeutic value of the treatment.

Already, there are administrative provisions to ensure that a person who is injured or taken ill in a country other than his own may receive treatment in that country, under the health insurance scheme to which he belongs in his own Member State. This right could be extended so that patients would be free to choose where to receive treatment.

The availability of equipment and other facilities is usually dictated by economic considerations. This should not however prevent patients from obtaining the most up-to-date form of treatment.

Treatment that is appropriate to the illness, under the conditions which I have just outlined, is not the only prerequisite for a satisfactory recovery or an effective cure. Information about the gravity and extent of his illness, and also about the methods of treating it, is the patient's personal right. He may, for family, business, philosophical or religious reasons, wish to make decisions concerning the type of treatment he will opt for in full knowledge of the facts. In this respect, each patient should be treated as an individual and it is the responsibility of his doctor to decide whether and to what extent his patient is psychologically equipped to face the truth, for instance in the case of incurable diseases.

The right to information about treatment presupposes the right to be informed in clear and precise terms about the very real risks involved in certain forms of treatment. The patient's conscious choice of the treatment he will undergo should not be confined to the acceptance of the therapeutic effects which it will have on his illness. He should also be put in a position to weigh up both the improvements which he can expect in his conditions and the risks inherent in the treatment: side-effects, restrictions on physical activity, decline in intellectual powers, etc.

Another of the patient's personal rights is to confidentiality and there should not normally be any exception to this rule. Patients must not of course be denied access to confidential information concerning their own medical conditions and they should be free to examine their own medical records. In certain exceptional circumstances or where the interests of the public so warrant, this principle could be relaxed to permit a total or partial waiver of the principle of medical confidentiality. However, there would have to be specific limits to this, to ensure that this relaxation was not used as a pretext for circumventing the rule or making exceptions to it. Exceptional circumstances include the need to avoid or eliminate epidemics or to protect people from contamination. These cases would have to be considered carefully and in a restrictive sense. The right to medical confidentiality and the right to accept or decline treatment are in themselves guarantees of respect for the personal integrity of the patient.

These guarantees should be even more all-embracing and should be extended to all the moral and emotional aspects of the patient's personality such as his private life and his religious and philosophical beliefs.

The problems associated with the rights of sick children and the mentally ill have not been discussed in this context. Maternity cases have also been excluded from the terms of this resolution. Children and the mentally ill have been excluded because they entail particular problems which should be covered by a special charter.

Pruvot

This subject brings us to the question of ability to consent and powers of judgement.

Prolonged and persistent treatment does not always allow patients to die as they would wish. Every patient should be permitted to express his wishes on the philosophical question of dignity and the consideration of his own dignity, always supposing, of course, that the patient is still fully conscious and can express his preferences in the face of death.

Another aspect of patients' rights concerns the medical or hospital environment. Humane medicine is not merely divorced from financial considerations and based on mutual respect and confidence; it also entails freedom to choose one's practitioner or the place of treatment treated. This also implies freedom to change one's doctor.

In this connection, it should be mentioned that some countries, such as Denmark, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom require all subjects to be registered with a doctor, even if they are not ill, and so restrict freedom of choice, insofar as the formalities involved in changing doctors take some time.

There should also be a procedure for establishing the extent to which a patient has received the best possible care, with a view to protecting his interests, having regard to the state of the art and the rules of medical practice. This procedure would not under any circumstances prevent individuals from taking legal action within the prescribed period of time. Legal action requires careful consideration and warrants a few remarks.

It has to be admitted that doctors can make mistakes. Without being at all negligent, a doctor may make a mistake in the diagnosis of a complaint, in the choice of treatment or in the administration of the treatment, and this mistake may prove fatal. The patient must have the right to obtain redress — in the form of damages — and he must be given the opportunity of exercising this right. The medical profession cannot be an exception to this rule — I repeat — but we must of course prevent abuse. In the United States there is a procedure called malpractice, under which a patient is entitled to sue a doctor if he is dissatisfied with his treatment. Regrettably this procedure, although based on an essential principle, is sometimes grossly abused. We have to ensure that the right to take legal action does not lead to a proliferation of legal proceedings initiated solely with the object of attacking the medical profession or bringing it into disrepute. The plaintiffs would not derive any objective or positive benefit from them.

Similarly, the situation of a patient in hospital also has to be given careful consideration. His rights also have to be protected when he is hospitalized in the course of an illness.

I will conclude, Mr President, with the statement that the relationship between doctor and patient cannot be

governed by red tape. This relationship is far too delicate to be subjected to inflexible regulations. The patient is entitled to humane medicine which is appropriate to his own individual case.

We accordingly urge that the Community Charter on the Rights of Patients be implemented along these lines and with due regard for situations which are in themselves distressing: illness, hospitalization, physical weakness and low morale.

Naturally, no legislation should influence or put pressure on a doctor's professional conscience.

Mrs Van den Heuvel (S), *draftsman of the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee*. — (NL) Mr President, the subject under discussion today is extremely important, and as draftsman of an opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee I would like to extend my thanks to the person responsible for initiating this debate, Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, and the rapporteur, Mrs Pruvot, whose report provided a useful introduction to this debate.

I feel we should be grateful to the many patients' associations whose work has made not only patients but also doctors and nurses aware of the need to strengthen patients' rights, especially at a time when methods of treatment are becoming increasingly sophisticated.

It comes as no surprise that scientists are the main supporters of the associations' work, since they have first-hand experience of the problems involved. I need only mention organ transplants and the techniques used to prolong life, an issue which raises the ethical question as to what extent a life sustained artificially can be humanly worthwhile.

Patients have begun to ask themselves how far they should continue to accept decisions which doctors take over their heads or even without consulting them. They have been asking for information on their own medical files and have been wanting to take their own decisions on treatment and on the termination of treatment. At the same time there has arisen a need to formulate patients' rights more satisfactorily.

The raises a number of interesting legal problems. For example, when does a patient acquire his rights? The answer is quite simply — at birth. The next question is obviously, when to these rights no longer apply? Again, the answer is simple — at death. But then there are clearly a number of special situations. Some rights, in fact, are always valid, for example a patient's right to confidentiality with regard to his own situation and his right to decide whether his organs are to be removed after he dies. A patient's rights are by definition not transferable, in other words children also have rights. It is therefore unacceptable for parents to decide on their children's treatment on the basis, for example, of their own personal convictions. Then

Van den Heuvel

there is the question of what happens when patients are so ill that they cannot be consulted. In such cases decisions must be based on the patient's 'presumed consent'. In most cases the patient's family know what decision the patient would have made if it had been possible to consult him.

Anyone discussing patients' rights will be confronted with the attitude that to define these rights is to intrude into the confidential relationship which should exist between doctor and patient, or with the view that only the doctor is in a position to weigh up the pro and cons of a situation. Mr President, the Legal Affairs Committee considers this view to be unfounded. All too often doctors cannot tell what is best for their patients. They are after all only human, and doctors who have busy practices and who see scores of patients pass through their surgeries every day cannot always accurately assess what is right for each patient. They may make the right medical decisions in most cases, but it is clearly not always possible to make the right decision from the moral or psychological point of view.

As far as the formal definition of patients' rights is concerned, one might ask why this should raise more objections than, for example, the relations between parents and children, which are of a much more private nature. And yet, we all treat the definition of mutual rights and obligations as the most natural thing in the world. Of course, the rights of patients cannot be considered absolute. There may be cases where doctors decide, on the basis of their consciences, that to tell the whole truth would be harmful to their patients. Doctors must continue to be allowed to decide on this. If the patient had the right to refer to an independent medical authority, this might prevent the doctor from claiming the need to withhold information, but it could also protect him from unreasonable complaints.

Once again, it is good that this matter is now being dealt with at Community level. A legal instrument in the form of a charter of patients' rights as called for in the motion for a resolution could be a further development of the process which the Council of Europe initiated by accepting the Voogd report and is fully in line with earlier EEC efforts to establish a draft charter for hospital patients, for example the EEC Hospital Committee. I have tabled an amendment in connection with this as rapporteur for the Legal Affairs Committee.

I hope, Mr President — and here I can wind up — that the Commission will work out a proposal for a charter in the near future and thus provide greater protection for patients so that they can really exercise their rights.

Mrs Krouwel-Vlam (S). — (NL) Mr President, the growing number of patients' associations, the numerous action groups and the activities of the consumer organizations in a number of Member

States have prompted the Socialist Group to take action to give legal status to the relationship between patients and medical staff.

A well informed patient is less helpless than a poorly informed one, and appropriate legislation could prove very useful in establishing relationships between patients and doctors which are based on equality. There has been an enormous increase in red tape. Rights are being claimed more and more, while the individual is respected less and less. Such phenomena, Mr President, are apparent throughout society, as well as in the field of health care. Patients have to make appointments, are received by strangers, they must wait for their operations and are sent from one doctor to another by an impersonal system of cards. When they are finally given a hospital bed, they receive little or no information and in many cases are visited by a different doctor each day of the week. This obviously makes a mockery of the idea of confidentiality in relations between doctors and patients.

The patient's position is still comparatively weak. There is often no freedom of choice as regards the type of treatment or hospital, and patients cannot address their complaints concerning treatment or damage sustained to independent parties. They have little faith in the boards which examine complaints, since their members are the colleagues of those against whom the complaint is lodged. If complaints are to be assessed objectively, such boards must consist entirely of independent experts or the medical group in question and the patient's representative must be equally represented. There must also be a special address to which complaints can be sent, and the complaints procedure should be simple, reasonably rapid and cost little or nothing.

Patients have become more emancipated and have been increasing their influence by forming organizations and action groups to express their dissatisfaction with the present state of affairs. They object to unbridled medical power and want more influence in health care. This movement has gone from strength to strength in recent years. Patients are trying to stand up for themselves; they are aware that they have their own rights and ask for their own limited expertise to be considered along with that of their doctors. An attempt must be made to reduce the gap between patients and medical staff and to transform the patient's dependent position into one of relative independence, coupled with effective legal protection. That is why it is so desirable to work out a clear definition of patients' rights and obligations.

We are wholeheartedly in favour of Mrs. Pruvot's report, since its objectives are similar to our own. We are also in complete agreement with the large number of amendments supplementing and improving the existing text. We expect the Commission to issue proposals in the near future for a charter benefiting patients in Europe.

Mr Ghergo (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the motions presented by Mrs Krouwel-Vlam and others, and by Mrs Squarcialupi on the drawing up of a European Charter on the Rights of Patients have been fired by the noble and praiseworthy intention of ensuring that people who normally enjoy rights connected with their own human individuality which are universally recognized and fostered, have the same rights in all possible situations in life, even when they are ill and find themselves in a particularly dependent situation from both the physical and psychological point of view. It is the uniqueness of this situation which makes it necessary for these rights to be specifically defined, since they are too often ignored, the means (therapy) being often given priority over the end (the welfare of the individual).

The proposals put forward by the rapporteur mainly concern the relationship between doctor and patient and can only meet with our approval. The only possible doubt that could be raised would be their practical implications. Since the relationship between doctor and patient is based on trust than any other, it lends itself to specific rules and behaviour.

I believe that the greatest progress in this field was made by Hippocrates when he laid down rules for the ethics of the medical profession. If too many conditions are imposed, this may lead to a lessening of the doctor's sense of responsibility in that he could feel professionally conditioned by the more or less well-founded fear that he is contravening some sort of measure of guarantee. Here I should like to express my most sincere appreciation for the realistic and balanced tone of Mrs Pruvot's report. My opinion is that we should perhaps emphasize the objective elements of this report, which are less connected with individual sensitivity, intuition and personal value judgements. These could include the right to prompt therapy, which can affect the effectiveness of the therapy itself. With the increase in the State welfare and the increasing bureaucratization of the bodies called upon to provide the services, it is taking longer to carry out analyses, checkups, and even admissions into hospital. This is particularly the case where there are State health services: it is necessary to book months in advance even for a simple clinical analysis.

During the last few weeks in Italy, the courts have taken steps in this field and have ruled that requests for analyses must be met by the State health authorities within three days. Otherwise the citizen must be directed to a private clinic with which the State authority has an arrangement and which can meet the requirement within the amount of time specified. This represents an act of condemnation of the Italian State service.

Nevertheless I believe that, apart from the formal definition of specific rights, the important thing is that

the individual should be respected as such, and this basically depends on the attitude of society at a political and organizational level where such respect should be expressed in real terms.

The 'Charter' would seem to provide an opportunity for a possible and desirable stimulus for the moral and civil growth of society, and my group believes that it should meet with Parliament's approval in the form set out by the rapporteur, Mrs Pruvot, but with the addition of the amendment which I have presented in connection with the promptness with which the health service should offer its services.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I should like to devote the time allocated to me to illustrate the contents of the amendments which we have presented for Mrs Pruvot's excellent report on the Charter on the Rights of Patients.

I believe that every effort should be made to improve the relations between on the one hand the patients who are people who, by definition, find themselves in a particularly delicate situation, and on the other the health operators — whether nurses or doctors — and the hospitals themselves, i.e. these enormous structures which take in those needing care and which are sometimes rather forbidding in themselves, thus adding to the fears which the patient entertains in connection with his own illness. I believe that, with due respect for the independence and dignity of every professional working in this sector, every effort should be made to make these relationships as human as possible, so that the patient can be helped to overcome his illness on a psychological as well as a physical level.

Another amendment concerns a point which is certainly very delicate and difficult, that of the representativeness of autonomous associations and organizations which operate, for example, in hospitals. In Italy, we have the 'patients' tribunal'. These organizations should be able to represent the patients, because a sick person is naturally weak, and sometimes in a financially weak situation too, since he is not being able to work or works less and therefore has a reduced salary or income. We call for proper representation for the patient, or rather for these organizations to be able to represent the patient even where decision-making is concerned, so that he is afforded better protection.

The last amendment concerns women giving birth. Such women are not sick. Their situation in the hospital is very different, and it is for this reason that I believe it desirable for there to be a 'charter for expectant mothers' which would cover the method of childbirth chosen, the importance of, for example, the presence of the husband or other people who are close to her, and the significance of feeding the baby or of the mother being able to keep the baby beside her. I therefore think that the case of the mother giving birth is

Squarcialupi

different from that of all the other sick people in the hospital, because the mother is not sick : she is giving birth, and therefore has the right to be treated differently by the hospital.

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — Mr President, may I congratulate Mrs Pruvot. I will not go over all the things she said, with which I fully agree. I am only rising because I have one amendment which I understand is acceptable to Mrs Pruvot if I delete the reference to maternity services. My amendment introduces the notion of distance and access to hospitals. I think there should be a right to access to hospitals within a reasonable travelling distance. If you find yourself in an emergency or an accident 80 kilometres from a hospital by moorway, that is one thing. But if you are 80 kilometres or more away and the road is a single-track one, in winter icy or impassable because of snow, in summer chock-a-block with caravans — which admittedly we are very pleased to see for the tourist trade — then there is a problem. As Mrs. Squarcialupi said, it is a serious problem. There should be a charter for mothers — driving 80 kilometres down Loch Lomond in labour is no joke, and eventually there will be a tragedy if it continues.

At any rate, there must be provision for emergencies and casualties. It should be recognized that citizens of this Community are entitled to get to hospital somehow or other — perhaps by helicopter — or that hospitals should be within reasonable travelling distance.

Mr Eisma (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, I shall confine myself to just one section of Mrs Pruvot's report that relating to each person's right to decide on his or her own life, by which I mean the right to end that life or to have it terminated if the person so wishes.

This is a highly controversial issue, but that is no reason to avoid discussing it. Indeed, public debate on this question has become very intense, the legal aspects are being considered and legislation is sure to follow.

In the motion for a resolution before us the question of the termination of life is referred to twice : the first mention comes in paragraph 3 (c), which says that patients are entitled to refuse the treatment proposed. In other words, patients may choose to ask for vital treatment to be stopped, which would mean that they would die. This is passive euthanasia. Paragraph 3 (j) then refers to the 'right to a dignified death'. The wording here is very vague, and the explanatory statement does not clarify the underlying aim.

Over the past few decades doctor have been able to prolong life for the first time in human history. The old Hippocratic injunction that doctors should strive to preserve life at all costs can now no longer be obeyed without creating situations in which the patient is made to endure the most appalling suffering.

However, the Member States' legislation has for the past 100 years prohibited any medical involvement in voluntary euthanasia. Euthanasia is in fact practised in thousands of cases each year, but mostly in secret. The doctor then pronounces that death occurred 'naturally'. We object to this practice since we feel that it is open to all sorts of abuses.

That is our reason for tabling amendment No 5, according to which the following would be added to the reference to the 'right to a dignified death' in paragraph 3 (j) : 'including the termination of life at the patient's express request and subject to stringent conditions'. This is active euthanasia.

By 'stringent conditions' we mean firstly that the patient must have carefully considered his decision to have his life terminated, secondly, that his decision must result from prolonged and unbearable suffering and, thirdly, that the doctor must perform the act with the utmost care.

Mr President, the opinion polls suggest that the right to voluntary euthanasia is being recognized by more and more people. We believe that if the legislation were brought up to date, this would prevent a great deal of very severe suffering among patients and nagging uncertainty among doctors provided there were adequate guarantees that euthanasia would be carried out with care and that there were no possibility of abuses. We therefore urge Parliament to provide a stimulus towards this by accepting amendment No 5.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, the ideal doctor as he is seen in picture books, who knows his patient, who knows all his medical history, who has as clear a picture as possible of his illness and tries to treat this illness by the best possible means, is unfortunately not always to be found in real life in the Communities today. Mrs Krouwel-Vlam has described to us very convincingly what the situation is really like in many of our overburdened hospitals. There fore I am unable to agree with Mr Ghergo, who believes that the relationship of trust between doctor and patient could suffer if the patient were granted the right to know everything about his illness. I believe that that is an absolutely fundamental human right.

The active help of the patient, which is the most important prerequisite for any healing process and for any effective preventive measures, depends on the patient's knowing all about himself or, as the case may be preferring not to. I am convinced of that, for I know that there are some people who do not want to know too precisely what their state of health is ; they themselves choose not to know. However, one cannot out of consideration for these people, deny the basic right of the individual to know what his position is, what the chances of his recovery are, and how he can help the healing process by his own active intervention.

Seibel-Emmerling

It is the right of the patient to know about therapy, the extent of the threat to him and any chance of help. However, one may wonder why we have to grant this right at European Community level.

Anybody who knows well what the situation is like in our hospitals knows that illness does not stop at frontiers and that the lives of Community citizens are so interwoven that many patients in our hospitals come from another Community country. These people must have the same opportunities and the same rights in all Community countries, if the new relationship of trust which we believe to be indispensable between patient and doctor is to be built up.

An important area seems to me to be the situation of those in hospital who cannot understand the language of the country, who often cannot articulate their distress and who are faced with methods of treatment which they are unable to understand because they cannot cope with the language or lack experience of such things, since they may be quite different in their own countries. I believe that we must help these patients and, above all, the many children and young people who do not know the language spoken in the hospital.

It also seems to us to be important that the patient should have available not only — as is stated in the report — the best possible equipment but also that he is safeguarded from having to help pay off the excessive amounts of equipment in many medical practices today. The main concern is the recovery of the patient, and not any economic consideration.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, in 1979 my predecessor, Commissioner Vredeling, in an answer to a written question by Mr Van Aerssen was sympathetic to the objectives of a charter on the rights of patients, and in general I should like to tell the House that I share those feelings. Since 1979 the Commission services have initiated and undertaken a study to prepare a report on the topic of confidentiality, which, as I am sure all those who have taken part in this debate will realize, is central to the issue. This report which will shortly be published addresses the question of the conflict between patients' rights, the needs of research and the protection of public health. Following this the Commission has initiated a further project on ethical issues in preventive medicine, and a report will be available for discussion by the end of 1984.

It is hoped that both of these documents will serve to provide guidelines for practice and help to resolve some of the problems concerning patients' rights. During these last few years the Commission has maintained and further developed a close working relationship with the World Health Organization, the Council

of Europe and the Hospital Committee of the European Community. We have carefully followed all of the discussions in those bodies on this particular matter.

It has to be said that there are serious problems. If a list of the rights of patients is drawn up, for example, there is the danger that it is either too general and therefore become irrelevant or that it goes too far into detail, thereby creating difficulties which arise from national traditions or local traditions absolutely legitimate in themselves in the context of the cultural diversities within the Community.

The history of the philosophy of human rights is not so much a history of the concepts attached to those rights as the history of encroachments upon them. I am sure it is correct, therefore, to seek safeguards, but I think that we have to remain aware of the different systems of healthcare that exist in the Community and how the suggested provisions might create varying problems.

Having said that, however, may I also say that I recognize the strength of feeling that has been expressed by Parliament in the course of this debate. Not all the contributions have been along similar lines, and I am sure those who have listened to the debate will be the first to accept that some of the suggestion would indeed be extremely controversial. Nevertheless, in response to this resolution and the views expressed by Parliament, and on the basis of our work so far, I intend that the Commission services should now prepare a reflection paper on this whole issue for discussion within the Commission and with Member States with a view, eventually, to presenting a communication to the Council on this important matter.

Since we intend, as I say, to prepare a reflection paper — if I can use a fairly neutral phrase to describe it at this stage — obviously it would be important to us that Parliament should express its view free and untrammelled. Therefore, so far as the amendments to this particular report and motion for a resolution are concerned, the Commission at this stage would prefer to express no opinion whatsoever on any of those amendments, so that we in our preparations can be absolutely clear about what it is precisely that Parliament wishes us to do.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

6. Combating of acid rain

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-1168/83), drawn up by Muntingh on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the combating of acid rain.

Mr Muntingh (S), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, when dealing with the Pisani memorandum and Parliament's opinion on Lomé III, we discussed the situation in the developing countries, in particular the problem of deforestation in those countries, in which 150 000 km² of forest is disappearing every year. This results in soil erosion, the formation of deserts, the destruction of plant and animal life, which in turn leads to increased poverty, underdevelopment, hunger and misery. And it must be plainly stated here that Western and Japanese timber firms are responsible for a great deal of the damage — in other words, we are in the process of stripping the developing countries of their forests.

But deforestation is not confined to the developing countries; the industrialized countries are also being affected on a large scale. The cause is acid rain, a nasty and insidious form of pollution which attacks trees through their leaves and roots. It is very widespread in the industrialized world, not only here in Europe but elsewhere, like the United States, Canada, Mexico, Japan, China, Singapore — in fact, wherever there is industry and woodland, the woods are destroyed by acid rain. The problem is particularly severe, however, here in Europe. A third of the woods in Germany have been affected, and in my own country, the Netherlands, at least 95% or just about all of the conifers have been affected, and the figure for the deciduous trees is probably the same.

In other words, we in this age are trying very hard to rid our earth of its woods, to deprive it of its lungs, with all the dire consequences this could have.

Acid rain attacks not only trees but also water, especially in lakes and fens, as well as groundwater and the soil. The message is gradually sinking in that in Sweden, for example, 18 000 lakes have been affected, 4 000 of which are already biologically dead. It is already common knowledge that in south Norway there is an area of 13 000 km² where fish have been completely wiped out. And the rain damages not only water and trees, not only our natural environment, but also the non-living environment including paint, varnish, construction materials, concrete, houses, buildings — nothing is safe from acid rain. These are ordinary, everyday things, but the rain also attacks important things like works of art, for example, old books, paintings, sculptures and other artifacts — everything is destroyed.

Mr President, it is clear that we are polluting the environment to an appalling degree and that we have a major problem on our hands. If this were unavoidable for our survival, there would be some justification; but this is not the case, because the ways of preventing acid rain are known. We could reduce pollution from our factories and electric power stations by 90% — the methods are known and are practised in the United States and Japan; we just don't practise them

here. We know how to prevent pollution from motor vehicles, we know that we can reduce this pollution by 90% by using lead-free petrol and catalysts; but we just don't use this knowledge. We know that the ammonia problem can be solved, for example, by using biogas installations; we just don't do it. We also know how to reduce air pollution by the recovery of waste heat, by using heat pumps, energy conservation and certain types of fuel, we just don't do it or don't do it enough!

Although, Mr President, a great deal has been completely lost, we can still try and save as much as possible. The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection has tabled a number of proposals with this aim in mind. It has proposed that, rather than throw in the sponge, we should direct all our energy into producing a *large-scale* programme to combat air pollution, in which the Commission would have to take the lead. One of its objectives would be to introduce legislation whereby standards are applied to the main air pollutants in the environment. It would also seek to halt pollution from the main sources, that is the electric power stations, the oil refineries, the chemical industry and cars by means of a system of regulations. Above all, we in the Environment Committee feel that the Commission should draw up an action programme to add real weight to the legislation in which industry, possibly together with the people of Europe and the Commission itself, would establish a plan showing how the standards, regulations and directives can be applied in reality.

The Environment Committee has also tabled other proposals. For example, it believes that a programme for the selective use of fuels should be introduced which can also be used by households. It also thinks that lead-free petrol should be introduced as soon as possible. Moreover, it takes the view that we should use less harmful fuels such as LPG, and that we should obviously make more use of public transport, since this would automatically reduce energy consumption. To sum up, Mr President, we have submitted a number of proposals which — and this is the most important point — will lead to a 75% reduction in air pollution in Europe in the next ten years, and not just 30%, as I believe the Commission is proposing. That is not enough, Commissioner. We shall have to reduce air pollution by 75% in ten years, and that is the purpose of the programme!

The Environment Committee has submitted some good proposals which will have to be implemented efficiently and quickly. The Commission and the national governments will have to get down to work; and we too must work hard because, Mr President, we want living forests, not dead ones! We, the people of Europe, want our museums to be full, not empty! And we want to breathe good, clean air in Europe!

(Applause)

Mr Petersen (S), *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology*. — (DA) Mr Chairman, acid rain is one of the greatest problems of our time. Half a million hectares of forest in Germany are totally ravaged, and signs of damage can now be seen throughout half of Germany's coniferous forests. So it can really be said that the forests are dying, and if the forests die, mankind dies too.

The Parthenon, symbol of ancient classical times, has survived more than two thousand years of men's actions. Even when the Turkish powder magazine blew up, the Parthenon survived. But what time has not been able to eat into for over two thousand years has now been eroded in less than 50 years by modern patterns of living and industrial methods. In order to prevent acid rain from literally dissolving the Parthenon from the face of the earth, over 50 million ECU have had to be spent as a temporary measure. Is that what we understand by European culture, which we talk so much about in this House and elsewhere?

Forests are dying, lakes are dying the whole sea is being destroyed, the air is not fit to breathe, and children are dying in their cots. What on earth have we done? Ever since the 1950s we have created a way of life and introduced methods based on the policy of grabbing more and more — no matter what the cost to nature. A unidimensional form of economic growth, which can only tell the difference between more and less and not between good and evil. Killing forests is a harmful action. Thou shalt not kill, either thy neighbour or nature. In our modern dance around the golden calf, we have been able to distinguish only between quantities and not qualities. In everything we produce there is good and evil. Energy from a wind-mill or a solar panel is morally a good thing, since it kills neither forests nor men. Energy from oil or coal-fired power stations is a form of energy that can be harmful to the quality of life. If life is to continue, we shall have to think and act qualitatively again, choose between good and evil and not only think in terms of quantity, more or less or more and more.

There are limits to how much trees can grow. In fact, at the moment they are dying prematurely because we in our arrogance believed that unqualified economic growth could continue indefinitely. It cannot. There are limits to growth — at least to the kind of growth which lays nature waste. And so the crisis hit us, because we did not learn in time how to live and produce what we needed in a way more commensurate with the earth's scarce resources and which did not threaten nature with extinction and men with death and misery. It is not only through wars that we are faced with the threat of extinction. Our much vaunted economic miracle poses a similar threat. Therefore, the time has come to act, and it is very gratifying that the Committee on the Environment has

shown such understanding and foresight in this matter.

I should like to compliment Mr Muntingh on two things. His report is one of the most important ever submitted to Parliament — highly informative and instructive in its presentation and wide-ranging in its objectives. I am pleased to note that the Committee on the Environment has set a more demanding target than we did in the Committee on Energy. Whereas we in the Committee on Energy urged that pollution be halved by the year 2000, the Committee on the Environment urges it be halved within five years, and that within ten years there should be a 75% drop in pollution. I personally fully support this demand.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, let us do our duty and vote for this report, so that the Commission can get to work. Let us then go home and tell our peoples and our colleagues in the national Parliaments that now is the time to act if we are to combat the threat of extinction.

(Applause)

Mrs Weber (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. There are many people in Europe who still believe that the woods are not dying but are only suffering from an illness which can be cured with a few injections. Unfortunately, the process continues inexorably. It is evident today in various places in Europe. You need only to go to the Czechoslovakian border area, where all the trees are dead, or to the Bavarian Forest or the Black Forest where, in the area near Freudensdtadt, nine out of ten trees are affected and even in the Vosges, where the forests are as yet least affected, the first casualties can be seen.

But it is not only the forests which are dying, The blood lead levels in children are increasing, and this is causing great concern in Great Britain and in France, where people perhaps still think that the Germans have a particularly Germanic relationship with woods. In the Federal Republic new surveys have shown that many children's respiratory diseases are attributable to air pollution — false croup for instance. Every country in Europe is saying that action is the responsibility of others. But, just like air pollution, responsibility does not stop at frontiers. Europe has been challenged to do its duty. We need the directive on air pollution from industrial plants. Why did the Council still not approve this directive at its December meeting?

We need the directive on industrial furnaces. On this topic, too, the Commission has submitted proposals which are being debated in Parliament. We need lead-free petrol as quickly as possible. Parliament called for this in July 1983. Why has the Council not yet reached a decision? Is there no possibility that the Commission could introduce speed restrictions throughout Europe? A speed restriction of 100 km an hour would, in fact, mean a reduction of 20% in

Weber

nitrogen oxide emission. Why is it not possible to levy taxes on pollution similar to those levied on sewage in the Federal Republic, so that our objectives can be attained all the more quickly?

The Member States should implement these principles, which they approved at European level, as quickly as possible and add further measures at national level. But the regions too, for example the *Länder* in the Federal Republic, are involved. They must improve monitoring. They must employ more people in the bodies responsible for monitoring — the industrial monitoring services, the factory inspectorate — than they have hitherto, and they can also carry out the work involved more quickly than required, for there is no law against acting more quickly and effectively than is strictly necessary. But all our local authorities, throughout Europe, should assume responsibility in these matters. They can make lead-free petrol available. They can build centralized heating plants and district heating plants, and they can encourage the combined generation of heat and power in their areas. They can — as Mr Muntingh said — encourage the use of public transport for short journeys and build networks of cycle tracks, so that not everybody is forced to travel by car.

I must warn those over-zealous people who believe that nuclear energy will solve their problems. Building more nuclear power stations will not mean that any reduction in air pollution from coal-fired power stations can be expected within the next ten years. We cannot substitute other fuels for coal just like that. There would be a noticeable increase in prices, and in addition, while we are on the subject, we should not forget the employment situation in the coal and steel regions. There are as yet no technical solutions to the replacement of coal for medium and peak-demand periods. Costs for desulphurization can, however, be forecast. If we, in the Federal Republic, were to desulphurize all coal-fired power stations, it would cost six to ten thousand million DM. One nuclear power station alone costs six thousand million.

I urge that the CDU Members, and in particular the Germans, who indeed talk a great deal about the death of the forests, should make available any money which might find its way back to the Federal Republic for desulphurization plants and not for an update of a superproject such as Kalkar, where the funds flow into some bottomless pit and one never knows exactly what results emerge and when.

Incorporating desulphurization units does not present any problem. They were first used in Europe. Unfortunately, though, there are too few of them here.

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

The increase in electricity prices which would result from the installation of desulphurization plants would, on average, be one pfennig per kilowatt-hour, which

means production costs for industry would rise by 0.15%. I consider that that rise is tolerable. Compared with that, what does air pollution cost, and who bears these costs?

The people of Europe must realize that forests are very valuable as recreational areas. It is also important to ensure a pure water table. The health of mankind is also certainly not something to be ignored and, in any case, our social services system is overloaded to an extent that is no longer tolerable. The people of Europe must be better informed. We must act together on all levels, but in this case the challenge is particularly to Europe.

(Applause)

Mr Mertens (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. Let me say to begin with that I should have preferred us to be able to discuss my colleague Mr Muntingh's worthy report earlier on, at least before the Athens summit, because in that case we might perhaps have had more hope that some decisions might be reached there.

We see this report as a continuation of our efforts, for you will remember that as far back as May 1982 we tabled a similar motion for a resolution in Parliament, since we were eager to discuss the topic of air pollution as a matter of priority. We are very pleased that many of our colleagues have cheerfully and willingly taken up our proposals and have joined our camp. We are pleased that the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection has also taken up our suggestions to the extent of producing this report.

It was at our suggestion, too that a hearing took place in Brussels from 19 to 21 April 1983, in which many scientists from all over the world took part, and we believe that important findings emerged from this hearing.

I do not need to say very much more on this point, since the exposition by the rapporteur was very good and virtually exhaustive, but one or two things must be emphasized. In our concern for people's health we must not allow ourselves to be pushed into a back seat. We must continually hammer home our point, because otherwise other aspects of pollution will be the main topics of discussion. It is people's health that is, in fact, the most important thing — and too little research has as yet been done on this subject.

Secondly — and we deliberately make this our second point — there is the phenomenon of the death of the forests, which really is alarmingly widespread. The great ecosystem of the forests has always been an admirable filter by means of which the air was kept pure. I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, what are we going to do when this filter, too, is eaten up by the vast quantities of air pollution that we find today?

Mertens

Thirdly, I should like to point out that the buildings and all the historical monuments of western Christianity which we, of course, want to save are at risk. We understand that the Commission, having received a mandate do so from the Stuttgart Summit, has already set to work in a big way, and, as we all know, we have already noted some proposals that it has submitted. So, before the Athens Summit, at least, we were able to debate the Commission's proposals for industrial plant. Unfortunately, nothing was decided by the Council in Athens.

In addition, the Commission has submitted a proposal concerning industrial furnaces and a proposal on coordinating research. As we know, it will also submit to the Council by March a similar proposal on lead-free petrol, based on the report by our colleague, Mr Cera-
volo.

But where is all this leading to? Parliament can only hope that the Council or the Summit will reach some decisions under the new Council presidency. It's about time something was decided! Here we really must make an appeal for solidarity. Nothing will work otherwise. It was so disappointing to see that nothing was decided in Athens, and we have heard that it was one country in particular that was out of line with the others. Don't be afraid that I shall name that country. That would only stir things up again. But if a Prime Minister, with an iron hand in a velvet glove bangs on the table and says: 'I want my money', then she would be well advised to appeal to the sense of solidarity and sympathy of the other countries. Let us act together in a spirit of solidarity, for we know that this is a European problem and that we can only solve it by working together. We shall never be able to solve these problems if somebody always puts a spanner in the works. We have, after all, outgrown the times when people believed it was possible for a country to get by in splendid isolation, and that will be even less possible in future.

We have tabled a few amendments which we believe might improve the report. But we are also pleased to confirm that we can back this report. It is basic research of the best kind. Perhaps in some legal respects it could have been expressed more coherently, but we hope that it will prove to be a basis for joint decisions, so that at long last we shall manage better in future to protect mankind from large-scale air pollution.

(Applause)

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President, this valuable report by the Committee on the Environment, presented by its diligent rapporteur, will receive almost total acceptance from the members of my group. It is a worthy project in every way.

My group in this Parliament has been aware, thanks to the excellent help of valued Members from other States, of the nature and scope of this problem. Mainly

because of the geographical position of the British Isles, the amount of acid rain falling on our country has been relatively small and is confined even now to very few areas. We have many winds that blow around our land. We have reduced sulphur dioxide pollution in particular. Nevertheless, my group here has been stressing the importance of Community environment policies directing attention and resources to those issues which are truly transfrontier problems. Here we must make our very greatest endeavours to ensure that we get, from all of the European States and from all of those States on the other side of the Iron Curtain, the maximum assistance we can.

By trying to remove the concept of ongoing research, as Amendment No 11 seeks to do, I think we would be defeating a very valuable contribution. We have got to go on finding out. Just as with lead in petrol, we may find ourselves forced to take action long before we have all the answers to all the problems, but that is no excuse for abandoning research.

Finally, I must commend to the Members here the idea of a truly unpolluted atmosphere. The proposals before us go some way with sulphur oxides and nitrogen oxides, but the problem of carbon dioxide is in no way tackled. My dream for the growing generations is one of a totally pure atmosphere, where the threat of the greenhouse effect is also removed. There is — I address this remark to Mr Petersen and others — only one path we can take to this, and that is by increased use of nuclear power to generate electricity, which we will then use to provide energy for most of our needs, including powering our urban traffic. There are risks, there are dangers. The story of human evolution is meeting these dangers and triumphing over them, I commend this very strongly to your attention.

Mr Jürgens (L). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen. The report we have before us contains numerous figures and formulae, all of which I must confess I have not fully understood. But I believe that a programme such as is proposed here is absolutely vital. The Liberal and Democratic Group will therefore support this report, in which acid rain is mooted as the cause of the death of the forests and damage to millions of hectares of woodland.

It is true that in Europe, the United States and Canada the damage is so great that it can and will affect the ecological balance of nature. It is also true that the activities of the European Parliament mentioned in this report have so far been relatively unsuccessful, because the Council of Ministers was repeatedly unable to reach. It is also true that we can only tackle and solve this problem across national frontiers.

In my opinion, however, it is a false assumption that acid rain alone is responsible for the death of the forests. We must tackle the root cause of this problem and base our efforts on research. This is the main burden of my speech.

Jürgens

Professor Ulrich of Göttingen first put forward the idea of acid rain in 1967, and for the past 17 years his wide-ranging research on ecosystems has investigated the death of the forests and acid rain and pinned down many causes which must be tackled and eliminated. This institute produced the first results of research on measures to combat acid rain. Since 1966, this modern, integrated ecosystem has engaged the attention of soil scientists, botanists, forestry managers, agricultural scientists, meteorologists, microbiologists, zoologists and forestry research stations, all working in cooperation.

This institute has available data which is unrivalled anywhere in the world, and one decisive factor is that it is expanding its research work considerably and building up a programme such as we propose, based on this kind of scientific research.

It is five minutes to twelve, and we Liberals have considered the motion that DM 12 million of the 1984 budget should be allocated to research into the death of the forests and acid rain on the understanding that research in this field should be promoted as a matter of priority at European level.

These allocations will, in my opinion, be used to the best advantage at the centre for research on the death of the forests and woodland ecosystems at the University of Göttingen. There is scarcely another site in the world where so many results have been produced during the past 17 years in the field of ecosystem research. The European programme must be based on this research and accordingly spend the available grants on this work. It would be too expensive to set up new institutes, and only by developing what we have learnt up till now will we avoid duplicating research work.

For some time now the Americans and Canadians have been consulting this institute in Göttingen for advice, and scientists who use this advice for their own research on the death of the forests and acid rain in their own countries have met with success.

What is good enough for the Americans should be good enough for us. We cannot give away the results of 17 years research. We must do something but we cannot afford to take wrong decisions in this programme we must do the right thing.

(Applause)

Mr Nyborg (DEP). — *(DA)* Mr President, today it is snowing and everything looks beautiful outside, but we are reminded, too, that snow can be a cause for concern, since snow and rain are not pure when they fall but are full of poisons of various kinds.

Mr Muntingh's exhaustive report gives the reasons why. It seems that there is still no absolute scientific

proof, but there is no doubt that there is a connection between air pollution and damage to men, nature and our cultural heritage. And some shocking figures emerge. We have heard today that 560 000 hectares of forest must be considered as totally ravaged areas, and that is in West Germany alone. In the towns, one can see that various other valuable assets are being lost, but it is not that which is so alarming. The worst thing is that nature is being destroyed. Natural metabolic processes are essential if man is to continue to breathe. We do not know the long-term effects of acid rain. Not all the destruction that it causes is equally visible. Thirty years ago, hardier trees began to be planted in the Ruhr district, and now these trees have begun to die in great numbers. The bark is splitting away from the trunk and the roots are rotting, and in my opinion there is no doubt that the European Communities have the size and stature needed to give a lead in getting international transfrontier pollution reduced. And it must be reduced.

Through European Community regulations we can ensure that demands for action are intensified internationally, and thus that our record improves in relation to that of other countries. What is the position in the Eastern European and other Western European countries? However the fact that they are doing nothing is in no way an excuse for us to sit back and turn a blind eye. The facts are that, in Norway, Sweden and Finland for example, there were reports a long time ago of terrible damage to nature, but nothing was really done about it on that occasion. We really should have guilty consciences about that even now. 4 000 lakes in Sweden are biologically dead. In Southern Norway, the situation is even worse, in that there 80 % of the lakes have no life in them any more. In Denmark, too, things are beginning to go wrong, although not — fortunately — so terribly wrong as in our neighbouring countries, but we too have good reason to be alarmed. In West Jutland, where the earth is poor and deficient in lime, it has been noted that in some plantations about 1 000 hectares of forest have been destroyed because there is too much aluminium in the precipitation. However, the hard winter and dry summer may also be contributory causes. This has been suggested, anyway.

Over the 10-year period from 1983 to 1993 the Commission wants to reduce sulphur discharges into the air by 30 % compared with the amounts released in 1980. This is still not the most desirable figure, but it is bound to help a little, at least.

We support the Muntingh report. We have, however, like Mr Muntingh himself, certain reservations about one particular point where it is maintained that the increasing use of atomic power can reduce the problem of acid rain. In my opinion, it is not a good idea to combat one evil with an evil that may prove to be even greater.

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

President

President. — It is voting time. The debate will be adjourned and resumed after the votes.

7. Votes¹

SABY REPORT (DOC. 1-1110/83 'COMMUNITY FINANCING OF RESEARCH AND INDUSTRY')

Mr Seligman (ED). — As vice-chairman of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, but not on behalf of that committee, I should like to move the referral back to committee of the Saby report, on the grounds that it deals with research, which is a matter for the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, and that it has not been referred to that committee for an opinion of any sort. During the debate this afternoon the Chair said the matter would be referred to the Bureau. By that time the report will have been voted on and it will be too late. So I would like it to be referred back to committee and the opinion of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology asked for — even if it is only a quick verbal opinion.

Mr Saby (S), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, I think our colleagues are making a mistake, because as far as the competence of the Committee on Budgetary Control is concerned Parliament agreed that with regard to the discharge procedure this committee would make the financial and political assessment of the results of an action and would propose initiatives. It was this committee therefore which voted through Mr Wettig's report on agricultural problems during the discharge procedure, and also a lot of other reports.

What this means, Mr President, is that we are dealing with a report which really does come under budgetary control. This is something which follows budgetary matters and it should not be systematically referred to committee; otherwise, it would be impossible to get anything done in this Parliament. In any case, this report incorporates very objectively the work carried out by the Committee on Energy and Research.

Mrs Walz (PPE), chairman of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology. — (DE) Mr President, we should have no objections to proceeding as Mr Saby indicates. What we do object to is that the fact that the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology is just not consulted, even though it is a matter for us, although at the same time I heard Mr Saby say that he contacted us. Unfortunately this was not the case and for this reason we must insist that

we are entitled at least to get a hearing. I have had the matter checked by our Secretariat and we heard nothing from him. That is just not on in a case like this. They should have asked us for an opinion.

(Parliament rejected the request for referral)

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, may I ask you personally, inasmuch as this was presumably referred as an own-initiative report by the Bureau to the Committee on Budgetary Control, why an opinion was not also invited from the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology under Rule 94 (3)? Was there any particular reason why that was not done at the time? Could I also ask for your assurance that in future the Committee on Budgetary Control will either be confined to its own terms of reference or else that the competent, specialized committee will at least be asked for an opinion?

President. — Mr Purvis, I can only say that with own-initiative reports the Bureau only decides whether or not such an own-initiative report should be allowed. The question of asking opinions of other committees should be resolved by the committees themselves, and coordination should be such that if the Committee on Budgetary Control is drawing up a report which deals with energy, it should be automatic that the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology can give an opinion. I think the procedure should work better than it has done in this case.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, Rule 94 (3) says: 'Should two or more committees be competent to deal with a question, one committee shall be named as the committee responsible and the others as committees asked for opinions'.

I think the only people in a position to decide that are the Bureau, when they are giving approval for an own-initiative report, and may I ask that at that point the Bureau should consider whether other committees should be asked for their opinion. Otherwise, as in this case, we come to the plenary part-session and suddenly find a report which we did not even realize affected our area.

President. — Mr Purvis, rules are rules, but I would say that in general when the Bureau has to decide on the authorization of reports, it is impossible for the Bureau at that moment to know exactly what is what. In other words, more directly involved authorities within the administration of Parliament should take that responsibility, as it is impossible for the Bureau to read all the own-initiative proposals in order to see which committees should be involved. It would also create a tremendous delay in dealing with these requests, and therefore it should be left to the administration to carefully watch what is going on and to inform the relevant committees if an opinion is deemed necessary. I think that is the only way to deal with the matter.

¹ See Annex.

Mr Aigner (PPE), chairman of the Committee on Budgetary Control. — (DE) Mr President, I have no wish to prolong the discussion but I have to speak now because I want to reject the accusation that the committee has exceeded its brief. The Bureau looked at the matter and authorized us to draw up this own initiative report, precisely because our job is not only to check accounts but also to take a look at the efficiency of a policy. I am sorry for what has happened. It was not done with any malice but because we thought there had been total communication since the rapporteur is also a member of the specialized committee. Mrs Walz, you know how well we usually work together. There has been a misunderstanding. Consequently, Mrs Walz, what I propose now is that you take another look at this newly approved report in your committee and that you appoint a rapporteur with whom we can discuss various points and then decide whether a second report should be drawn up by you or by us or whether there should be a minor correction. I should not like you to feel that this discussion means that there is a basic argument between the committees.

Mr Beazley (ED). — Mr President, as regards your ruling, should it become a precedent, I think we should be aware that Rule 94, which my colleague Mr Purvis quoted, does not make any reference to Rule 32, which I think it might have done if your interpretation had been right. You might be creating a precedent which could be undesirable, and I just wanted to draw your attention to it.

President. — Not quite, Mr Beazley, because there is also Rule 101 — I think we have too many Rules. Rule 101 says:

'Should the committee to which a question was first referred wish to hear the views of another committee, or should another committee wish to make known its views on the report of the committee to which a question was first referred, such committees may request the President that, in accordance with Rule 94(3), one committee can be named as the committee responsible and the other as the committee asked for an opinion.'

We have a mass of rules and we should try to solve our problems in a pragmatic way so that political justice is done to every committee. That is what I proposed, and I do not think it is contrary to the Rule. It is an interpretation.

8. Combating of acid rain (continuation)

President. — The next item is the resumption of the debate on the Muntingh report on the combating of acid rain.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — (IT) Mr President, I believe that this motion represents an important step forward for the European Parliament as regards the protection of the environment. I am grateful to all my colleagues who have presented motions connected

with this issue, and, in particular, Mr Muntingh, who has drawn up such a comprehensive report.

The problem of acid rain has aroused at least as much interest as the interest non apparent here today in Parliament which has perhaps been caused by the voting on the Charter on the Rights of Patients.

Nature is afflicted with an illness too: acid rain which is derived from a specific source, or rather (Mr Muntingh has drawn up a detailed list) from various sources where it would be possible to reduce the degree and type of pollution. I would add that this type of pollution — acid rain — has aroused much emotion amongst the public as a whole and all the political groups because the relative effects are clearly evident. Many political forces only intervene when presented with the tangible effects of pollution. In this case the effects have been evident both in the devastated forests and especially in the damage caused to monuments in particular: the damage to health is less evident and some political forces are therefore more slow to act and show less sensitivity.

In the 'hearing' which we held in Brussels we were able to note that the problem will not be solved until the inevitable clash between collective and private interests is reconciled and, above all, until the ratio between cost and gain is made clear.

Here the figures contradict each other. In general, however, they are derived from studies carried out by 'the other side' such as energy producers and the industries which cause pollution. We believe that greater assistance should be given to independent institutions and scientists in order to solve this enormous contradiction between cost and profit which only apparently exists.

I meant to add a few things to what my colleagues have said. I deeply regret not having been able to submit amendments because the final text, for some reason, was very late in reaching me.

In any case it is necessary that the Council should take concrete action against air pollution; it should at least adopt the very modest directive on air pollution caused by industrial plant. This would only be a small step, but it would be a start. The Council should be able to show the continuity of the activities of the institutions and not, I hope, their lack of activity.

Mr Eisma (NI). — (NL) Mr President, the widespread alarm concerning the dying forests might suggest that acid rain is something relatively recent. Nothing could be further from the truth. For decades we have been hearing reports of dying lakes in Scandinavia and Canada and of the corrosion of buildings in eastern and southern Europe. The shameful thing is that no-one then took the danger seriously, but the problem has spread so quickly in the past few years that now it is impossible to ignore it.

Nonetheless, the national governments and the Council have so far done precious little to turn the tide. At the two Council meetings of environment

Eisma

ministers held in November and December last year no decision could be reached. The latest compromise proposal referred only to target figures for sulphur dioxide emissions and did not lay down any maximum permissible levels, mainly because of the objections of the United Kingdom — if I may mention that country by name, Mr President.

However, it is essential that this problem should be tackled multilaterally, primarily for reasons of competition, but also because acid rain is an international problem. It is all very well for the United Kingdom to talk about the relatively low deposits of sulphur dioxide when the prevailing westerly winds carry a large proportion of its emissions to the continent. Happily the United Kingdom's attitude to acid rain appears to have changed somewhat of late.

Sulphur dioxide is not confined within the Community's internal frontiers since the problem in fact extends beyond its external frontiers. I am therefore pleased that the essence of my draft resolution concerning East-West discussions on acid rain is included in the motion for a resolution before us. I am referring to the request that the Council and the Commission should insist that the 1979 treaty on international long-distance air pollution should be ratified by those countries which have not already done so and that, together with the Scandinavian countries, the talks with the Eastern European countries should be intensified in order to reduce sulphur dioxide emissions on both sides and to include nitrogen dioxide emissions in the treaty.

The only thing we can do here is to urge the Council for the umpteenth time to come up with some decisions. Parliament knows exactly what needs to be done — indeed, the Muntingh report is full of good advice. The Council should listen to Parliament for once.

Whatever happens, one thing is clear — acid rain has had a profound effect on public opinion. I began by talking about the completely justified alarm which is being felt, but I have good reason to hope that this will jolt public opinion into appreciating that an environmentally sound policy is not something we can just take or leave — it is a matter of life or death.

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, the report before us by Mr Muntingh, whom I would like to congratulate, dates back to an initiative in which my Group, among others, was involved in 1982. I was among those who signed the initiative at that time, and I am particularly pleased that we now have a full-scale report on this subject, although I think that if it had been presented a little earlier it might have had some effect on the last two Council meetings of environment ministers.

I shall not go into the general position adopted by my group, since my colleague, Mr Mertens, has already done this most admirably. As the second speaker for my group, I shall confine myself to making one or

two observations concerning certain aspects of the problem.

I would like to comment on the health aspects of acid rain, not only as it affects the environment but also as it affects people. I would like to comment on the extent to which the Eastern European countries are responsible for acid rain, and I shall be saying something about the nuclear energy aspects and legislation.

Firstly, the effects of acid rain on people. In this debate a great deal of attention has been drawn to our ailing forests, to the acidification of the soil and of lakes, as well as to the damage inflicted on our monuments. However, it is as well to point out that humans also suffer as a direct result of acid rain. About 10% of the Netherlands' population, for example, suffers from chronic respiratory diseases, that is asthma and asthmatic diseases or chronic bronchitis. There is a significantly greater incidence of such diseases in areas where sulphur and nitrogen oxide concentrations are highest. I believe this is a further reason for limiting emissions of these substances, especially in densely populated areas.

A completely different aspect of the problem, but one which cannot be ignored, is air pollution from the Eastern Bloc countries. Nearly half the atmospheric pollution in the Federal Republic of Germany comes from Poland, East Germany and Czechoslovakia. In other words EEC regulations are not sufficient to combat air pollution especially in West Germany. For this reason the Eastern Bloc countries must be persuaded to join in the fight against acid rain as soon as possible — and this will be no easy task. It may in fact be advisable to discuss this problem as part of the negotiations concerning gas purchases and export of grain to Eastern Europe.

The third comment I would like to make concerns the relationship between acid rain and nuclear energy. Mr Muntingh's motion for a resolution includes a paragraph in which nuclear energy is hailed as the only viable alternative to the traditional air-polluting energy sources. This seems to me rather one-sided, and I have tabled an amendment in which it is conceded that while nuclear power stations pollute the atmosphere far less than conventional power stations, there is still the problem of nuclear waste, which will have to be overcome on the basis of joint research projects. I am no opponent of nuclear energy, but it is unwise to minimize the problems and bury our heads in the sand — especially if the sand contains nuclear waste.

Finally, Mr President, I have one criticism to add to our positive appraisal. There is one essential element missing from Mr Muntingh's report — an outline of national and Community legislation in this field, which means that there is also no indication of which Member States are in the lead and which are lagging behind the struggle against air pollution. In any struggle it is always as well to know who your friends are, and I would point out to Mr Muntingh the

Maij-Weggen

constructive attitudes of West Germany and the Netherlands in this field. They are unquestionably in the lead as far as the combating of acid rain and the relevant legislation are concerned. It is no coincidence that both governments are Liberal/Christian-Democratic. Both attach the utmost importance to the fight against air pollution and both play a leading part in applying measures on a European scale.

I feel it very important, Mr President, that this addition should be made to this otherwise highly praiseworthy report by our socialist colleague.

Mr Kirk (ED). — (DA) Mr President, I should like to stress the importance of Mr Muntingh's report. I believe that the Community is obliged to set itself certain targets with regard to cutting down pollution and improving the environment throughout Europe.

I should, therefore, like to emphasize, that, in my opinion, the Muntingh report is a step in the right direction; it tries to set these targets in such a way that we have something specific to aim at when we undertake future investment in the various technologies. This applies both to industry and to private investment. I very much hope that the Commission will be able to take up this challenge, so that in the foreseeable future we shall have achieved something in the way of improving the environment. The cost to the Community will be high. The effects of this damage to the environment — as was also stated in the Muntingh report — are of the order of 60 to 80 thousand million ECU a year. As I have said, this represents an important task for the Community.

But at the same time, I should like to stress that it is also vital for the Commission and other institutions to be able to pursue a firm policy with regard to third countries. It is pointless for us to reduce pollution from our own countries if third countries do not do the same, so that in fact pollution is carried over our frontiers. I therefore believe that it is essential for us to raise this question in our negotiations with third countries on their relations with the Community. I hope that the Commission will be in a position to answer this affirmatively so that we get something done about pollution in Europe and improve the environment everywhere, both within the Community and outside.

Miss Brookes (ED). — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a sudden decline in the fisheries of several lakes in the Abersystwyth area of Mid-Wales, which, I must state, is in the United Kingdom, first led the Welsh Water Authority to suspect, the presence of acid rain in Wales in the 1970s. The continuing inability of these lakes to support fish, due to the high acid and aluminium content of the water, has prompted the Welsh Water Authority to invest UKL 100 000. May I say to Mr Jürgens that this money is being spent on an extensive programme of research to investigate the extent and the cause of the problem. The survey has established that a fairly substantial area is affected by or is vulnerable to acid

rain, but that the precise cause of the phenomenon is not yet understood. Several possible causes have been identified, and the cause is probably the result of a combination of atmospheric pollution and a particularly acid soil being washed into the lakes by heavy rainfall.

In order to establish which of these two contributory causes is the main one, the Welsh Water Authority has collaborated with the Institute of Terrestrial Ecology of Bangor University in North Wales, and with the University College of London, to examine the sediments of the lakes and to measure the acid levels of the sediments at various times in the past. By determining whether or not there has been a sudden rise in the acid content of the sediments after 1850 — and I do mean 1850 — the Welsh Water Authority hopes to be able to decide whether acid rain has been caused by a continuing natural process or whether the cause is, in fact, due to a rise in atmospheric pollution due to industrialization. In its research the Welsh Water Authority is collaborating closely with research institutes in Germany and Scandinavia and is finding many similarities in its results.

May I say to Mrs Weber that this type of research is of vital importance, because it is only when the real cause of the problem of acid rain has been identified that any effective solution can be found and action can be taken. It is equally important that the research carried out in the various institutes of Europe should be coordinated and should be given the full support of the European Community so that an effective solution can be found as soon as possible.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) I should like first of all to thank the rapporteur for his committed presentation of the report and for the excellent analysis, which assessed the results of the hearing in Brussels on 19 and 20 April 1983. With this report, Parliament has reached a milestone and made an excellent contribution to our common cause.

I should also like to thank all of those who have expressed thanks to the Commission or made suggestions and criticisms. Time is too short for me to go into each point in detail, especially since many of the comments and questions are answered either directly or indirectly in our document which contains the Directive on the limitation of toxic emissions from industrial furnaces.

I should like to dwell on five points. First of all, I agree with all those who have emphasized the need to supervise and monitor all measures aimed at protecting the environment. In the long view in fact, this could be the real weak point in the implementation of our policies.

Secondly, I agree with those who have emphasized the special tasks and responsibilities of local authorities. Their citizens are directly affected by pollution and therefore they ought, in many respects to be the first to recognize that something is wrong and, as far as possible, put it right.

Narjes

Thirdly, I should also like to support all those who have emphasized the need to intensify East-West dialogue on this subject. We invited scientists from the Eastern Bloc to our own hearing in Karlsruhe, but they did not come. They were invited indirectly through the ECE Secretariat in Geneva. We hope that the East-West Scientific Congress on Air Pollution to be held in Munich in June, on the initiative of the Federal Republic, will be better attended and we hope above all that the Eastern Bloc will realize that it is in its own interests to take measures to control air pollution.

I should like to assure Mr Kirk that in our discussions with the Third World, especially on the extension of the Lomé Convention, we are well aware of the problems of environmental protection and environmental policy. It is not, however, easy to put things into practice. It might, for instance, be possible to organize a conference of experts to discuss one particular project and the environmental consequences of the proposed solutions, as well as how they may be influenced. Unfortunately, any scope there may be for more far-reaching or even overall influence runs up against the obstacle of staffing limits in the Commission — limits which I have often spoken about and which in my opinion, are far below what is acceptable from a budgetary point of view.

My final point is a question directed to the rapporteur. He has accused the Commission of aiming at a reduction in pollution of only 30 %. I don't know where he gets this figure from. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, may I perhaps refer to Article 3 of the Regulation on industrial furnaces in which we propose that by 1995 sulphur dioxide emissions should be reduced by 60 % and emissions of dust and nitrogen oxides by 40%. Those are only interim objectives, for in addition the quality standards or minimum emission standards which we are going to introduce will take effect, so that at the moment I do not know where the 30% figure comes from. I should like it to be corrected.

I could comment on many more individual points in detail, but I shall not do so since I wish to lend more weight to the one important request I have to make to Parliament, namely that the two outstanding proposals which we consider very important should be debated and adopted by Parliament during its present term. I am referring to our directive on the limitation of toxic emissions from industrial furnaces and our directive on the reduction of the nitrogen oxide content of the air. If these two proposals for directives are not adopted by Parliament before it is dissolved, it will be the end of the year before there is any chance of this happening, which in turn will mean that we shall have an extremely difficult problem of timing as regards the Council of Ministers.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

(The sitting was suspended at 7.50 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

9. Radiation protection

President. — The next item is the report by Sir Peter Vanneck, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (Doc. 1-1128/83), on

the proposal of the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-470/83 — COM (83) 301 final) for a decision adopting a multiannual research and training programme for the European Atomic Energy Community in the field of radiation protection (1985-89).

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President and fellow Members — all five of you — I have much pleasure as well as pride in introducing this report as, I believe, as hammered out in my committee, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, it accords with a consensus of the Parliament. The evidence is that there are no amendments tabled to it.

There can be few people who are unaware of the dangers of radioactivity. The fact that we have lived with a background of natural radiation for millions of years, varying considerably from place to place as it does, does not stop us being scared of the effects of man-made radiation. Of course, our political enemies behind the Iron Curtain and, sad to say, sometimes sitting on the benches opposite to me in this House, are all too happy to exploit our worries, to attempt to deny us, for instance, the timely advantages of cheap electrical energy, so vital to Western economies.

We need, though, to use radioactivity for many other purposes. We need it for engineering techniques, for cancer cures, for diagnostics and other X-rays, for example. And we must make every effort to ensure that all beneficial uses, from nuclear power-stations to the treatment of leukaemia, result in no undue hazard to the population at large. It is our hope and trust that this multi-annual research and training programme in the field of radiation protection will achieve just that.

Mr President, colleagues, I commend it to this House.

Mrs Phlix (PPE), draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology. — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, representatives of

Phlix

the Council, Sir Peter Vanneck has just said a word or two to the other side of the House. I hope that they can read better than they can listen.

The Commission's proposal to the Council for a decision adopting a multiannual programme for research and training in the European Community for Atomic Energy in the field of radiation protection was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology.

The research programmes that have already been carried out by the Commission have undoubtedly substantially contributed to an objective evaluation of the consequences and dangers of ionizing radiation and have demonstrated their effectiveness. It is gratifying and encouraging for a Member of this Parliament, in drawing up his report, to be able to get worldwide support for such scientific research. Research into radiation protection will make an appreciable contribution towards one of the main aims of the outline programme 'Improvement of Living and Working Conditions' and of the APO programme 'Health and Safety'.

It is worthwhile pointing out here that, first, 30 % of the relevant research in the Member States is carried out under the auspices of the Community, 80 % is indirectly connected with Community research and, furthermore, very special attention is given to coordination so as to avoid overlapping and gaps.

Second, research findings on radiation risks are relevant in two important respects: the future development of energy sources and their exploitation, and the optimum use of ionizing radiation in medicine, the importance of which the rapporteur has demonstrated. Furthermore, it has already been shown that such research will favourably affect knowledge in other sectors of health protection, such as bone marrow transplants, genetic engineering, neutron therapy, etc.

Speaking on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, I should very much like to see means being made available to ensure the continuity of such research. Consequently, the Committee wishes to be kept regularly informed of developments and results with a view to furthering the dialogue between Parliament and Commission. And finally, staff numbers should be in line with the importance of this type of research.

We ask that an especial effort be made in this connection, and I urge the Commission to inform the public at large of the Community's activities and findings in this domain. There are a good many people, including myself, who are convinced that information of this sort can do much to improve general awareness in the Community.

Mrs Schleicher (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Group of the European People's party, I extend my warm thanks to the rapporteur, Sir Peter Vanneck, and also the draftsman,

Mrs Phlix, for their really excellent documents and so, *ipso facto*, for something which rarely occurs: that is to say, no amendments at all have been tabled to this report. That means that it has met with everyone's agreement, and such a degree of unanimity I find very heartening.

As we present the opinion of the European Parliament on the multiannual research and training programme for the European Atomic Energy Community in the field of radiation protection (1985-89) as a continuation of the existing programme, I should like to draw attention to just two points — first, to Mr Ghergo's report on radiation protection, which surely provides a good basis for the research programme, and secondly, to paragraph 2 of the resolution now before the House, in which Parliament calls for a review of the programme after three years.

The cost of such a research programme is very high. Mr Aigner has already spoken today about these costs in another connection, and it seems to me that Parliament has to accept these costs without having any say in the selection of personnel, even though this might be very important for us. It should be possible to establish whether this need would very much be met the promoter's intentions. In my view, high standards must be applied to the selection of research workers, and use should be made of Europe's finest experts. All the authorities that are in any way appropriate should therefore be called in during the selection procedure, which still leaves much to be desired.

The particular aim of this radiation protection programme is to protect both the population and the environment from ionizing radiation. That means exploiting the effects of radiation and reducing as far as possible the dangers ensuing therefrom. We know that radiation exploitation brings a number of risks with it: these have to be recognized and appropriate measures taken. In this way, we hope that the research programme will promote the health and safety of the population of Europe.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Protection of the environment was first recognized as an all-embracing political responsibility about ten years ago, but certain questions of detail have a much longer tradition in the Community. Radiation protection and related research are examples. Over the last 25 years or more, a system of large-scale cooperation in research in this field has been built up: more than 30 % of all the research conducted in the Member States has been carried out within the framework of the radiation protection research programmes which have been running since 1958, and approaching 80 % of all research is covered and evaluated by Community conferences and seminars of specialists. In this respect, therefore, Mrs Phlix is quite right. We do, indeed, count for something in this special sphere, and are even the prime mover of development. Public

Narjes

opinion learns far too little about what we are doing. This is partly due to the fact that the subject-matter and the jargon used to describe it are not accessible to everyone and partly to the fact that there are fewer experts than is generally supposed in the business of translating scientific jargon into a language that is generally understandable.

The whole thing is a result of many years' constructive effort. Today, the radiation protection programme is an indispensable point of crystallization for scientific research in this field, not only in Europe but throughout the world. Here we do not need to play second fiddle to anybody; by the same token, however, we are bound to ensure the continuity referred to by Mrs Phlix.

The report presented by Sir Peter Vanneck on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection on the new multiannual programme is an important aid for further consultations. The Commission is particularly beholden to the rapporteur and his committee for the unreserved support they give to our programme, for there should be no doubt in anyone's mind that this work must go on. Scarcely a day goes by but we hear or read of real or alleged damage from ionizing radiation — problems which either subsequently turn out to have been exaggerated or really need to be handled by us. What we need is therefore a reliable and effective research potential which investigates all questions that arise and produces reliable results. Stagnation would amount to regression, and that we cannot afford, whether in the interests of the citizens of Europe or for the sake of ensuring the safety of our energy supplies.

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

10. *Safety and health at work*

President. — The next item is the report by Mrs Scrivener, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (Doc. 1-1082/83), on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-927/82 — COM(82) 690 final) for a draft resolution on a second programme of action of the European Communities on safety and health at work.

Mrs Scrivener (L), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report on safety and health at work is an important topic, but the most important requirement is to continue what was already begun under the first programme, taking into account what has been achieved up until 1982.

The proposals concerning protection against dangerous substances have been taken over and extended to other substances which can have noxious

effects. Those concerning protection against accidents and situations regarded as dangerous stress — and this is something new — the concept of accidents in the most exposed sectors. With regard to organization of health surveillance, the Commission is insisting on the rôle of health services in small and medium-sized undertakings as well as the groups of workers who are exposed to particularly serious risks. Finally, a new heading on training and information highlights the Commission's interest in this area.

Although the programme contains a number of positive elements not found in the first programme, nonetheless the fact that it is still very general and differs little from the preceding text has led our committee to make a certain number of comments. In the first place, the comparative data necessary for assessing the incidence of occupational accidents and diseases is lacking, since there is no breakdown by years by types of work or by Community countries. Such figures would have been useful in determining what progress has been made and in identifying priority areas scientifically. In the absence of this information, a certain number of points could at least have been clarified. For example, in the case of occupational accidents, although the general trend is favourable, serious disparities exist where the type of work, the size of the undertaking and indeed the country are concerned. Furthermore, it is regrettable that there are no comparative data whatsoever on occupational diseases.

Other questions call for more detailed answers from the Commission. This is the case where the deadlines for initiating action and the priorities which should ultimately be observed are concerned.

Hence we felt we should ask the Commission to provide a survey of matters affecting safety and health in the Community. This should show in particular the cost of occupational accidents and diseases and the cost of preventive measures, as it would be wrong to underestimate the importance of this economic approach, which is basic and which, moreover, raises the important question of the extent to which security measures are tested in these undertakings.

Parliament has frequently stressed the need to provide aid particularly to small and medium-sized undertakings to enable them to acquire the instruments which would enable genuinely comparable measures to be adopted throughout the Community.

Finally, we are obliged to stress the need for better information on the occupational causes of cancer. Here, too, the real extent of the problem should be determined by geographical area and occupational sector in order to make it possible to deal with the problem with full knowledge of the facts.

Thus the second programme unfortunately inspires less confidence than we would have wished. The experience gained by the application — which can only be

Scrivener

described as limited — of the first programme has unfortunately been less than encouraging. It should, however, be added that this is a very difficult area, that one has to make an act of faith in the subject but that we should nonetheless ask ourselves how the Commission intends to put this new programme into operation.

Mrs Weber (S). — *(DE)* Ladies and gentlemen, those few who are still here, ...

President. — Quality at all events is assured!

(Laughter)

Mrs Weber (S). — *(DE)* ... you see that now one-half of us are women and the other half men, if I have counted rightly.

Technical progress does not necessarily mean the improvement of working conditions, and this is shown by the urgent need for such a Council resolution. The risks may well change, and today new forms of nuisance have come into existence: noise, air conditions, noxious substances are now added to the chronic dangers to which workers have been exposed for centuries. Contact with dangerous materials can only be made relatively harmless when the worker properly understands their harmful effects. Limit values can only be adhered to when all those concerned — the workers, their official and unofficial representatives, the works doctor and the employer — cooperate in a responsible spirit. Virtually every attempt to reduce the effects of nuisance and improve working conditions encounters considerable opposition: an example is the noise restriction directive that we shall be debating later, where, during the discussion in committee, observations were made that were reminiscent of the disputes at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution!

On no account should we allow economic problems, under the pretext of cutting expenses — incidentally, only those of employers — to jeopardize hard-won improvements in working and environmental conditions and in health protection or prevent the implementation of other improvements that are urgently needed. Here, too, prevention is better than cure — that is to say, than repairing damage after it has been done or providing financial compensation for illnesses incurred or, it might be, a death caused by vocational disease. Our amendment calling for a programme of research into the medical and technical conditions required for the prevention of vocational diseases was unfortunately rejected in committee by the Christian Democrats, Conservatives and Liberals. All the damage done has to be borne by our society: whoever rejects measures to restrict noise in the workshop because they would be too expensive — that is a quotation — and is only prepared to issue workers with earplugs is turning a blind eye to the consequences for society.

Between 1978 and 1982, a total of 73 679 cases of vocational illness caused by noise at the place of work were registered in German industry alone — in the Community as a whole, the number runs into millions — and every year about 10 000 cases of serious skin-disease are reported where the victims had to abandon the trade or speciality they had been exercising. Dust and inorganic particulates lead to between 3 000 and 4 000 cases of silicosis every year. These are examples that should make one think again, especially those who still piously subscribe to the thesis that growth always means progress. For the Socialists, growth can only mean progress when it brings with it a qualitative improvement in living and working conditions. We regret that this programme is not more specific in its provisions for certain critical areas, but we give our support to all amendments designed to strengthen the participation of workers and their representatives, since these problems can only be solved through cooperation and not confrontation.

Statistics relating to the incidence of vocational diseases must be coordinated, so that the information they offer can be consolidated and the coordination of countermeasures improved. Measuring procedures must also be harmonized, and a European data-bank provide all the information available to all those concerned, including the trade-unions.

Another important point is that during the statistical processing of industrial accidents and cases of vocational disease the costs arising for the victims, the employer and the medical insurance should all be given, since this is essential for establishing the correct cost-utility ratio for preventive measures.

When it is found that the damage done to health and the environment by a production method or even by a product is too great, restrictions on application, extending, where necessary to a ban on application, must be introduced. The European Community has a long way to go before all its citizens can live in tolerable conditions and all are guaranteed the right to protection from bodily harm. Today we have the opportunity of taking an important step to this end.

Mrs Schleicher (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we thank the rapporteur, Mrs Scrivener, for her comprehensive report. The research programme is very important and contains a number of important objectives. The action programme for safety and health protection aims at enhancing the degree of workers' protection against dangers of all kinds associated with the exercise of their trade or profession, by improving the tools and materials they have to use and the conditions in which they have to work on the basis of our knowledge of human conduct.

Schleicher

The essential aims of this action programme are to improve statistics relating to accidents at work and vocational diseases, to offer protection against dangerous substances and against the various dangers and harmful effects of machinery, and to correct human behaviour.

The Group of the European People's Party takes the view that health protection measures must take precedence before measures that are merely designed to supplement our statistical and other information on labour problems. Our group therefore calls for the establishment of an order of priority covering the entire programme. This particularly applies to the selection of dangerous and carcinogenic substances for which specific directives will have to be elaborated. We take the view that certain criteria will have to be adopted, the first of which must be the extent to which the substance is capable of threatening human health. Then, of course, it is important how many persons are exposed to danger and the number of undertakings concerned. The technological and economic importance of the substance and criteria relating to activity and procedure also play a part. Finally, the possibility of finding substitutes and so eliminating the use of dangerous substances will, so far as it exists, also be decisive.

In conclusion, I should like to say that my group is satisfied with the report. It was unanimously adopted in committee, and therefore all further amendments are those which were not adopted in committee and which we consequently reject.

Mr Fernandez COM). — (FR) Mr President, the work-place is where the future health of men and women is determined in the last analysis. The social and professional category to which one belongs is what determines one's expectation of life.

French medical statistics show that deaths from cancer between the ages of 35 and 44 years are four times as high amongst manual labourers and employees as among industrialists and big businessmen. Furthermore, a child's expectation of life varies according as whether the father was a miner, an employee or a business manager. The working environment, working hours and the rhythm of work are the primary factors adversely affecting health, and the changes are not only physical — cancer or diseases of the spine — but can also be, and even more frequently are, mental. Even ignoring the human considerations, working conditions are responsible for a large part of the cost of the medical treatment paid for by social security bodies. Similarly, prevention, the fight against causes of work-related diseases and accidents is an effective way of slowing down the rise in health costs. It is therefore a useful investment.

Under Articles 117 and 118 of the Treaty, the Community has a responsibility in this field. Preven-

tion, understanding of the risk factors, providing information about them to workers, directors of undertakings and industrial physicians is the way to combat accidents at work and the harmful effects of work. Consultation of the workers is also a determining factor.

The report of the Committee on the Environment and the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs show that the results obtained at the end of the first action programme have been slight. We feel that the Commission should provide as soon as possible a survey of the measures adopted and their application by country. It should propose legal instruments taking account of the problems posed by workers' health and incorporating ideas such as the independence, in particular, of industrial physicians, the right of employees to benefit from industrial medicine services, their participation in the management of the health bodies which concern them, the right of workers to be involved in the planning and utilization of work tools when their health and safety is involved. Finally, Mr President, the adoption of these practical measures is the way to ensure that an action programme does not remain a mere catalogue of pious wishes.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — (NL) As Mr Fernandez has stressed, this report is concerned with the terrible disparities among workers in the matter of death, accidents and sickness. The heavier the work, the lower the wages and the greater the chances that the worker will fall victim to an industrial accident, an occupational disease or a premature death. Hence the first priority in a civilized world must be to ensure the worker's safety and health. The present second action programme, however, has been drastically cut back. We expected more from a Community that can take men to the moon, from a European Parliament and a European Economic Community that shows concern for the fate of baby seals and geese that have been a little overfed.

We still have not got much further than the 1974 Social Action Programme or the 1978 First Safety Programme. It is still a very general text, and the worker is still only a secondary consideration. Does this report not say that the aim must be less occupational disease and fewer industrial accidents, principally because they cost the firm so much? Does it not strike you as a little cynical that the cost and social consequences for the victims are not once mentioned? Nowhere in this text do I see any thought given to consulting the workers' representatives and granting them access to the planned databank on safety and health information.

Within the framework of the ECSC, Mr President, there are at least joint or tripartite committees dealing with the safety and health of workers. The proposal to extend such committees to other sectors did not find favour with the committee. An outline directive was

Van Hemeldonck

also proposed in respect of machines, and installations in factories. These, too, failed to get a majority. The Socialist Group feels therefore that this text represents only a very small step forward and that it must be followed by very detailed proposals on each individual problem covered therein.

Finally, it should be pointed out that no mention is made of the large numbers of guest workers, especially in the primary and secondary sectors. One of the problems here is that these people are unfamiliar with machines and, more often than not, with the language in which the instructions and safety warnings are given.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by thanking Mrs Scrivener for the report which she has drawn up on the action programme and for giving close attention to the budgetary aspects. I am happy to note that Parliament supports the attitude adopted by the Commission in a proposal which reflects the concerns of today's society and which takes into account the rapid development of technological innovations and the changes taking place in the organization of work. This programme, which will cover the next five years, points the way to ensuring the continuous implementation of initiatives in the area of safety and health at work. The application of the actions based on this programme will have beneficial results both direct and indirect: direct, since they will help to improve the safety and health of workers, indirect, because they give the public at large a more human and, I hope, a more accurate image of the European Communities.

As Parliament is aware, since the adoption of the first programme in 1978 the Commission has continued to draw up and submit proposals to the Council, so that in the space of barely four years the Council has adopted a small but significant number of directives directly affecting the safety and health of millions of workers.

Parliament will have noted that most of these directives have dealt with dangerous substances. This is not surprising, since the first programme stressed these aspects rather than the prevention of accidents. Although there are still many problems to be solved where dangerous substances are concerned, the Commission recognizes that a better balance should be established between, on the one hand, health aspects, and on the other the safety aspects contained in the second programme. It believes that this balance has now been achieved by increasing the number of actions provided for in the chapter on accident prevention.

Making available information and adequate training to all those who are concerned with safety and health at

work is another aspect which was somewhat neglected in the first programme. The Commission has also submitted practical proposals to strengthen the actions in this area as well, since a well-trained and well-informed work-force can, by improving safety and health at work, make an important contribution to implementing an overall policy.

Although I do not intend to undertake a detailed comparison of the differences between the first and second programmes — indeed, this is something which Mrs Scrivener did to some extent in her report — I should like to stress that the Commission intends progressively to implement the second programme by setting up annual work programmes. It will therefore consult the Advisory Committee on Safety, Hygiene and Health Protection at Work and also seek the opinion of national authorities on its programme.

This will enable those responsible for safety and health matters to make their contribution and to be informed of any future developments which occur. Once a programme of work has been drawn up, we shall readily make it available to those who wish to have it.

I consider that the amendments proposed by Parliament are in line with our proposal and do not give rise to any objection, except Amendment No 18, since I would like again to stress that the Advisory Committee on Safety, Hygiene and Health Protection at Work will be closely associated with our work and will have access to information on its progress. This information will be included in the committee's annual reports which we will ensure are forwarded to Parliament. I have in this connection noted the requests for surveys made by Mrs Scrivener and Mr Fernandez.

I should like, once again, to thank the House for favourably receiving this second programme. We look forward to the adoption of your opinion on a topic which is an important part of the Community's activity.

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

11. *Protection of workers*

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Sherlock, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (Doc. 1-1127/83), on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-830/82 — COM(82) 646 final) for a directive on the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to chemical, physical and biological agents at work: noise.

Mr Sherlock (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, it is a great pleasure to be with you again tonight on our own, our very own, version of the late night show!

(Laughter)

This report is one of the daughter reports of the original parent which I presented to this Parliament nearly three years ago. I do not intend tonight to go through all of the reasons why my report has taken the shape that it has. They are set out with consummate clarity in the explanatory statement, which, unlike a very great many such statements, has at least the merit of scientific accuracy. I therefore intend merely to look at one or two points, some of which have arisen in the past dialogue on Mrs Scrivener's excellent report.

Occupational health and safety is, of course, always concerned with prevention. Prevention is its only real effective tool. We are not in the business of setting out to cure those who suffer from industrial diseases; we are all in the business of preventing it. I have been in that business for much the greater part of my working life.

I would like to deal in the moments available to me principally with the amendments that have been resubmitted: 83 on a technical proposal — 83 amendments, the greater part of which have already been submitted to and rejected by the Committee on the Environment, Health and Consumer Protection! Resubmitted, and then some say, can we not have a deferment to talk about them — there are 83 of them — even though most of them have been resubmitted by themselves!

They fall into three categories. One concerns itself with trying to use this document to establish a position which they hold on employer-employee relationships. I am sorry, my working-paper is not concerned directly with establishing rules and regulations and backgrounds for this purpose. If they want to do that, let them submit other proposals. Secondly, we have other, shall I say, numerical suggestions — 80, 85, 90 decibels on this; 90, 95 and 100 decibels on the other. They are highly technical. Those of you who bothered to read it will form your own opinion, and I daresay a great many of you will have come in with a portfolio full of opinions already. But in the numbers game you take your choice. I would recommend you to accept the same version which the Committee on the Environment accepted and is putting forward as its own amendments to the Commission's proposals.

We then have a sudden manifestation of late resurrection among certain Socialist Danes who have proposed an entirely new statistical approach to the whole system of dose measurement impinging upon the eardrum of the unfortunate worker. It is even more incomprehensible than the logarithmic scale of decibels which I commend to you at least as having a

certain historical reverence and antiquity attached to it, and I think the submission made in this way will be equally rejected by the Commission's representative when he comes to give us his views.

I therefore recommend that the proposals made to and accepted by this committee, which has examined in tremendous detail and at great length and with immense thought the proposals of the Commission, be accepted and that only those amendments be accepted. If we take some of the risks of some of the proposals such as, for example, audiometry commencing at 80 decibels instead of 95, we are multiplying by five times the annual burden of examinations and the costs thereof. We could, to come back to Mrs Weber's earlier observation, very easily reduce the incidence of all industrial diseases by the simple expedient of shutting all factories. This is the sort of fatuous foolishness that emanates from back up there!

President. — Mr Sherlock, you should not carry the matter too far, because if you continue to refer to Members by name, they will ask for the floor to make a personal statement, and this will mean further loss of time.

Mr Patterson (ED), deputy draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. — Mr President, I cannot hope to emulate either the eloquence or the wit of the rapporteur, Mr Sherlock. There are two reasons. The first is that this is not my speech at all, but that of my colleague, Sir David Nicolson, who gives the House his apologies for not being able to be here this evening. The second reason is that it is really not the speech that Sir David Nicolson would have wished to give either, I suspect, but the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment of this Parliament.

The Committee on Social Affairs and Employment adopted its opinion on the Commission's proposal for a directive in April 1983, and we welcome the report by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection on the same subject of December 1983 as expressing a balanced and practical view of the problem. The committee does, however, differ from the views expressed in the report. We would like to see an 85-decibel threshold of noise adhered to when new plant and machinery is installed, and we should like to see audiometric testing carried out when levels of 80 decibels are consistently reached in the workplace.

The committee is, of course, most concerned that no worker should suffer damage to hearing through excessive noise in the working environment. We took into account the difficulties of fixing a practicable and workable limit both in terms of adequate and reliable audiometric testing, actual damage caused to hearing by noise levels at work as distinct from those caused in day-to-day life or by natural ageing processes. We

Patterson

also carefully considered the cost-benefit balance of requiring industry to reduce noise-levels to 85 decibels as the Commission proposes. It should also be noted that in certain instances we believed it technically impossible further to reduce noise at its source, so the use of acoustic screens and mufflers would have to suffice. In many cases we thought the cost of actually producing quieter machines to do the job was prohibitive and in time of economic difficulty for so many industries, particularly prohibitive, and we thought this would inevitably lead to closures and job loss. On this matter there is no difference between ourselves and Mr Sherlock.

Of course we believe that reductions of noise at the source is the best solution wherever practicable. In some cases, however, the onus may have to be on the worker to heed warnings given by employers and use ear protectors. The committee felt that an 85 decibel limit was a practical one to impose on industry, with a transitional period of at least five years when a level of 90 decibels would be enforced. The committee would like audiometric testing to take place at a level of 80 decibels, although it is cognisant of the view that testing of this level is difficult and at present not wholly reliable. I now switch off as draftsman of the opinion: my personal opinion is that this is actually not merely not wholly reliable but impossible!

However, the committee would urge the Commission to take careful consideration of the cost-benefit balance of imposing a low threshold of noise-level on industry in the prevailing economic climate and would urge that further research be undertaken to facilitate accurate and easily usable audiometric testing of employees and testing of sound-levels.

Could I add one final question to the Commission, because in the discussions in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, quite a bit turned on this particular matter. In Article 6 (1) of the draft directive, the phrase 'reasonably practical' is used when saying that noise-levels would be reduced as far as reasonably practical by means of technical or organizational measures. We were particularly concerned that a definition be provided of 'reasonably practical', since, first of all, we noted that a great deal of Snowpake appears to have been used in the Commission directive and this phrase appears in a different typeface from the rest of the directive. Secondly, we anticipated that in any legal actions, either in tribunals or courts, a great deal would turn on the precise definition of this phrase 'reasonably practical.' We note with pleasure that Mr Sherlock has taken on board our concerns that this phrase be defined, but even Mr Sherlock's addition to the directive does not, we feel, provide a definition which could be used in legal proceedings.

I conclude by saying that we should like the Commission to tell us exactly how they see this phrase 'reason-

ably practical' being interpreted when or if this directive became law.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, my group wishes to express its surprise at the fact that this item on the agenda is being taken under the new Rules of Procedure, for more than 80 important amendments have been tabled. It does not seem right to us that a text with so many amendments should be taken immediately and not referred to the committee.

President. — I would just like to put in a word here. A sort of consensus was reached that the new Rules of Procedure would not be too strictly applied during this part-session, but they would be at the next. It was judged better not to be too strict. Please continue.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — *(NL)* This will, of course give rise to very serious difficulties during the vote, given that there are more than 80 amendments that genuinely go to the heart of the matter.

As far as the subject itself is concerned, my group has been particularly unlucky, as regards both the Commission proposal and the freakish product that subsequently came out of the parliamentary committee. We are dealing here with a health matter that affects millions of workers in Europe. There are several million people who are hard of hearing, a disability caused by the working environment in Europe. That number is growing, partly as a result of new technologies. The new office technology, the new machinery in the tertiary sector as well, bring with them new types of noise hazard which affect not only the hearing but, above all, the nervous system, the vascular system, the heart. This is now a particularly serious issue of industrial hygiene.

We have serious reservations about the Commission's texts. The basic concept in the Commission proposal is unusual in occupational medicine and in the occupational-hygiene legislation of Member States. The Commission text speaks of exposure to noise. Most legislations speak of the level of acoustic stress to which the worker is constantly subjected over a certain period. The ambit of this directive — as indicated in Article 3 — is also very vaguely defined. An audiometric limit must be set adopting a specified noise threshold. The Commission itself has in other texts set the limit at 80 decibels. Many experts consider that 75 decibels constitute a neutral noise limit, whilst Dr Sherlock has always stood out for 90 decibels! He treats the matter as if it were a numbers game, or a game of roulette. What is at stake here is the health of millions of people, but on this he seems to have only the most trivial things to say.

It is important that the limit values, as specified in Article 4 (2), should be as close as possible to the limit set in other Commission texts, namely 80 decibels,

Van Hemeldonck

though provision may have to be made for derogations in special circumstances. We find it entirely unacceptable that in calculating limit values, the line taken is that the worker is already wearing a protective device. A protective device is in itself a hindrance. It is indeed a bungling way of muffling the unwanted 30 to 40 decibels.

To sum up then, Mr President, tomorrow we shall be faced with the 80 amendments. Our group will be watching very closely, and if the amendments, containing the important changes which we consider vital, are not accepted, we shall reject the report as a whole.

Mr Ghergo (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, there is no doubt that noise poses a serious threat to the worker exposed to it. For this reason therefore the Commission proposal laying down measures to protect workers against risks of this kind is both timely and desirable.

We are largely in agreement with the proposal for a directive. I shall therefore confine myself to a few remarks, intended mainly to explain the amendments that I have tabled on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party.

I should like first of all to make two remarks on the text of the proposal.

Firstly, it does not contain any definition of hypacusia, something that would have been extremely useful. It is hard to see, therefore, how it is possible to have any assessment of hearing impairment. Secondly, in the definitions set out in Article 2 the unit of measurement L EX, T is used. This has been taken over from the draft standard ISO 1999, which, however, is not yet operational, since it has not been accepted by various Member States. For this reason it will be difficult to apply and will almost certainly have to be amended. However, that may be, an EEC directive cannot be based on a technical document which is not yet official.

It must also be pointed out that as of the present there is no instrument commercially available that is capable of measuring the L EX, T level already referred to, and this can only lead to operational complications and increased measurement costs without any appreciable return.

The Commission should therefore look into the question of whether it ought not to scrap the first two definitions of sound-exposure levels set out in the aforementioned Article 2 and leave only the third relating to the measurement unit L Aeq, T, which defines the equivalent continuous A-weighted sound-pressure level.

I now turn to the report drawn up by our colleague, Mr Sherlock, to whom I should like to express my sincere appreciation for the valuable work he has done with such dedication and competence.

I feel that the basic need to safeguard the health of workers can be reconciled with the need to keep within reasonable bounds the burthens that implementation of this directive will create for undertakings.

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection has raised the maximum sound-exposure level in the work-place to 90 decibels, which is the limit generally laid down in present-day national legislations, even though some countries recommend the lower limit of 85 decibels proposed by the Commission.

Rather than look for a reduction to levels that are psychologically more tolerable — as proposed also by the Commission — we have agreed, in view of the high cost of any such reduction, that the limit should be set at 90 decibels. As far as my group is concerned, however, this higher level is acceptable only on condition that the workers exposed to these sound-levels should be required to undergo regular medical examinations. In line with this I have tabled amendments stipulating the intervals between medical examinations for workers exposed to sound-levels above 80 decibels, as proposed by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

Another of my amendments was intended to make a slight change in the form of Article 6 of the directive, thus making it, in my view, clearer and less ambiguous.

Finally, as a result of the adoption in committee of an amendment by Mrs Scrivener seeking a generally applicable transitional period — in respect of which, therefore, there are no longer any specific concessions — the third subparagraph of Article 4 (2) of the directive has become superfluous. Another of my amendments seeks therefore to have this subparagraph deleted.

In conclusion, I would like to express my agreement and that of my group to the adoption of the Sherlock report, subject to the changes I have suggested in my amendments, and I would strongly recommend that the House approve these amendments.

IN THE CHAIR : MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

Mr Kirk (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, as the earlier speeches have shown, the report before us is very technical so that the same rules apply to this as to all other reports — namely, it is a question of policy and of what possibilities we can put forward. I feel that, in his report Dr Sherlock has clearly been more realistic than the Commission in its proposed directive. I believe that Dr Sherlock has tried to strike a balance

Kirk

between protecting workers against noise and at the same time ensuring that undertakings are able to survive. In particular, many small and medium-sized undertakings will be affected by this proposed directive, and I therefore believe it is very important for Parliament to support Dr Sherlock, particularly on the question of how many decibels are permitted in the various undertakings for different types of machines. I think it is unrealistic to believe that the Commission's proposal of 85 dB can be applied without serious adverse consequences for individual undertakings. Therefore, we, the Conservatives, support Dr Sherlock's proposals that the level be fixed at 90 dB.

Moreover, I should like to say that we also feel there should be a sufficiently long transitional period, since we are dealing with undertakings which have to invest in new machines and it must be possible to instal these machines gradually in the undertakings. Therefore we also support Dr Sherlock's proposal that there should be a transitional period of 10 years. Finally, we take the view that in undertakings where the noise-level exceeds 85 dB, workers should be supplied with hearing protectors. Clearly we do not believe that workers should suffer any injury whatsoever from working in factories, but at the same time we wish to ensure that jobs are not threatened. That is why we are insisting that workers should be protected against excessive noise by the use of hearing protectory.

Finally, Mr President, I should like to say that we believe that Member States which are in a position to pass national legislation requiring lower noise-levels should be free to do so. In other words, we do not want this directive to lay down upper limits. We believe that Member States which feel capable of achieving this through national legislation should have the possibility of doing so. The Community should not place any obstacle to this.

Mrs Boserup (COM). — *(DA)* Mr President, on a point of order, I should like to know, in virtue of what rules some Members of this House are to be addressed and referred to as 'Doctor' whereas the rest of us are simply Members. How does one distinguish between first-class Members of this Assembly and other classes of Member? I should like to have your guidance on this Mr President.

(Laughter)

President. — Mrs Boserup, you are as aware as I am that the Rules have nothing to say on this subject. It is more, I think, a matter of custom in the different languages, some of which use the title of doctor while others do not.

Mrs Squarzialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I do not see why I should not also be called 'Doctor'. I am, in fact, a doctor.

(Laughter)

However, this is a point of no consequence. I should merely like to try and explain why so many amendments have been tabled to this motion for a resolution. Clearly, this stems from the fact that the document is not in tune with reality, as most people see it, and that precisely for this reason, so to speak, it has been held at arm's length.

If I may at this point introduce a personal note, Mr President, I should like to tell you a little story. This evening, as I was passing by Mr Vandewiele's place he was clearly moved by the debate on the protection of workers at the work-place. He remarked to me that from the very beginning of his working life he had been instructing workers in how to guard against certain dangers arising from their work, and that this was therefore for him a truly gratifying occasion. He was referring, however, to the splendid report by Mrs Scrivener, a report that we support.

I do not think that he could say the same on listening to Mr Sherlock's presentation of his report. Now it is true, of course, that the report was adopted by a majority in the committee, and, as happens in a democracy, it is the majority that decides. I do hope, however, that in the meantime various groups will have had second thoughts. It is simply unthinkable that workers who are exposed to noise for eight hours a day or more should not be given suitable and adequate protection.

I will not go into the various figures that have been bandied about, since this would only add to the confusion. I shall only say with all the vigour at my command that for Mr Vandewiele, who has been so active in the Catholic trade-union movement, and for others who, like him have fought for the dignity of the worker, certain sound-levels are unacceptable, since they literally grind down the worker by condemning him to a future of impaired hearing.

I know, Mr President, that I have exceeded the time allotted to me, but I think that my group still has sufficient time left to allow me to say just one more thing. You cannot simply dismiss the worker as somebody who puts on his hearing protectors, keeps his mouth shut and gets on with his work.

Mr Nyborg (DEP). — *(DA)* Mr President, I should like to begin by complimenting Dr Sherlock on his outstanding report and then go on to make a few comments.

The Commission proposes a maximum level of 85dB, whereas the rapporteur suggests 90. I have heard it said in debate — not here this evening but in other places — that ear protectors are uncomfortable to wear. This is something I can well believe. But let me add that it is also uncomfortable to wear glasses, but if one cannot see without glasses then one has to wear them. If the level of noise in a factory is so high that one is disturbed by it and has to wear hearing protectors, then one should wear them. To me that seems to be the only logical thing to do.

Nyborg

Moreover, the discussion also raises the question, what we are measuring, and where. If we imagine a straight line drawn between the source of the noise and the ear, then, in my opinion, the correct place to measure the noise is immediately before the noise reaches the ear or the hearing protector. But we should bear in mind that what we are dealing with here will certainly involve a substantial increase in costs, particularly in the initial phase. It has been calculated that the costs of applying over a very short period of time a maximum noise-level of 85dB would be in the region of DKR 9 000 million. Small and medium-sized undertakings which cannot draw on the same economic resources as large undertakings will be particularly hard hit.

Finally, we should also bear in mind that these rules are not applied in many countries with which we are in competition on the world market and that, as a result, their costs will be lower and that they will be better able to compete. We should be careful not to run the risk of increasing unemployment by overprotection. We will therefore support the Sherlock report and, at the same time, as Mr Kirk stated, refrain from seeking to remove the provision whereby national legislation can require noise levels of less than 90dB. One can go right down to 70dB if one wishes to do so at national level.

Mrs Hammerich (CDI). — *(DA)* Mr President, our opposition to the EEC's working-environment rules is not based exclusively on national considerations. It is because they consistently create less favourable working conditions than we formerly had in Denmark or than those which are being sought by the organizations representing the people who are directly exposed to danger at work namely the workers themselves. We are as equally opposed to minimalist as to maximalist directives, since they indirectly put a break on development. The directive on noise lays down minimum standards. None the less, the Danish trade-union organization LO has subjected it to slashing criticism for the following reasons. It may appear very nice that the maximum permissible noise-level is being reduced from the current level of 90dB to 85dB in 1990, but these 85dB are measured not at the source of the noise but on the inside of the hearing protector, which it is unpleasant for the worker to wear. This is in fact a step backwards. The maximum level being proposed is too high, and it is absurd that the maximum levels should be fixed on the basis of the use or non-use of hearing protectors. The hearing protectors which one has to use continually are uncomfortable, and should, therefore, be considered as a last resort where protection is concerned.

There are many points to be criticized, but the most important is that the directive makes no real effort to eliminate noise at the place of work, but rather insists that the workers must protect themselves, be subject to checks and laid off when their hearing is impaired.

With regard to the report itself, Dr Sherlock's report is simply unacceptable irrespective of whether he is a doctor or not. It undermines the proposal for a directive point by point, so that one could almost come to believe that it was written by people who wished to retain obsolete and extremely noisy machines, and that it regarded the workers themselves as defective parts of these machines. The maximum limit of 90dB is maintained, the transitional period is extended to 10 years and economic considerations take precedence over human considerations, the Commission is allowed to grant derogations and the directive itself becomes a maximalist directive. That simply is not acceptable. Moreover, the proposal for a directive has no chance of being accepted in Denmark — thank God! The cooperation between those who are opposed to the EEC and the trade-union movement is too close to allow it.

(Applause)

Mrs Weber (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, I think I can continue the thread of what I was saying before. Nothing has changed in the meantime. Perhaps one should make it quite clear that one's hearing, once impaired, cannot be restored, so that of all the 10 000 cases that occur every year in the Federal Republic, none of the victims will ever be able to hear properly again. Perhaps our physician, Dr Sherlock, should be reminded of this once more.

In the Federal Republic, 25 500 people at present receive compensation for impaired hearing due to working conditions. The 85 million marks paid every year to these persons could surely have been put to better use by being spent on measures to prevent the occurrence of these cases.

(Interruption from the European Democratic Group)

Mr Sherlock, you were saying a few moments ago that if nothing is produced, there can be no industrial damage to health. Perhaps you should read some of the many clever books which tell you that there is always some connection between labour and capital — that is to say, if you have no more workers capable of working, nothing more can be produced.

On the subject of the way the work is organized, we took the view that something has to be done when a certain noise-level has to be exceeded. I think this is very sensible, and I can quote some good examples from this House. Take, for instance, the interpreters, who have to wear earphones for eight hours a day and longer, and compare them with the large number of Members who, when they have had enough, remove their earphones and go off to the bar. This factory-workers cannot do when the noise gets too much for them and lasts too long. One of the things to be done by way of organizing work is therefore to shorten working-hours so that people only have to wear such

Weber

equipment for a limited length of time. It is no pleasure to do so, and it also does not improve one's hearing, Mr Nyborg — again he is missing, I see — as wearing spectacles improves one's eyesight; instead, the result is that one ceases to hear at all, which is very uncomfortable.

Finally, Mr Sherlock, you were saying — and this particularly disturbed me during the discussion in the Environment Committee — that a reduction of five decibels makes no practical difference and is therefore unnecessary, and that apart from that the cost is much too high. You ought, perhaps, to go one day into a room where the noise varies between 80 and 90 decibels. One should, perhaps, have demonstrated the difference by means of the noise, so that it is indeed important whether the protection threshold is set at 85 or 80 decibels. We take the view that if hearing is impaired with effect from 85 decibels, this level must be avoided, and so the Socialist Group has tabled an amendment in favour of coming down to 80 decibels, for only then can our workers work under sensible conditions.

(Applause)

Mr Moreland (ED). — Mr President, I and my group believe that there must be progress in this field and that there must be a directive on this subject, both from the point of view of industrial competition and, what is more important, that of raising the standards of protection against noise in the Community.

Having said that, I just want to make what might be described as a personal comment. I have no doubt that there are many Members, especially over there, who believe that in the after-life I shall be down below stoking the fires, and I have no doubt that the ladies over there will be up in Heaven. I am sure that they will be up in Heaven because they are already on a cloud...

Mr Muntingh (S). — Are you a guardian angel?

Mr Moreland (ED). — I can only say, Mr President, that I look forward to being a guardian angel, and I look forward particularly to guarding, for example, Mrs Weber. But, Mr President, they share the same fault as their Socialist colleagues who debated this issue in my own national parliament — indeed, one of the spokesmen for the Labour Party in my own national parliament happened to come from my constituency — in that they are totally divorced from what is, in fact, the industrial feeling on this particular proposal.

Let us emphasize, as I am sure Mr Sherlock, who is a doctor, would emphasize, that under this proposed directive nobody is going to go deaf. That is the important thing. The questions which the Socialists fail to ask on this issue are three. The first question is, does the Commission's proposal reflect expert

medical knowledge? The second question is, how much is it going to cost? And the third is, is it going to be enforced?

Now, I think there are actually some doubts about the Commission's proposal on all those three questions. If I may give an example, I have yet to find out on what expert medical basis they came down in favour of 85 rather than 90 decibels. All that I have seen tends to favour 90 rather than 85. Secondly, on cost, I happen to represent an area which is dominated by the ceramic industry. The experts tell me on the basis of detailed studies that in Britain alone it would cost that industry £3.4m to implement the threshold of 85 decibels. If that is for Britain alone, what will it cost, for example, in Mrs Seibel-Emmerling's region of Bavaria, which also has a ceramic industry, or elsewhere in the Community? I would also make the point that increasing costs means losing jobs, and I did not get elected to this Parliament to lose jobs: maybe they did.

Finally, Mr President, may I just make this point on enforcement. Many of us will have to be honest and ask ourselves whether, in strict terms, the Commission's proposals could be enforced. I would point here to Annex II of the Commission's proposals, where they are suggesting that before a person is subjected to audiometric tests he should spend 14 hours away from being exposed to 80 decibels. How do you actually enforce that? That means at least six hours away from work, away from his employer's influence. Mrs Weber and I could be at a disco for all you know during those six hours that we are away and be exposed to far more. I make that as a facetious remark, but there are a lot of other such examples. I personally think that it could not be enforced in the United Kingdom. If I were objective, I should have to say that the United Kingdom does have a reputation for believing in the rule of law. If it is not going to be enforced in the United Kingdom therefore, it is not going to be enforced elsewhere.

So there will have to be amendments to this proposed directive. I think, frankly, that Mr Sherlock's proposals are the proposals that most Member States of the Community want to see, and I hope Parliament will accept them.

President. — I notice with great pleasure that you believe in angels.

Mr Moreland (ED). — ... and in God!

Mr Frischmann (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, we are far from satisfied with the proposed directive before us on combating noise at work, particularly because of its non-compulsory character.

We regard noise as a veritable scourge for three important reasons which do not appear to have particularly concerned our colleagues on the other side of the Chamber — to use the same expression as they use.

Frischmann

The first reason is its effect on health. Everyone says that the most obvious danger is damage caused to hearing and therefore the risk of deafness. But in fact noise constitutes a danger to the whole organism of the worker by making him more liable to cardiovascular diseases, by increasing general fatigue, disturbing digestion and reducing resistance to infections and to toxic substances. Noise often produces aggressiveness or greater intolerance towards those around us.

The second reason why noise is damaging concerns its effect on the efficiency of work itself. Noise undoubtedly diminishes precision and attention and therefore reduces output. This has been shown by numerous studies, so I shall not pursue it further. It should be added that noise increases the risk of accidents by making people less alert, by drowning acoustic danger-signals such as suspicious noises in a defective piece of machinery or warnings shouted by other workers.

The third reason is its cost to society. In France, 11 % of industrial accidents, 25 % of working-days lost, 20 % of psychiatric hospitalizations are attributable to noise. Quite apart from the cost to the workers themselves and their families, this is also a charge on social security. There are also costs arising from the easy recourse to tranquilizers, anti-depressants and other medicines intended to enable one to, as it is said, 'keep going', so that it is estimated in France that noise costs a total of FF 2.5 billion per year. This is what those on the other side of the House should be saying and taking into consideration. Under these circumstances, how can Mr Sherlock say that the Commission's proposals are too ambitious and propose that the level of noise to which one is daily exposed be simply reduced to 90 dB? Contrary to what he has stated, the cost of investing in the campaign against noise is not high if one considers the enormous costs which, as I have just shown, noise gives rise to.

Moreover, as one Member just pointed out, an increase of 5 dB is far from negligible since, as everyone should realize, the effect of adding 1 dB to another is not an arithmetical progression. The Member in question correctly pointed out that a noise of 83 dB is almost twice as loud as a noise of 80 dB. Nor can an anti-noise ear protector, the use of which Mr Sherlock recommends, be an acceptable solution. The wearing of these protectors throughout one's whole working life is an inconvenience which workers cannot accept. They give an unpleasant feeling of disequilibrium, they isolate the workers among themselves and from one another. Finally, they are, themselves, responsible for many accidents.

Covering machines, coupled with the acoustic insulation of the premises, is a measure which could consid-

erably reduce noise. But it must be repeated that noise is most often caused by bad design or the fact that the machinery and installations themselves are too old, which is what happens when you opt for progress at any price. Machines should be made less noisy at source that is to say, at the designing stage. Any serious mechanic will tell you that a machine is only a success if it is quiet.

In addition to providing for the active participation of the workers themselves, an all-out campaign against noise should give pride of place to prevention. To go on accepting the cost of this human and economic mess is simply to continue to absolve the employers of responsibility. It also delays the moment when the conscience is awakened — which it can be without the quality of life having to suffer.

The means exist. It is the political will which is lacking, and it is the eternal search for profit at any price which stands in the way of the human solutions needed to protect the workers. This is what we and what the workers themselves deplore, and it is and will continue to be the fundamental reason why the struggle will be intensified.

Mrs Desouches (S). — (FR) I do not want to pass myself off as an angel, but I should like to say to my colleague across the way, who says that he would be down below stoking the fires, that there was at least one thing in what he said that seemed to me to be correct.

(Laughter)

It is true that the Socialists do not begin by asking — and I insist on the word *begin* — how much all this is going to cost. This does not mean, however, that they are not at all concerned with the problem of cost, but that they put it in a different way. They take a broader view which embraces, as my colleague has just said, the social costs, and without forgetting the human suffering involved which, to my eyes, also has its price.

I should like to voice my amazement on reading some of the amendments tabled to the directive. Even while far too many workers have to undergo the distressing and frequently irreversible effects, both on the auditory system and on the nervous system, of exposure to noise, certain Members of this House go on quibbling about a few decibels and about the frequency of audiometric examinations.

For many years I was concerned with these problems in the health service of the Brest naval dockyard, and I was able to measure the physical, psychological and social effects of work done while exposed to noise. That is why I feel that the health of workers requires that the health problems caused by noise should be met fairly and squarely and that we should rise above the pettiness evident in some of these amendments.

Desouches

The measures proposed in the directive are far from being excessive. They are minimal and, in certain cases, even inadequate, cutting back as they do on the existing national provisions. The number of audiometric examinations is one simple example. The directive proposes that they be held every three years, while the amendments tabled by the Committee on the Environment propose every five years. In France these examinations have been taking place every two years for some time now, and I feel that no one can say that the French do not have their feet on the ground.

As far as I am concerned, therefore, there can be no question of scaling down the provisions of the directive, as is proposed by the Committee on the Environment in its amendments.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Boserup (COM). — *(DA)* Mr President, the Commission has given birth to the directive on the reduction of noise at the place of work. It is a fragile little child which has been born. The best part is in the preamble. In fact I do not like this proposal for a directive at all. I am particularly unhappy with the idea of sorting workers on the basis of a medical examination. It is alright to say that the employer should, where possible, provide another job. We know very well that in a period of unemployment this can be regarded as impossible, and in this way one can exclude from the labour market workers who are more than 50 years old. I find this deplorable. I am myself 50 years old, but I am still quite healthy.

I should like to add that my disappointment at the proposal for a directive is nothing compared with the anger I felt when reading the committee's document. It is quite ironic that this wretched piece of paper has been drawn up by a self-styled Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. None of these three things is evident in this paper. It has been drawn up by an *ad hoc* committee for the protection of the economic interests of obsolete industries, and nothing else. They should be ashamed of themselves, but clearly they are not.

Systematically and point by point, the directive has been watered down to the detriment of the workers. The level of noise is to be raised, the transitional period doubled, the controls are made mere formalities and the doctors cannot lay down conditions but can only give advice. What is the real meaning of this hairsplitting? What purpose is it intended to serve? The committee proposes that Article 1 (2) should be deleted. This provision is in fact very important in that it lays down the Member State's right to introduce stricter provisions. One can enter into a debate on whether this provision is necessary in view of the fact that it is a specific directive and can be subject to a framework directive and it is the framework directive which should be considered. That is nonsense,

and in my opinion paragraph 2 as proposed by the Commission should be allowed to stand.

The leftist Members of this House were voted down in the committee and have responded by tabling a series of amendments. I can support them, but I do not think it will change very much. The bourgeois majority in this House will not budge from its position, so that all we can hope for is that the Commission will hold fast and refuse to allow its draft directive, which is quite modest, to be watered down.

As usual, people are bemoaning, in typically conservative fashion, the cost of this for industry. Has none of them the imagination to consider that reducing noise will create jobs and improve competitiveness? Can nobody see the possibilities opened up by being the first to develop new machines, a new organization of work, which would help to increase productivity and reduce absenteeism? The modernization which we have heard referred to over and over again in this Chamber could be stimulated if we demanded better conditions of work in industry. Nobody buys new machinery unless he has to. Let us develop new machines and they will be sold!

There is no future for work in noisy and unhealthy conditions. We talk a lot about the future here, so why should we not bet on the future — a future where workers will enjoy a healthier and better life and do not have to be separated from their comrades and colleagues by having to wear hearing protectors? The next thing we shall be asking them to do is to wear muzzles.

(Applause)

Mr Sherlock (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, if you would permit me one point of order and one point of personal reply.

Your predecessor in the Chair this evening was asked for a ruling on amendments and, of course, earlier this week there was a proposal that 40-plus amendments should automatically qualify a proposal for reference to its parent committee. I believe I am correct, Mr President — though I shall accept your ruling — that this was not to be applied during the course of this part-session of the Parliament. But I would take the opportunity to observe that of the 83 amendments, 60 were non-committee amendments. That leaves 23 that had already been approved by the committee but, of course, have to be resubmitted in accordance with our procedure. Over 50 of these were submitted by the Socialist and Communist Groups, who have taken the opportunity to complain that there are 83 amendments.

Secondly, the observation that some of us are referred to as 'doctor' and some of us are referred to as one thing or another. I really do not care what you call me, Mr President, as long as it is not too late for breakfast. In all the documentation I think you will find I am referred to as Mr Sherlock. I have, I must admit,

Sherlock

during a long life and the acquisition of grey hairs, acquired the courtesy of fairly frequently being addressed as 'Dr Sherlock' in deference to the profession that I have practised so long. Courtesy, of course, is a charming attribute with which Mrs Boserup is naturally very well endowed and she always behaves in the most charming way. I am sure she did not mean to hurt me in the least.

President. — Thank you, Mr Sherlock I believe the President did indicate, in fact, that the new Rules would not be applied during this part-session.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, the importance of this debate becomes very obvious when one hears the speeches that have been made and the measure of legitimate passion that has been voiced in them.

I would remind the House that we brought forward this proposal because, to a greater extent than any other harmful substance, noise in the work place affects workers exposed to it and thus creates a problem which we simply cannot ignore.

I would also say — and you yourselves have shown this to be true — that we are dealing here with a matter that is both technically complex and economically sensitive. However, let me just make two brief initial remarks.

Firstly, it is true, as has been said, that this directive does not put paid to the entire problem. Prevention is also important — in the long run, indeed, even more important. It is therefore perfectly clear that other actions must be envisaged, and the Commission has drawn up a certain number of proposals on this subject. However, I find it perfectly in order that this other dimension of the question has been raised.

My second remark has to do with the clash between economic considerations and considerations of health. It is perfectly legitimate to bear economic considerations in mind, and it is not for me, exercising the office that I do, to take it upon myself to overlook that. However, I also feel that, faced with a problem that is so important from the physical and human point of view, it is equally legitimate to bear in mind that a proposal such as this must not be undermined by mere economic considerations. A balance must be found, and this is what we have tried to do. Taking a broad view of the entire matter, it seems to me perfectly fair to compare the cost of these measures, which admittedly will fall most directly on the undertakings, with what the community will save in terms of social expenditure. An overall view of this kind must, it seems to me, be based on broader considerations than those which are normally taken into account.

That much having been said, it seems to me that no one has questioned the basic premises of our proposal.

It is true that prolonged exposure to intense noise can lead to deafness, which is a serious social handicap. It is also true, as Mrs Weber pointed out, that this loss of hearing is irreversible and incurable, since certain delicate components of the inner ear will have been destroyed.

Much of the discussion centres on the level of exposure to noise and the costs this entails. Both these two factors must ultimately be taken into account in fixing any upper limit.

As far as definitions and figures are concerned, we have been obliged — for example, in expressing the quantity of noise to which the ear is subjected — to abide by international definitions, which are, of course, continually being updated. On a more general note we found, as is frequently the case, that the figures varied according to the sources from which they were taken. However, we do accept the first table set out in the report, which is taken from a document drawn up in the United Kingdom. Without going into the question of the different definitions and different values, I would regard the figures given in this table as correct in relation to the job that we are trying to do. They show what percentage of workers may be expected to suffer serious handicap as a result of exposure to noise.

In order to be quite clear as to what I mean by this, I would explain that such a serious handicap would consist in having difficulty in understanding conversations carried out in a normal tone of voice without any background noise.

The figures show that 6 % of all workers are liable to be affected by a noise-level of 85dB, while the percentage rises to 13 % when the noise-level reaches 90 dB. The percentage more than doubles, and I feel that this must be taken into consideration when weighing up the various elements in the case.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

These, then, are the facts, or some of the facts, that led the Commission to propose an upper limit of 85 dB. With regard to the figure of 80 dB, it is true that this does appear in some of our reports and that it has been upheld in some Community legislation, but more in connection with the environment than with health.

The workers' representatives wanted a lower limit than the one we proposed, while industry held out for a higher figure. We felt that, for the reasons I have just given and taking into account the economic implications, 85 dB provided a fair balance between the two points of view and was also a sound-level that is to be found in some of the regulations currently in force. We would argue therefore that the Commission proposal maintains a sound balance between the dangers and the social and economic considerations.

Ortoli

There are two further comments that I should like to make. I am surprised at Amendment No 3, deleting Article 1.2. and with it all reference to the right of Member States to ensure greater protection for workers. I can think of no explanation for this amendment. I should also point out that there is already a provision to this effect in the outline directive as well as in the first two specific directives on lead and asbestos respectively. Noise would not seem, therefore, to raise any new problems that would justify us in departing from what has already been established.

Finally, Amendment No 18 would have the Commission grant the derogations.

I am grateful to the House for this mark of trust, but this seems to me impracticable, because the Commission will not be able to check on working conditions in the Member States, and it should not try to do so. We are already frequently accused of being a niggling and intrusive bureaucracy. Where there are national inspection systems, it is for them to do that job. Our role is to promote, by means of an exchange of information and experience and possibly of staff, a certain conformity in practices followed. It is not to push the mistrust to the point where we are replacing national mechanisms that have proved their worth.

(Applause)

Mr Moreland (ED). — Mr President, is it possible to put a question to the Commissioner following what he said, because there are one or two points he raised which I would have thought were questionable. First, he said that existing regulations in one or two Member States laid down 85. Am I not right in saying that there is actually no Member State which has a mandatory 85 decibels? Secondly, he refers to the table in his own proposal on page 3, which he said came from 'a British organization'. It does not say that in the actual proposal. He also stated that he had looked for something between what the workers wanted and what the employers wanted. Surely the important point is that you accept what authoritative medical and scientific expertise wants. My understanding is that that tends to be around 90, and indeed the British organization he refers to has revised this table since it was published in the Commission proposal.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-president of the Commission. — *(FR)* Mr President, the table is in a report of which I am not the author. I read the table in your report. I ...

(Applause)

Mr Sherlock (ED), rapporteur. — There is a different table in my report, Mr Commissioner. You might care to read that one too.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-president of the Commission — *(FR)* I did not say that the legislation applied to the figure

of 85 dB, I said that the figure of 85 figured in a number of measures, or rather I said that the figure of 85 figured in the national legislation of some countries. This applies to a number of particular measures — for example, in France or in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Mr Moreland (ED). — ... Not mandatory in any legislation.

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(FR)* Did I mention the word 'mandatory'?

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will take place at the next voting-time.

12. Pollution of the North Sea

President. — The next item is the report by Mrs Maij-Weggen, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on pollution of the North Sea (Doc. 1-1173/83).

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE), rapporteur. — *(NL)* Mr President, pollution of the North Sea is a subject which has already been debated several times in this Parliament. We have had the resolutions on oil pollution, the resolutions on titanium dioxide discharges and the resolutions on the dumping of nuclear waste. However, all these resolutions and reports dealt with only a part of the pollution problem.

The aim of this report is to give an overall view of the total problem. The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection realized that this was no small task, and one which would require some time. We have been studying the subject for something like two years. We have brought in the experts concerned and five times extensively discussed the North Sea question in the parliamentary committee. The result is a comprehensive report with, I hope, politically balanced and acceptable proposals in the resolution.

In the resolution, we have mainly focused on the legislation to combat pollution of the North Sea. Our inquiry has shown that there are many laws to protect the North Sea. We have listed 17 national laws, 11 European directives and 13 international conventions applicable to the North Sea, and I would not swear to it that we have not forgotten a few. We can let ourselves be impressed by all this national, Community and international legislation, but you must understand that such a multiplicity of legislation policy, since the number of gaps within these laws and also the gaps between them are so large that it is no wonder that even legal dumping and disposal are commonly practised.

Maij-Weggen

In my report I have given a general view of the nature and extent of the pollution. You can read the details for yourselves, but I just want to give you a few facts and figures so that you may have some idea of the problem. In spite of regulations banning their use, plankton, fish, birds and marine mammals in the North Sea still contain large amounts of the extremely dangerous PCP. We also established that each year the North Sea States as a whole together discharged into the North Sea from dumping vessels some 7 million tonnes of inorganic chemicals mixed with organic wastes. Also some 62 million tonnes of dredged earth are still being dumped into the sea by the EEC Member States, mostly from North Sea harbours, and there are serious doubts about the nature of this material.

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection has considered how best to tackle the chaotic legislation for the North Sea and how to fill in the gaps they leave. There are two ways of looking at this, which are perhaps complementary rather than conflicting. You can try quite systematically to plug the gaps and harmonize the laws; alternatively — and this idea attracted more interest in the parliamentary committee — you can aim at an all-embracing legislation and try to cover the whole field through a kind of global European framework regulation.

The committee opted for the latter idea with a large majority. This could be linked with an initiative taken by the Commission in 1979 in one fell swoop to bring a large number of substances — 129 chemical substances if my memory serves me right — under one European framework regulation; it did not succeed with that proposal, but perhaps the climate of opinion has changed sufficiently for it now to be acceptable.

Mr President, we know that the Commission is making preparations for a special conference on North Sea pollution. If I am correctly informed, it will take place in Bremen in the autumn. It is our hope that the data and suggestions contained in this report and in this resolution will be well to the fore in the preparation of this conference. We have put forward an idea here which is a piece of dogma. We have not taken out a patent on it, but we hope that it will be earnestly considered by the Commission, and we trust that these matters will be taken seriously at the conference.

Mr President, one final remark. I was unable to introduce into my report the amendments of the Legal Affairs Committee because they became available too late, but now that I have had a chance to examine them I think that they usefully complement the text. If I understand the Legal Affairs Committee aright, it supports the idea of a global convention, but it feels, of course, that a great deal must be done before that

can happen and it has listed for us what it sees as the necessary steps. I would like Mr Sieglerschmidt to explain this once again, and I do not think we shall have any problem in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection in finding room for the Legal Affairs Committee's amendments.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S), draftsman of the report of the Legal Affairs Committee. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, pollution of the North Sea is growing at a spectacular rate, and this closed sea — it is not an ocean — calls for a special legal settlement and, indeed, makes it urgently necessary.

As the rapporteur has already pointed out, we are confronted here with a multiplicity of legal provisions. There are overlapping international treaties, some of the signatories to which are far beyond the boundaries of the Community; moreover, Community law and national law are involved. It would be simpler if the North Sea were at least a closed sea within the European Community, but that is only partly true since Norway and Sweden are also involved.

As draftsman of the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee, I must point out that my committee has not discussed the question whether there is any point in aiming at such an overall settlement as the responsible committee has done. I can quite imagine that legitimate arguments could be advanced in favour of such an aim, but one should consider how difficult it is to harmonize the laws of the Member States within the Community, and when one reflects that over and above the Community international treaties would have to be harmonized with Community law, then one sees that this would be a pretty difficult approach to such an overall settlement.

At any rate, I feel that what the Legal Affairs Committee proposes could make a useful contribution. The goal set forth in this report is not necessarily negated by trying at first to take a few smaller steps that might be important. I will briefly enumerate the main points contained in the Legal Affairs Committee's amendments.

First, the Oslo and London Conventions should be ratified as soon as possible by those Member States who have not yet done so. This particularly applies to Annex V of the London Convention, which is concerned with the disposal of waste from ships, because the control of this disposal is of particular importance for certain areas.

Secondly, implementation of international agreements, especially the Oslo and London Conventions, some of whose provisions are very far-reaching, must be coordinated, and an important means to this end, in the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee, although this is not expressly stated in the amendments, would be the signing of these Conventions by

Sieglerschmidt

the Community as such. I know there have been difficulties, but the Legal Affairs Committee considers that they are not insuperable and that this would be an expedient course to take as in the case of a maritime convention.

Thirdly, there is the newly revised and extended Agreement for cooperation in dealing with pollution of the North Sea by oil and other noxious substances. This, too, should be ratified as soon as possible by the Member States of the European Community — and, of course, by the other signatory States. That is another of our demands. This agreement in its revised form was signed only last September. It is a step forward and should be ratified in order to become a reality.

Fourthly, as we know, the Commission submitted in 1976 a draft directive on the coordinated implementation of international agreements, which did not get through the Council, and we hope that it will submit as soon as possible its revised draft directive on this subject, taking account of both the 1976 resolution and that before us today, in order that we can make further progress.

If I may say so to the Commissioner, Mr Narjes, it need be — that is to say, if the affair is jeopardized by objections raised by a Member State against the competence of the Community — instead of getting involved in legal squabbles, it would be better to explore the possibility of an agreement between the Member States of the Community.

Finally, I want to mention briefly that we call for a code of conduct for oil-tankers laying down, amongst other things, compulsory pilotage for these vessels.

I hope that the House will adopt the amendments submitted by the Legal Affairs Committee, and particularly that the new Parliament, on the basis of the memorandum called for in the motion for a resolution, will follow the example consistently set by this Parliament and shoulder its responsibility as a pace-maker on the road to environmental protection and combating marine pollution, particularly pollution of the North Sea.

(Applause)

Mr Muntingh (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, Mrs Maij-Weggen said a moment ago that the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection had opted for a North Sea convention. That is not so. Paragraph 1 says, and I quote: 'Calls on the Commission, in preparation for the forthcoming Conference on the North Sea, to study whether ...' This does not mean that the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection has already decided that there should be a North Sea convention. We wish to consider whether it is feasible, and I therefore contest the statement by Mrs Maij-Weggen that the Committee on the Environment,

Public Health and Consumer Protection has opted for a North Sea convention. She even said this in the Dutch press and it is just not true! This is not the position of our group at the moment. In a resolution we have asked the Commission to go into this because it may well be that a North Sea convention is a good thing. But it is also possible that it is not a good thing. At the moment there are any number of treaties on the North Sea and they are not being implemented. If to this we add still another, will this improve matters? I ask this in all earnestness, and I want to know the hard facts before we as a committee say whether we want a North Sea convention. And Mrs Maij-Weggen must not distort the facts as perceived in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. I really must protest.

Right, Mr President, we are now considering the resolution as a whole. There are other points to be looked at as well. For two years now we have been wrestling with this report in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. We have had the Pickaver case. We have been thoroughly annoyed at the ways this report has been handled, and now we have the resolution. What makes it even worse is that we find this resolution weak and vague. It is the kind of resolution that says things like 'the North Sea is polluted, this and that is the problem' and then suggests that all the problems are solved. But they are not.

What we have in this resolution is quite unsatisfactory. It contains a number of things that do not conform to truth. Let me explain. Take, for example, recital F. It is somewhat inconsistent with recital H. This in turn is inconsistent with recital A. Recital I is not altogether sound either. It is not true that the countries have done nothing. They really have done something.

There are, then, a number of inconsistencies and inaccuracies in this resolution with which we cannot go along too happily. We also find the formulations in paragraph 3 (f) and (g) vague. We have therefore tabled amendments bringing in the instrument known as 'environmental impact statement', which in our opinion is a more effective means of achieving our object.

Our chief criticism, however, Mr President, is that the resolution wholly disregards the problem of the pollution of the sea with chemicals, a problem which is perhaps more serious than pollution of the sea with oil. I have tabled an amendment on this. Of course I find the contents of paragraph 4 (i) on nuclear energy much too weak. Nuclear plants have not to be 'improved': They must be closed. I am also unhappy — as is the group — with subparagraphs k and l of paragraph 4. Why may not the North Sea be polluted with all the things that are burned on ships and

Muntingh

dumped overboard? And what makes it right for the Atlantic Ocean to be polluted? It is simply shifting the problem somewhere else, and this is exactly what the Christian-Democratic Group are advocating with regard to nuclear energy and pollution of the atmosphere. The problem is transferred and no environmental solutions are found.

To sum up, Mr President, we consider this resolution weak, and even if our amendments were to be adopted, it would still be weak. But Socialists have a reputation for defending the weak, and so in this case they will do what they think is right: if our amendments are adopted, we shall vote for this resolution; if not, it will not be possible to give a favourable vote.

President. — Mrs Maij-Weggen, you asked for the floor. Do you want to speak in your capacity as rapporteur or is it to make a personal statement?

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I do not wish to respond to the personal attacks directed against me by Mr Muntingh, which are really rather absurd; I have better things to do. I merely wish to clear up one factual point, or perhaps two factual points. Mr Muntingh said that the concept of a convention was not a choice made by the Committee on the Environment. Might I point out that in my first version of the report the idea of a convention was not raised; but this was followed by resolutions, including one by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, in which this idea was indeed put forward. A discussion took place in the Committee on the Environment, after which the text was in fact modified to meet the wishes of colleagues. We did not insist on the idea; indeed I said in my report that this was not something of which we demanded acceptance. We only spoke of it as a possibility. A real possibility, as confirmed by Mr Sieglerschmidt, for instance. I just wanted to make that clear.

The second factual inaccuracy occurred, Mr President, when Mr Muntingh said that the report dealt only with oil pollution and not with chemical pollution. I must put that right. In the first place, one of the three chapters of the report deals wholly with chemical pollution and, secondly, two important paragraphs in the resolution are concerned entirely with chemical pollution. Indeed, a large number of chemical substances — notably cadmium and lead, but I could name a few more — are named quite specifically.

I repeat that I did not want to go into the personal attacks, but I thought it was right to correct a number of factual inaccuracies. I hope, Mr President, that you will spare me further attacks from Mr Muntingh, since they are not to be taken seriously and bring this Parliament into disrepute.

Mr Muntingh (S). — (NL) Mr President, I made no personal attack on Mrs Maij-Weggen. I merely attacked the report. That is the first point.

Second, I said that Mrs Maij-Weggen had made an incorrect statement. Mrs Maij-Weggen expressly said to the press and to us a moment ago — and you can check this in the report of proceedings that the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection had opted for a North Sea convention, and that is not the case. We asked for an inquiry into the possibilities of an environmental convention. That is what I said, and I repeat it with emphasis.

Finally, Mr President, I did not say that the subject of chemical pollution did not appear in Mrs Maij-Weggen's report. I said that it did not appear in the resolution. I was talking about the resolution and I found it weak.

I would end by saying that in no way was I making a personal attack on Mrs Maij-Weggen. I was acting perfectly properly. I simply said that I found the resolution as a whole vague and weak and I was being strictly matter-of-fact. I therefore refute this attack by Mrs Maij-Weggen, which is quite unfounded.

President. — Mr Muntingh, you may be sure that what you say will be recorded in the Report of Proceedings of this sitting.

Mrs Schleicher (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it was Mrs Maij-Weggen who, shortly after the first direct elections, raised in our group the problem of pollution of the North Sea. She has now given in her report an exhaustive account of the progress made by this pollution. At the same time, her report contains numerous demands and suggestions for improving the state of the North Sea, at least in the long term. The essential thing, though, is that both Commission and Council reach agreement as soon as possible with the littoral States on the measures that are needed and then take action.

In the last few days, headlines have reappeared in our newspapers such as, 'After the forests, it is the seabirds' turn', and it was stressed that not only damage to the environment but also atmospheric conditions can exert an influence. Not only that, the birds, already in a weak condition, are exposed to infectious diseases, and this was how the disaster occurred. Decisions have to be taken straight away, and we hope that the European North Sea Conference, chaired by the Federal Republic of Germany, will produce some useful proposals.

I therefore want to say once more, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, that our main demands are for an efficacious control or surveillance of the North Sea from the air, the introduction of technical inspections on board ship, the installations of special port facilities for disposing of used oil and dangerous liquids in order to prevent the ejection of these substances into the sea, and finally, stricter adherence to the existing laws and severer penalties for their violation.

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, it gives me great pleasure to take part in this debate tonight, because I am glad to welcome, on behalf of my group, the report of Mrs Maij-Weggen. I think she has put a great deal of work into it, and if anybody cares to read the explanatory statement. I think they will learn a great deal about some of the problems that we have to face.

My country, and my constituency of North-East Scotland in particular, depend greatly on the North Sea. I have 50% of the UK fishing-fleet and I also have the oil capital of Europe in Aberdeen. Therefore I have a significant interest in what is in this report.

Mr Sieglerschmidt said that the North Sea was a closed sea. I would contest that. It is not nearly as closed as the Mediterranean Sea, and we have not done very much about controlling pollution there. I would have thought that, as far as the North Sea is concerned, we are still in the fortunate position of having a fairly acceptable standard, but I agree entirely with the tone of the report in wanting to make certain that it gets better and not worse than it is at present. Therefore I believe that we want to improve controls but not necessarily add to bureaucracy.

I was intrigued in the combat that took place between Mr Muntingh and the rapporteur, and I was surprised to find that Mr Muntingh, in his remarks, was really implying that he did not want to see a convention set up because he only wanted to see a study carried out.

Having said that we want to improve controls, I must then go on to say that I find it extraordinary that within this report we talk about catch quotas and that type of thing. That has nothing to do with pollution. I am also surprised to find the talk about improving national regulations governing the living, safety and working conditions of personnel on offshore installations. That has really nothing to do with pollution of the North Sea. Nor has restricting military activity in tidal flats.

Nevertheless, the general tenor of the report is welcome. We must all realize that we have a great deal of work to do in the future if we are to stop harmful pollution of the North Sea. That we must stop while allowing trade and the economy to proceed as normal.

Mr Jürgens (L). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, first of all I wish to express to the rapporteur my appreciation of her document, which goes deeply into the problem of pollution of the North Sea. Pollution of the open sea, of rivers and of coastal areas is one of the biggest problems to be found in Northern Europe. Serious damage is being done to the marine environment, and even though we have been told that there is a quantity of national legisla-

tion on the subject, these laws contain many gaps and often overlap. The central point of this discussion is the need for developing and harmonizing laws on the pollution of the North Sea, extending right up to practicable central agreements.

We need a single convention to coordinate the implementation and supervision of existing laws and regulations, and I think all littoral States should have an interest in this. Who else but the European Community and its institutions should take the initiative here in starting and developing the activities required? All the littoral States should sit down at one table as soon as possible, and I do not share Mr Muntingh's view that a North Sea Conference is a waste of time. I am of the opinion that things cannot get worse than they are at present.

Until such agreements are concluded, we should also continue to investigate the causes and eliminate the consequences as far as possible. One of the most important things to do is to force shipping to avoid pollution. Mention has already been made of the cleaning of oil-tanks in port, but facilities must be provided for the disposal of solid waste. The cleaning of tanks at sea must be made punishable by a heavy penalty, but for this purpose surveillance and inspection are needed. The Netherlands have an excellent system of surveillance by means of aircraft with equipment capable of penetrating to great depths, but this sort of thing cannot be used to keep watch over the whole of the North Sea. Until there is an all-embracing system of surveillance covering also oil accidents, we must continue to promote the efforts of the voluntary organizations that have sprung up everywhere along the coast.

However, we should not forget the problem of dealing with the damage done by accidents. Now that the trap-ship 'Thor' has produced such excellent results in the removal of oil-slicks in the North Sea, I find it incredible that other types of vessel continue to be built. This trap-ship is the best thing possible for removing these slicks.

Another important point is the unloading at sea of industrial waste. Here all States should see to it that when this procedure is forbidden in another country this waste does not find its way into the North Sea *via* their own territory. In this connection, I think we must also consider the question where such waste has to find its final resting-place.

As regards the practice of depositing waste in rivers and the consequent pollution of the North Sea *via* these rivers, I will only say that when firms invest they are not always aware of what they are allowed and what they are not allowed to do. Big towns on

Jürgens

river estuaries also create a big problem. If they spent on sewerage plants no more than half of what small rural communities devote in the way of taxes *per capita* of the population to the same purpose, the problems arising from large cities on certain river estuaries would no longer exist.

Finally, we must very soon give a thought to the question how the fishermen, who, after all, have to bear the burden of this pollution of the North Sea, are to be compensated. Pollution has led to a decimation of fish-stocks which is only exceeded by that of the Members of this Parliament this evening, though this latter is certainly not due to any pollution of this House.

(Applause)

Mr Muntingh (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, it has just been said again, this time by Mr Jürgens — there appears to have been an error in the interpretation, I seem to be rather unlucky — that I am against a North Sea convention. That is not what I said. I said that at this moment we Socialists are neither for nor against a North Sea convention, that we simply want the matter looked into. I also said that this was stated in the resolution of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. I want that put in the record, because I do not wish to be known as someone who *a priori* is against a North Sea convention on behalf of the Socialist Group. It may well be a good thing, but first I want to see the relevant facts made clear.

President. — I have already told you, Mr Muntingh, that your statements will appear in the Report of Proceedings of this sitting. What you have just said will be reproduced there in its entirety.

Mr Turner (ED). — Mr President, I will make a point of not saying that Mr Muntingh said that he did not want a North Sea Convention. So that makes it perfectly plain. I support Mrs Maij-Weggen's report competely. The North Sea should be the quintessence of the EEC, with Denmark, Germany, Holland, Belgium, France and Britain around it. Yet of course it is not. The North Sea carries the greater part of the commerce of the EEC and yet we have less influence there as a community than anywhere else, because it is composed of water and not of land.

I believe we must plan the North Sea as a single area. We have the problem of jurisdiction over ships, depending on what their flag is and what ports they go into. Mr Sieglerschmidt said quite accurately that when you have great difficulties you can only take small steps. What I would say is this. Certainly, there are a great many difficulties, but we must take a great many small steps, coordinated as far as possible, and take them now. Mr Sieglerschmidt also said on behalf of the lawyers, of whom I am one, that the European Parliament should be the pacemaker for pollution

prevention in the EEC. I say this Parliament should be more. It should demand of the Commission that it demands of the Council that it gets together and deals with the North Sea sensibly and not in a nationalistic manner.

Mrs Maij-Weggen's report deals fully with many specific matters such as shipping safety, oil-rig safety and pollution with toxic chemicals. I want to refer to two matters. The first one is litter on beaches, which is a very serious matter in my constituency of Suffolk and Harwich. The beaches are rendered horrible by the number of plastic containers which are thrown from ships. Plastic containers, it has been calculated, last for four years once they have been thrown into the sea.

And so it is a very serious problem. The Convention of 1973 has an Annex V, which specifically bans throwing plastic materials overboard from ships, and Britain, Belgium and Holland have not signed that annex. Britain has said, for instance, that there are not sufficient facilities in the ports to take the refuse from ships when they are in port.

On the other hand, Denmark, Germany and France have signed Annex V. I call upon the other three to sign it forthwith. If three can do it, there is no reason why the other three should not do it too.

The second thing is oil-slicks. I thoroughly agree with Mrs Schleicher when she said that aerial surveillance is a good way of checking on them. In fact, I have been up in a very small aeroplane and watched slicks coming out of ships cleaning their tanks. It was possible to fly down so low that you could read the name of the ship and take a photograph of what was going on. I believe we should use aerial surveillance.

Three times in 1980 and 1981 the European Parliament called for compulsory pilotage of all oil tankers in congested waters of the EEC. I think we should call upon the EEC a fourth time to require this. The Legal Affairs Committee's amendments specifically refer to the previous occasions on which we have demanded that there should be compulsory pilotage for all oil tankers in the North Sea.

Finally, the largest pilotage area in the North Sea happens to be that of London, which covers a very large area, including my own constituency of Felixstowe, Harwich and Ipswich, as well as a great many other places. There is now a proposal that that area should be reduced to less than one-third of its present size by having 360 square miles taken off it. That would result in all north-bound ships for London crossing over the main line which every giant tanker takes through the Channel and crossing over the only line which all ships take when sailing southwards from Rotterdam, Antwerp, the North Sea and London. This proposal is down in order to save costs. On the other hand, in Germany one finds that the pilotage zone is now being extended from 7 miles to 20 miles

Turner

from the coast in certain areas. I call upon the Commission to take note of this and not to wash its hands of the matter. I have had meetings with the Commission and with the pilots of the European Pilots' Association asking them to take this matter up, and they have indicated that they have not got the power. I call upon the Commission to do something about this. The least they can do is to say to the authorities concerned that they do not approve of the idea of cutting down pilotage in the North Sea at this stage rather than increasing it. I call upon them to take such a positive step and to be bolder than they have been in the past in the North Sea and to take a lead. They may not have the legal right to demand this or that, but at least they can try and persuade. Mrs Maij-Weggen said they can all a conference and knock the heads of the governments together to get something settled.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) I should like to begin by thanking Mrs Maij-Weggen for her very meaty report, which was remarkable both for its very thorough analysis and also for the wealth of data contained in it. It has been of great assistance to us.

Before I go into the details, there are perhaps a few comments that I should like to make on the debate. First of all, there was the question of nomenclature, on which we had a difference of opinion between Mr Sieglerschmidt and Mr Provan. It is all a question really of getting the correct translation of the original term. I believe that the geographers and also the international conferences speak of semi-enclosed seas, and this is, in fact, the correct designation for the North Sea. It is like the Mediterranean, the Adriatic and other waters of this kind and is, I believe, also regarded as such in the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

My second comment is that, in the interests of completeness and accuracy, I should point out that the common fisheries policy, which we at long last successfully concluded some time ago, also has very marked environmental effects. At least it will have these effects if it is put into force — I should add that straight away. The reason for this is that it at least makes a substantial contribution to the conservation of fishery stocks and ought to prevent the over-fishing or indeed the destruction of certain fish species. That is, after all, the whole purpose of the TACs, and this is a point that ought not to be lost sight of in the debate.

My next remark has to do also in this case with the need to make some distinction between the monitoring and implementation of existing agreements and legislation on the one hand and the exactment of further legislation and agreements on the other. We have many conventions, particularly in regard to the North Sea, but in the case of almost all conventions

we have difficulties with regard to enforcement, monitoring and implementation. This is partly because some of the riparian States have hitherto refused to translate optional modes of proceeding into statutory obligations. In this connection the problem of plastic containers and similar waste should constitute a warning to the governments concerned that they should tighten up the statutory provisions available to them, in other words, that in the case of Marpol they should move certain things from Annex V to Annex I or Annex II. They cannot say that they do not have the possibility of taking sterner measures to counter abuses of this kind. It may be hard to do, but it has got to be done.

My next point is that I agree entirely with Mr Turner that the North Sea must increasingly come to be dealt with as a Community maritime transport area, with all the problems that this will involve. This is, of course, a long-term approach. However, for many reasons, including environmental and transport considerations, it is imperative that the North Sea should be approached in this way and that the legal grey area, which exists in this regard at the present time and is the cause of many disadvantages, should be kept as narrow as possible.

The Commission has frequently had occasion to voice its undeniable interest in the protection of the North Sea and will therefore make as full a contribution as possible to the aforementioned ministerial conference to be held in Bremen, probably towards the end of October. It is taking part in the working groups, some of which are dealing with precisely the matters that have been raised by one or other Member of this House. I am quite certain that by the end of the year we shall have a view of the problems and the answers — and also of the questions that still have to be put to the experts — that will be much clearer and more comprehensive than any view that we could have at this present time, even with the utmost goodwill and with the best information at our command. We are quite certain that the preliminary meetings for the Bremen conference will see a precise programme drawn up setting out the technical preparatory work that needs to be done and backed by preliminary reports, so that the conference can hold its discussions at a high level and can be expected to produce decisions.

As far back as March 1983, I had to tell this Parliament that its widely acknowledged shortage of staff will set a limit to what the Commission can do in the coming years. We shall be able to do what we would like to do and what this House rightly asks us to do only if the Council of Ministers comes up with basic changes in its staff policy. With the number of workers that we have available for this purpose, the required policy plans can be only partly put into effect, and that would be extremely regrettable.

Narjes

In this connection I must point out that in the hydrocarbons sector a Community information system was set up in 1981 to monitor and reduce oil pollution and that in 1983 the Commission forwarded to the Council a proposal for a directive on the drawing up of emergency plans to combat marine oil pollution as a result of accidents. It hoped that the conference on the protection of the North Sea, of which I have already spoken, will produce results that will make it easier for these proposals to be pushed through the Council of Ministers.

Mr Muntingh (S). — *(DE)* Mr Narjes, in today's debate on acid rain you said over and over again that the Commission could not do very much about the problem of acid rain and also about the problem of the North Sea. Now you say that the Council is to blame. Can no decisions whatever be taken within the Commission itself, or is there no possibility of shifting staff around so that more staff can be made available in the Directorate-General responsible? Can the Commission itself do nothing whatever about making any changes in the position with regard to staff, or must it always be, as you claim, a matter for the Council?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — *(DE)* I regret that I cannot go along with you on this point. On the contrary! The dilemma facing the Commission is like that of a doctor treating both typhoid and cholera patients at the same time and unable to make up his mind which of the two is the more serious. The way the Council of Ministers generally refuses requests for staff and then pushes staff around wholesale without going into the merits of the matter is simply not justifiable from a European point of view. That is why I never tire of bringing up this point at every opportunity. There are so many erroneous views and so many prejudices — in the press and to some extent also in this House — about the actual staff situation in the Commission that I have taken it on myself to avail myself of every opportunity to point out the constraints imposed upon the Commission by this refusal to give it sufficient staff, constraints that are directly opposed to the European objectives that this House has set itself and that the Commission has sworn in its oath of office to implement.

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

13. *Safety of holidaymakers and other travellers*

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Protopapadakis, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the safety of holidaymakers and other travellers (Doc. 1-1149/83).

Mr Protopapadakis (PPE), rapporteur. — *(GR)* Mr President, the task of applying a common tourist policy in the Community has begun to receive serious attention only recently. It is not too late, however, provided that work proceeds at a pace consonant with the importance of the issue. Tourism is not simply a form of entertainment. It is an activity which helps to enhance the quality of life and also to educate the public and cultivate civilizing influences, closer links between peoples and reciprocal understanding, all of which are prerequisites for the advent of the longed-for united Europe and for world peace.

At the same time, tourism is a major economic activity which contributes to a more even distribution of wealth and provides employment for millions of European citizens. Besides, tourist policy extends beyond leisure travel to the huge business travel sector, in which the economic importance of travel is greatly multiplied.

So the time is ripe for the European Parliament to discuss a matter which, if correctly handled, will do much to further the development of tourism and the adoption by the Community of a common tourist policy — namely, the safety of holiday-makers.

Travellers have the right to protection against the various hazards they may encounter on their journeys, and the competent authorities have a duty to provide it. However, such protection is also essential for the development of mass travel, as is shown by the much greater frequency of journeys to safe areas. This is exemplified by places like the Greek islands and similar tourist areas, whose tremendous attraction lies not only in their natural beauty and in the kindness and courtesy of their inhabitants, but also in the excellent safety conditions prevailing there. Safety on the islands is guaranteed by zero crime rates, which enable tourists to move about freely round the clock, the small size of hotels, which makes them less dangerous in the event of fire, and the evenness of the landscape, which substantially reduces the likelihood of accidents.

In the resolution under discussion, we therefore call on the Commission to take the necessary steps to standardize safety requirements in all regions of Europe where social conditions or technological development, together with economic exploitation and wild natural surroundings, expose travellers to hazards.

We wish travellers to feel at ease and be freed of the fear that dogged those of previous centuries. We also call on the Commission to speed up the procedures which will enable citizens of any Community country to receive proper medical care, with the insurance cover provided in their own country, if they fall ill while travelling in another EEC member country.

To achieve these objects, the Commission must issue the appropriate regulations and other provisions after completion of the necessary studies. These provisions

Protopapadakis

must be realistic — in other words, applicable without bureaucratic complications and devoid of conditions entailing excessive expenditure. Moreover, it is absolutely essential that all the texts should be formulated constructively — that is, in such a way as to enable an undesirable situation to be remedied without offending the individuals or Member States concerned. If these conditions are not met, action to improve the safety of travellers will in the end be detrimental to both travellers and tourism.

So much for the actual provisions to be adopted by the Commission. There is a further problem, however: the lack of a specialized department within the Commission to coordinate action in tourist policy matters. This makes it imperative to set up a directorate-general for tourist affairs as soon as possible under the authority of the appropriate Commissioner.

To conclude, allow me to strike a more personal note. Since all of us at the European Parliament, whether Members or staff, constantly travel from one European town to another, and since I myself am an islander living in Greece and habitually travelling from one island to another in the Aegean Sea, let me wish all travellers many a pleasant journey.

(Applause)

Mr Moreland (ED). — Mr President, I have always thought that when it comes to an own-initiative report of this Parliament, the model report is one that is concise, makes the main points, and emphasizes the main views that this Parliament would like to bring home. I think the report we now have before us is a model report, and I wish to support it without any reservation. I think it is one of the best jobs a rapporteur has done in this Parliament.

I only wish to add to it two or three small points. First, there are problems of insurance coverage for tourists around the Community; and they come back to us, as Members from our constituents who travel to other parts of the Community when they find they are not properly insured. This needs to be examined.

My second point is the whole question of legal aid for travellers around the Community. Here I would pay a compliment to the Commission, because I know that the Commission is trying to get Member States to ratify certain international conventions. I hope it succeeds. I am well aware that my own country and one or two other Member States are not as forward as they might be in ratifying these conventions, but I hope that they will. I would like to encourage the Commission in this respect.

Finally, and perhaps most immediately, I think the Commission ought to examine more thoroughly the question of coach safety in the Community. This is a growing sector of tourism, and we hope that the Commission will come forward with proposals, for if I

may put it in electoral terms, we were very concerned last summer about the many press reports relating to the question of coach safety. As some of us will be fighting an election in June, we do not want to find this problem cropping up again before then; so we hope the Commission will produce appropriate proposals.

In general, this is an excellent report and I hope the Parliament will back it.

Miss Hooper (ED). — Mr President, in our Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, we frequently say in relation to the many and varied proposals coming before us that the two main criteria to be applied to any proposals are: Is this a matter which is best dealt with at the European level, and secondly, is it a matter which can be properly and effectively implemented at the European level?

Naturally enough, since I was a mover of one of the motions for resolutions which caused this report to be drawn up, concerning, in particular, fire safety in hotels, I do consider that fire-safety standards can and should be dealt with on a Community basis. After all, free movement between Member States is something we seek to facilitate and encourage; and tourism, as Mr Protopapadakis has said and as we emphasized again and again during the debate on tourism in December, is a growth industry — and necessarily so in these days of increased leisure and high unemployment.

I trust, too, that in preparing proposals based on this report and request, the Commission will go carefully into the considerations of implementation, because standards are of no avail if they are not properly observed and monitored.

It is with great pleasure that I can say, that my group will support Mr Protopapadakis's report. I would also like to compliment him, as has my colleague, on its conciseness and succinctness.

Mr Battersby (ED). — Mr President, I too would like to congratulate Mr Protopapadakis on an excellent and most important report. There is, however, little point in our producing work of practical, long-term value to the Community if the Commission cannot physically implement or even examine our proposals.

I would therefore like to ask one question of the Commission. Is the Commission in a position to assure the Parliament that it will, in the reasonably near future, present its proposals in the field of tourism, particularly on the security of tourists, as detailed in the report which is now under discussion and also in response to the Viehoff resolution on a policy for tourism which was adopted by this Parliament last December?

Battersby

The reason for that question, Mr President, is that I fear that although we are trying to do something important in the field of tourism, which is the second largest industry in the Community, we are not giving the Commission the tools with which to carry out the will of this Parliament.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (S). — (DE) The Socialist Group is glad that at the second attempt this report has become the kind of report that one may well be proud to put before this Parliament. I have asked for the floor because I want to ask the Commission to supplement the report that we have before us with another document setting out its views with regard to future policy. Twice now in rapid succession the committee has discussed the problem of tourism — first in Mr Ceravolo's report and now in the report we have before us today. We took considerable pains with the report by Mr Ceravolo, particularly in the matter of consumer policy, i.e., the safety measures that must be enacted in favour of travellers. Nevertheless, within the overall dossier on tourism, the report naturally did not get all the attention that it required. That is why I take the liberty of calling attention once more to this report and of asking the Commission, in setting out its views, to take on board, all the important proposals put forward by Parliament in favour of consumers, by which, of course, I mean travellers.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) First of all I should like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Protopadakis, for his splendid report and for the opportunity afforded this House of considering this matter, even if it is at a rather late hour.

The Commission is well aware of the importance of tourism. It realizes that this is a growth industry, even if, in terms of real income, it is not growing as rapidly now as it previously did. It also realizes how much the development of tourism can contribute to the development of particular regions within the Community.

I should like to begin by taking up one point that was not gone into at all in the debate. It is of particular importance for tourism that further work should be done on dismantling frontiers, since it is the tens of millions of tourists crossing frontiers every year that have to suffer the harassment associated with customs clearance. That is why those Members of this House who push tourism should also support the campaign to have frontiers dismantled. It is in this area that we

have experienced probably the most bitter disappointment of the entire internal market within the last three years. Progress was made in all areas, but in the matter of dismantling frontiers we found ourselves continually running up against stone walls in the person of bureaucrats who used every trick and every pretext to perpetuate their own existence and to resist any attempts at dismantling. I hope that in April this House will have an opportunity, by supporting a very eminent resolution, to put its views on this matter so clearly that the European elections will finally compel the politicians to create the conditions under which frontiers can really be abolished.

The Commission is making systematic efforts to deal with the various individual aspects of tourism. Mention has already been made of motor-car insurance and similar subjects, which are currently engaging the Council of Ministers. Some time ago, we forwarded to the Council a recommendation on safeguarding hotels against fire with a view to introducing minimum standards on fire protection in the interests of the tourist, the consumer, in Europe. These standards are chiefly designed to ensure the safety and protection of travellers.

We are also making great efforts to ensure the safety of travellers in road traffic. Surveys on this matter were begun, and we are prepared, if the results of these surveys justify it, to introduce the corresponding measures. Finally, I feel that I can say that regional policy also deserves a mention in this connection. Mention should also possibly be made of an enlarged agricultural structures policy, because it is not only agriculture itself that needs restructuring. Investment in tourism should be encouraged in those regions in which the entire rural way of life stands in need of restructuring. This is a further aspect that I should not like to see overlooked in this debate.

I thank the House for affording me the opportunity of making all these points.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting-time.¹

(The sitting closed at 12 midnight)

¹ For the next sitting's agenda, see the Minutes.

*ANNEX**Votes*

The Annex to the Report of Proceedings contains the rapporteur's opinion on the various amendments and the explanations of vote. For a detailed account of the voting, see Minutes.

MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'Stockholm Conference'

— HAAGERUP (Doc. 1-1282/83)

— PENDERS (Doc. 1-1291/83)

— FANTI AND PIQUET (Doc. 1-1301/83)

REPLACED BY AMENDMENT No 1 WHICH WAS ADOPTED

* * *

MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'Intra-Community Trade'

— MØLLER (Doc. 1-1284/83)

— MARCK (Doc. 1-1286/83)

REPLACED BY AMENDMENT No 1 WHICH WAS ADOPTED

* * *

SCRIVENER MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1281/83 'Athens Summit'): ADOPTED

* * *

EUROPEAN DEMOCRATIC GROUP MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1279/83 'Airbus'): ADOPTED

* * *

GERARD FUCHS MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1294/83 'Angola'): REPLACED BY AMENDMENT No 1 WHICH WAS ADOPTED

* * *

JAQUET AND GLINNE MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1298/83 'Iran-Iraq Conflict'): ADOPTED

* * *

LADY ELLES MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1292/83/REV. 'Maltese National Party'): ADOPTED

* * *

ENRIGHT AND GLINNE MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1296/83 'Chile'): ADOPTED

* * *

MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'Natural Disasters'

— PROVAN (Doc. 1-1280/83): ADOPTED

— EWING (Doc. 1-1283/83): ADOPTED

— PEDINI (Doc. 1-1288/83): ADOPTED

* * *

WALZ REPORT (Doc. 1-1129/83 'Radioactive Waste'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was :

— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 10, 11 and 16;

— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 9, 12 to 15 and 17 to 20.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Viehoff (S). — (NL) I am in a somewhat difficult position in giving an explanation of vote on behalf of my group. The whole group will be voting against for the reason explained by Mr Schmid yesterday, i. e. that a number of amendments tabled by our group were rejected. I should like to make the following points on behalf of some of the Members in my group.

One of the problems with nuclear energy is that radioactive waste started to be produced before there had been any research into whether there was a solution to the question of disposing of the waste. The question about the storage of radioactive waste is not so much whether there is a safe solution, but rather which solution is the 'least bad'. It is quite likely, if there is any free choice in the matter, that this 'least bad' solution will be regarded as unacceptable.

The objective of Mrs Walz's report is to legitimize the production of radioactive waste. It amounts to a call for more nuclear power stations, and we reject this call. The report suggests that measures such as intermediate storage increase flexibility and should not be regarded as simply postponing any solution to the problems, since they will simplify all the subsequent stages. In our view these measures do, in fact, amount to postponing any solution to the problems. The fact is that it was only when radioactive waste had already been produced that we started looking at the problem of storage. All these intermediate stages, such as temporary storage, just introduce new risks. That is why we regard nuclear energy as being like an aircraft flying around with no landing strip available. It would be even more irresponsible to let more aircraft take off.

Some of Mrs Walz's arguments are wrong — for instance her suggestion that plutonium is totally unsuitable for military purposes. The American Atomic Energy Commission has undertaken tests with atom bombs containing plutonium from light-water reactors, and the tests were successful. The argument that disposal installations in thinly-populated areas are an instrument of regional and employment policy is also doubtful, since studies of this very question have shown that these disposal installations introduce activities which disturb the structure of the existing labour market, and the specialized work involved has to be carried out by people brought in from outside the region.

The fact that, after decades of nuclear energy, the European Parliament should be considering starting a Community storage project is an indication that the nuclear energy industry has failed. We do not see why we should have to use pseudo-solutions to rescue an industry which still has so many other unsolved problems. That is why we shall be voting against the motion.

Sir Peter Vanneck (ED). — With regret, for in general this report is excellent. I intend to abstain from giving it my support, because it does not preclude the transfer of noxious waste from one Member State to another, and this might mean that Billingham, in my constituency of Cleveland, ends up as a nuclear dustbin for Europe.

(Laughter from the left)

The only fortunate aspect at the end of the day is that there is no question of the British Government's allowing this to happen. So the people of Cleveland need not be terrified, even by the benches opposite, into thinking that the decision of Parliament this evening poses any threat to Billingham.

(Continuing laughter)

Because, despite the laughter, there is no built-in protection for urban populations, some of which my colleagues opposite may purport to represent, I do think the report is lacking an important dimension, and that is why I cannot endorse it.

Mr Beazley (ED), in writing. — There is no question but that Mrs Walz's report is an excellent one in every respect and fully deserves this House's support, including my own.

However, it is equally clear from the debate that there is a great difference between giving such a report general support and supporting it when you have the actual problem on your own doorstep. Only one speaker faced that problem of the likelihood of having a nuclear storage area in his own backyard.

It was noticeable that other speakers were keen to point out where it should *not* be dumped — at sea, for example, in built-up areas or even in rural areas where the population was very sparsely distributed. Where else then? In geographical strata like rock salt, granite or clay?

In Elstow — an ancient village a mere 2 or 3 miles from Bedford, a major population centre — tests are due to take place on storing low level waste in shallow clay structures on a site which actually has inhabited dwellings alongside part of its perimeter fence and villages, brickyards and farms nearby.

The heart of this matter is that you cannot have nuclear power without having the means for disposal of nuclear waste. The means of disposal and location must be decided at the start of the planning of nuclear power stations.

The authorities have the responsibility in this nuclear age of making the whole population of the Community aware of what nuclear radiation is and how people may be protected from it. Ignorance brings great fears. The population cannot be expected to learn this for themselves or take it on trust.

Where sites for nuclear disposal are investigated there must be public enquiries, where the necessary information is given and the hazards and safety precautions are fully discussed.

Paragraphs 11 to 18 deal with the problem of communicating with the public, which in practical experience has been shown to be vital. I believe, however, that more money and greater effort must be expended on this aspect of the problem. I emphasize this problem in order to support the report.

SELIGMAN REPORT (Doc. 1-1172/83 'Energy Research'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was :

- IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 3, 4, 9 to 12 and 14;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 2, 5 to 8 and 13.

Explanations of vote

Mr Veronesi (COM). — *(IT)* We have already announced that we could not accept Articles 14, 15, 16 and 17. We have changed our minds concerning 15, but cannot accept the others. We shall therefore vote against the motion.

I would, however, repeat that we agree with the Commission's programme: our vote against the motion only concerns the motion itself.

Mr Wurtz (COM), in writing. — *(FR)* The French members of the Communist and allies group endorse the Commission's declared will to strive to develop community policies for the use, production and supply of energy. Development of such policies is an essential element in the European industrial area which has already been proposed by the French government.

Having said this much the question remains of the ultimate objectives which are being sought. For communists the answer is clear: we must create the conditions which will give new impetus and develop employment.

Seen in this light, the proposal to establish a tax on energy consumption seems unlikely to produce any positive effect. We also reject the concept of a special tax on non-industrial energy consumption. Its only effect would be to harm further the domestic consumption of our own countries.

As regards employment, we are forced to note that the Commission does not mention the question. The social aspects of the proposed five-year programme are totally ignored, perhaps because they are unimaginable. The question does indeed deserve to be asked, in the light of the Commission's proposals for a solid fuels policy, which include plans for redundancies and criteria for the award of subsidies intended to modernize the coal industry.

Since the Commission is seeking a tax to finance its programmes, may I lastly suggest something very simple.

My proposal is similar to that put forward by the rapporteur, but has the advantage of being technically simpler to set up. It figured in the text of the Rogalla report which we have already debated. My proposal is to apply Article 27 of the ECSC Treaty, which provides for customs duties to be applied to imported coal products.

Although his proposal to tax imports is in line with our own views, we shall evidently not be supporting Mr Seligman's motion for resolution.

His proposal to secure the safety of energy supply lines outside NATO territory is enough to ensure our disapproval. Threats cannot be used as a basis for constructive political dialogue aimed at cooperation.

* * *

ISRAËL REPORT (Doc. 1-1143/83 'ACP-EEC'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was :

— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 and 4.

Explanations of vote

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — *(FR)* I listened to Mr Ortoli this morning, defending Angola's accession to the Lomé Convention, and I have to say that my profound respect for Mr Ortoli did not prevent my doubting, like Saint Thomas : I still neither agree nor accept. Rightly or wrongly, I still feel that Angola remains the prisoner of the Soviet Union and its allies, and that for Angola, membership of the Lomé Convention represents not the road to a new future but a lifeline for a régime which in spite of its uncertainties, in spite of its divisions, remains a prisoner.

I have just returned, Mr President, from Grenada, where the Governor-General expressed to me his considerable dismay at the aid provided by the Community to the Soviet-supported Bishop régime, in offering a grant for the construction of the airport ...

(Protests from the left)

If you please ... you may interrupt me when I have finished ... The problem in both Grenada and Angola seems to me to be that we must, without awarding black marks and bonus points, be selective in the aid we offer. We do not ask for unconditional allegiance from the Lomé countries, certainly not, but we are entitled to insist that any aid we supply should not be turned against us.

Since items 10 and 11 are being maintained, I shall be abstaining in the vote on the Israël report. My personal respect for the rapporteur obliges me to assure him that I have absolutely no wish to appear defiant in so doing.

Mr Pearce (ED). — We shall be voting in favour of this report and the comment I want to make really refers to why we were unable to support some of the amendments. I want to make it very clear that we are frightened, worried and shocked at the continuing presence of Eastern bloc troops — Cubans, Russians and so on — in Mozambique and Angola, and the sooner these people are removed the better.

We feel, nevertheless, that we should maintain the offer of welcome to Angola and Mozambique to join our Lomé Convention when they feel ready so to do. We believe, in fact, that having that welcome available for them is perhaps the best way of getting these accused Communist troops out of that part of southern Africa, thereby contributing towards the establishment of peace in that region.

Mr Denis (COM). — *(FR)* The parliamentary assembly of the Lomé Convention has proved its worth as a forum for dialogue and political initiative, and as the means of democratic control of the Community's development policy. It is always possible to improve it further, and it is proper to be working towards the prospect of Lomé III. We have one major constraint : our cooperation involves 600 million men, women and children, as we are reminded by the report, and it must be designed to meet the mutual interest of all the people. We must therefore strive towards real parity, and eschew anything which tends towards a unilateralist 'Europeanist' attitude — if I may use the term — whether we are talking about policies, or about the nature and the management of our cooperation.

Our countries are going through a crisis, but we must not forget that hunger is still a real problem — I am thinking of the Sahel, of Mozambique, and of others. The consultative assembly was right to call for long-term supply contracts for the supply of agricultural produce to our ACP partners. It is in all our interests. Let us try to keep in mind their

views on human rights, and to remember their constant calls that economic support for the Pretoria régime of apartheid should cease. We are committed by our resolution on the subject. On the eve of the Brazzaville talks we shall, in this light, be supporting the motion for resolution.

Mr Gérard Fuchs (S). — *(FR)* I should quickly like to draw to the attention of Mr Beyer de Ryke one small historical fact with which I am sure he is already familiar. Why were Cuban troops sent to Angola in the first place? I think we should remind ourselves that they were called in by the government of Angola in 1975 — no Mr Beyer de Ryke, I didn't interrupt you; don't you interrupt me — to stop a South African military advance which was only 250 kilometres from Luanda ...

(Interruption by Mr Vandewiele)

... Oh yes, they were — you check the facts. Shouting never prevented facts from being checked.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope and I believe that the government of Angola also wishes to see the Cubans go, but I tell you now that the best and quickest way of ensuring that they do leave is for Namibia to become independent, and, therefore, for South Africa to withdraw from Namibia.

(Applause from the left)

* * *

Carettoni-Romagnoli Report (Doc. 1-933/83 'International Development Association): ADOPTED

Mr Bersani, deputy rapporteur, was

— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1 to 3.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Poirier (COM). — *(FR)* In reducing their aid by 50 % the United States are implementing the restrictive policy towards developing countries which they have been advocating for some time, particularly towards the poorest of them.

The consequences are very serious indeed. The African countries south of the Sahara and the countries of Asia are the principal beneficiaries of the IDA, and will of course be the worst affected. The result is that all the Community's efforts, particularly those aimed at helping the least developed countries, are now jeopardized.

The United States government is ostensibly using cooperation policy as an instrument of political training. We must not forget that whilst the US contribution continues to fall steadily, they still do all they need to maintain their hegemony in international organizations.

In our view, the Member States of the Community must, in order to face up to this situation, evidently and first of all, respect their side of the undertakings given, so as to ensure the independence of the Association. This, indeed, is what Mrs Carettoni calls for in her report. It strikes us as odd, to say the least, the the Council has made no public statement and made no comment on this very serious question.

On the contrary, the Council must urgently use all its influence to persuade the US authorities to scrap their decision.

* * *

**Saby Report (Doc. 1-1110/83 'Community Financing of Research and Industry') :
ADOPTED**

Explanation of vote

Mr Edward Kellett-Bowman (ED). — It is with some regret that I cannot support this report from the Committee on Budgetary Control. When it came before us for voting, I was concerned that we were stepping over the bounds of the responsibilities of the Committee on Budgetary Control and into those of our colleagues on the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology. I managed to get some amendments down, but my worries were somewhat assuaged by the assurance I received — a categorical assurance, Mr President — that the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology had been consulted about the contents of the report which was before us. I think it is a question of over-enthusiasm on the part of the rapporteur, and for that reason I cannot support the report and must abstain and invite my colleagues so to do.

* * *

**Pruvot Report (Doc. 1-970/83 'European Charter on the Rights of Patients') :
ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was :

- IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17 and 18 ;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 6, 8, 11 to 13, 16, 20 and 21.

Explanations of vote

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — (DE) I shall vote for the resolution, although I should like expressly to exclude the point that I have just mentioned, namely paragraph 3 (c) 'the patient's right of access to his own medical data'. I believe that all that is necessary is fully stated in the first sentence and that such a far-reaching provision can, under certain circumstances, lead to very difficult consequences which I should not like to see.

Owing to the short time at my disposal, I cannot expand that point any further, but I can vote in favour of the motion especially since the 'euthanasia' amendments were rejected. For all my German colleagues, the word 'euthanasia' brings back terrible memories, and I speak here as someone who has taken part in many seminars and discussions on this subject. In principle, the matter is of course open to discussion, and yet if we want to draft it in legal form, which may in some ways lead to highly dubious results, ...

(The President interrupted the speaker, who had exceeded his speaking time)

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — (NL) I too am in favour of this report, although I very much regret that the paragraphs referred to by Mr Sieglerschmidt were not approved. Mr Eisma gave a very dignified presentation of his own and my amendments in the course of the debate. I do not think that a difficult moral problem can be solved if we refuse to talk about it or to think about it. Every day doctors are confronted with the moral dilemma of whether or not to agree to a patient's request to be able to die in dignity. Every day hospital staff are faced with the problem of deciding when a biological extension of life is no longer necessary. I believe that we shall have to devote a serious debate to this problem — if not today, then sometime in the months or years to come.

Mrs Schleicher (PPE). — *(DE)* The resolution that we have before us is very different from what was originally tabled. I was in favour of the previous motion, but after certain points have been amended I must vote no, because otherwise the impression could be given that the whole Parliament voted for all the proposals. I should like to state that I cannot agree with all the points.

Mrs Pruvot (L), rapporteur. — *(FR)* I should like to say much the same thing. I believe it is the responsibility of the rapporteur to draw Parliament's attention to the fact that as a result of various factors affecting the plenary vote which has just taken place, such as the mass abstention of the European Democrats, the motion for resolution which is now submitted to the House's vote bears very little resemblance to the motion for resolution originally proposed, which had been approved by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

I do not wish to advise the House on how to vote ; I merely wish to point out that what we now have has very little to do with the original text, and that we are embarking on a highly restrictive project which falls outside our own competence.

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 20 JANUARY 1984

Contents

1. <i>Welcome</i>	289	<i>wood; Mr Contogeorgis (Commission)</i>	295
2. <i>Votes</i> <i>Mr Sherlock; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Sherlock; Mr Contogeorgis (Commission); Mr Sherlock; Mr Gbergo; Mrs Maij-Weggen</i>	290	6. <i>IPDC — Report (Doc. 1-1154/83) by Mr Marck</i> <i>Mr Marck; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Contogeorgis (Commission); Mr Marck; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Marck</i>	299
3. <i>Classification of goods — Report (Doc. 1-1161/83) by Mr Turner</i> <i>Mr Turner; Mr Contogeorgis (Commission)</i>	291	7. <i>Deadline for tabling amendments</i> <i>Mr Seligman</i>	301
4. <i>Discrimination in the matter of passing on nationality — Report (Doc. 1-1166/83) by Mrs Cinciari Rodano</i> <i>Mrs Cinciari Rodano; Mrs Van Hemel-donck; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Contogeorgis (Commission); Mrs Cinciari Rodano</i>	293	8. <i>Adjournment of the session</i>	301
5. <i>Crisis in the tanning industry — Report (Doc. 1-1157/83) by Mr Gauthier</i> <i>Mr Gauthier; Mrs Viehoff; Mr McCartin; Mr Beazley; Mr Maher; Sir Fred Cather-</i>		<i>Annex</i> <i>Mr Muntingh; Mr Hutton; Mrs Weber; Mr Simmonds; Mr Wurtz; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Kyrkos; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Kirk; Mr Muntingh; Mr Nyborg; Mr Simmonds; Mr Patterson; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Kallias; Mr Pearce; Mrs Ewing</i>	302

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

President

(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)¹

1. *Welcome*

President. — I have great pleasure in welcoming to the European Parliament the delegation from the United States Congress which has just taken its seats in the gallery.

(Applause)

¹ Approval of minutes — Verification of credentials — Petitions — Motion for a resolution (Rule 49) — Documents received — Referral to committee — Procedure without report (Rule 99): See the Minutes of this sitting.

I should like to extend a special welcome to its two co-chairman Tom Lantos and Larry Winn.

This is, I think, the twenty-third interparliamentary exchange between the European Parliament and the US Congress, which is in itself an indication of the strong and well established traditional links we have with the US Congress.

Our American guests will spend the rest of the day discussing with our own delegation the complex and numerous problems which affect transatlantic relations. I wish them every success and a very pleasant stay here in the European Parliament and in Strasbourg.

(Applause)

2. Votes¹

SHERLOCK REPORT (Doc. 1-1127/83 — PROTECTION OF WORKERS)

*Proposal for a directive**Article 14 (1) — Amendments Nos 18 and 79/rev.*

Mr Sherlock (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, Amendment No 18, tabled by the committee, was supported by the committee, but I would draw voters' attention to the observation yesterday by the Commission that, if it is carried, they have neither the power nor the ability in any way to carry out this recommendation, which is that the Commission should assume powers of derogation. They denied yesterday that they possessed those powers. Therefore, though it was found the other way in committee, I would recommend either that this be withdrawn or that Members vote against it. I would prefer, however, that it be withdrawn.

After the rejection of Amendment No 18

Mr Sherlock (ED), rapporteur. — I would point out, Mr President, that now the original Commission proposal will stand and that the powers of derogation will rest with the Member State governments, which alone have the power to implement and inspect.

Article 14 (2) — Amendment No 19

Mr Sherlock (ED), rapporteur. — This amendment must fall, because it would require — if Amendment No 18 had been accepted — that the Commission inform itself of derogations granted. We can restore the original text, which I think would be better, i.e. that the Member States be required to inform the Commission as was originally intended. This could well be covered by the decision on Amendment No 18.

President. — Mr Sherlock, lest there should be any dispute as to whether or not it is covered, I think we should vote on Amendment No 19 unless you withdraw it.

Mr Sherlock (ED), rapporteur. — I will withdraw Amendment No 19 for the reasons I have given, Mr President.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — (IT) Mr President, it seems to me that there is an error in this amendment. The last word should not read 'Commission' but 'Parliament'. The result of the voting on the previous amendment is that the Commission is no longer empowered to grant derogations, but it is given the right to keep a register of all derogations and to communicate these to Parliament. I feel, Mr Sherlock,

that there is no need to throw out the amendment entirely; all we have to do is to make 'Parliament' the last word, and then the amendment makes sense. Furthermore, it could be very helpful to know in which countries derogations were being granted. This amendment would give us a single place in which all the derogations were gathered together, a book, so to speak, in which we all can read.

IN THE CHAIR: MR KLEPSCH

*Vice-President**Annex II — After the vote on Amendment No 21*

Mr Sherlock (ED), rapporteur. — At this point I think it would be appropriate to ask a representative of the Commission how it views the proposal now as amended. I intended to use Rule 36 (1) or 36 (2) of our Rules, as appropriate, unless I get a satisfactory answer.

Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Mr President, a number of amendments are intended to improve the wording of the text. These are acceptable to the Commission. However, as my colleague Mr Ortoli said yesterday, the Commission cannot accept Amendment No 3, which deletes Article 1, paragraph 2.

With regard to the amendments concerning limit values and the level at which action should be taken, Mr Ortoli explained yesterday that the Commission's proposal was justified on a number of counts. For that reason, and in view of his remarks, I cannot but uphold the Commission's position.

The Commission is consequently unable to accept these amendments in their present form.

Mr Sherlock (ED), rapporteur. — I would just like to take up the fact that the committee recommended, and this House has voted in favour of, Amendment No 3 under the impression that, as Article 100 of the Treaty is the foundation for this proposal, this exclusion granted under Article No 3 is not appropriate. In general, we are not greatly opposed to the exclusions which Article No 3 would have given and acknowledge, as Mr Ortoli said yesterday, that this is the usual thing, but we felt it was not entirely appropriate to the use of Article 100. I am sure we can very easily reach some agreement with the Commission on this particular point.

I presume that the point on which Mr Contogeorgis wishes to consult with his colleagues is the fact that we as a Parliament have departed from the numerical standard laid down in the Commission's original proposal.

¹ See Annex.

Sherlock

I think, therefore, that to withdraw under Rule 36 would be the appropriate thing for me to do at this time. This will bring the matter back to the committee, where I am sure we can discuss it further with the Commission.

(Parliament decided on referral back to committee)

Mr Ghergo (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, forgive me if I return to the matter we have been discussing. Rule 36 says that referral back to committee may be requested when the Commission refuses to accept the amendments.

If I have understood correctly, the Commissioner did not, in fact, turn down these amendments. On the contrary, he said that they improved the text and that the Commission would welcome them.

President. — Obviously you did not follow what Commissioner Contogeorgis was saying. He made it quite clear that he agrees with the objections raised by Mr Ortoli at the very outset. These objections refer mainly to Article 3, where the Commission is not in a position to accept Parliament's amendments.

MAIJ-WEGGEN REPORT (DOC. 1-1173/83 — POLLUTION OF THE NORTH SEA)

After the vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE), rapporteur. — *(NL)* Mr President, a certain impression has been given that in the Dutch press I gave an interpretation of the content of this resolution that departed from the actual tenor thereof. I feel that I must dispute this. The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection — and this emerges quite clearly from the report — came out very clearly in favour of the idea of a Convention and plainly asked the Commission to study this and to set out the various possibilities in a memorandum before the forthcoming North Sea I must therefore reject what Mr Muntingh says and stand by the interpretation that I have given on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. I think this makes the matter clear.

3. Classification of goods

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-1161/83) by Mr Turner, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-575/81 — COM(81) 483 final) for a Regulation on the information provided by the customs authorities of the Member States concerning the classification of goods in the customs nomenclature.

Mr Turner (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, this report amends, to a certain extent, a proposed directive concerning customs affairs, and it is quite a simple matter. The politics behind it are also quite simple.

The simple matter is this. If you go to a customs officer and ask for information about the classification of some goods which you want to buy or sell — and you may want to enter a contract lasting a year or two and know that throughout the life of that contract the classification of goods and therefore also the rate of duty will remain unchanged — in some countries of the EEC, i.e. Germany, Holland and Denmark, generally speaking the customs authorities will feel themselves bound by the information they give you, and so you can go ahead with your contract in confidence. In certain, other countries, notably the United Kingdom and Ireland, customs officers do not find themselves bound by any information they have given. This directive proposes that there should be a binding nature to information given by customs officers as to the classification of goods when a person asks a customs authority in the EEC. That is the commercial aspect of it.

The political aspect is this. There is an ideal system, which would be that if you ask a customs officer anywhere in the EEC about the classification for particular goods, he will be bound by that information and so will all the other authorities in the EEC. Otherwise, of course, there is no harmonization whatsoever. So we in the Legal Affairs Committee say that if information is given by one customs authority, then it should be binding not only on that authority but on the others too.

I have no doubt that the Commission prefers this solution as being the ideal. However, because they are dealing with the Council of Ministers and the national governments, they have had to settle for something less. They have settled for less in this respect: they have said that information given by the authorities of one state is not binding on the authorities of another state. They have gone further in compromising with the national governments. They have also said that the information given by a particular office in one state will not necessarily be binding on all other offices in that same state.

Mr President, you can see therefore that the degree of harmonization obtained by this proposal is not very great, although I must say, from a practical point of view, I think it would be a great step forward, and anything that comes out of the Council of Ministers — I should say wrung out of the Council of Ministers by the ingenuity of the Commission — is to be welcomed by this Parliament, however imperfect it may be.

Turner

What we in the Legal Affairs Committee have done is this. We have amended the proposals so as to render them truly harmonizing proposals in the ways I have mentioned to you. We do not expect the Commission to change their proposals and go back to the Council with our more perfect proposals, because we know that the Commission wants to get something out of the Council, however little. We do not, of course, expect the Council of Ministers to accept what we are proposing, but we hope they will at least make some step forward.

That is the background to the amendments. Now, I shall just go through them quite quickly individually. First of all, in Amendment No 2 we say that information given by one national authority should be binding on the other national authorities. The Commission disagrees with that because they say the national governments will not accept it.

In Amendment No 3 we say that information given by any national authority shall be binding on the other authorities in the same state. There again the Commission has had to assume a lower profile.

In Amendment No 4 we say that one can make applications throughout the EEC on the same form. In the Legal Affairs Committee in Brussels in September the Commission representatives actually accepted this proposal. However, at a subsequent meeting in Berlin, the Commission representatives did not accept that proposal, so they appear to have changed their minds. It is a very small matter and it merely requires that the forms shall be the same in each country rather than each country making up its own form.

I now come to three important amendments — Nos 5, 7 and 10. Unfortunately No 10 in the English text is called No 11 because of a typographical error, but in the French text it is correct. These all deal with the question of whether the offices of a particular national authority shall all be bound by the information given by one of their offices. We say yes. The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs in its opinion said yes, and the Economic and Social Committee in its opinion also said yes. I am sure the Commission would like to say yes, but because they are dealing with the Council they are saying, for the moment, no. I ask the House to vote yes and let the Commission go back to the Council and tell them they can have their little bit of harmonization but Parliament really wants them to do more, as they ought to have done.

Amendment No 6 says that where there is a difference between the classification given by one authority and that given by another authority, the matter shall be taken to the Committee on Common Customs Tariff Nomenclature. The Commission accepts that amendment. Amendment No 8 says that any binding information given to a person shall also be binding on the authorities with his successors and assigns. Here again in Brussels the Commission representatives, on 28 and 29 September, expressly said that they agreed

with this amendment. Incidentally, when I refer to the Commission agreeing with the amendments in Brussels, the matter has been checked up. I spoke to the Commission officials earlier this morning via the Legal Affairs Committee secretariat, who have listened again to the tape of the debate that took place in the Legal Affairs Committee, and they have confirmed that what we say in the introduction to this report — i.e. that the Commission only objected to four amendments — is correct or was correct at the time that they met us in September. Since then, in the meeting in Berlin, it would appear that they have changed their mind.

Amendments Nos 11 and 12 — in the English text the second Amendment No 11 because of the typographical error I referred to, but in the French text it is correct — merely switch round the proposal from one article to another, and the Commission accepts them. Again in Amendments Nos 13 and 9 in the French text — No 10 in the inaccurate English text — certain proposals are switched round from one article to another, and again the Commission accepts them. Finally, Amendment No 14, which is also accepted by the Commission, provides that there will be an annual report made on activities by the national governments under the provisions of the directive.

I hope that Parliament will accept all the Legal Affairs Committee amendments. As I say, they are true harmonization. We sympathize with the Commission and the Commissioner, who is now going to tell you that he has to go in for untrue and imperfect harmonization because of the imperfection of the human race and notably of the Council of Ministers and national customs authorities. I think we are all aware that national customs authorities suffer from some of the failings of the human race. I hope the Commissioner, in objecting to some of these amendments, will not push too hard, because he knows in his heart that they are the right ones and that one day we will have them. If today we vote for them, we will be leading the Council of Ministers, the Commission and the EEC rather than following.

Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Mr President, I should like to thank Mr Turner for the very thorough report he has submitted to Parliament. His community spirit is truly remarkable and the solutions he proposes would be ideal if there was a chance of their being accepted and immediately applied. Unfortunately, however, the present structure of government precludes acceptance of all his proposals.

The Commission's proposal is designed to introduce an element of security into trade and improve terms of competition. This Parliament has shown tremendous interest in it, as is apparent both from Mr Turner's report and the number of amendments tabled.

Contogeorgis

Mr President, to allay any doubts as to the Commission's views on these amendments, let me state which ones it accepts and which ones it does not. The numbers I shall refer to are those in the French text, since there are some discrepancies in this respect, as the debate revealed. The Commission endorses, and is prepared to accept, Amendments Nos 1, 9, 10 and 12 to 16. On the other hand, it cannot accept Amendments Nos 2, 3 and 7 because the present structure of the customs union does not yet enable reliable tariff information to be collected at Community level. It would be ideal if it did, but it is unfortunately impossible under present conditions.

Neither can the Commission accept Amendments Nos 4, 5, 8 and 11, because they concern the technical aspect of the operation of the system, in which information is binding on the government that supplies it. In the Commission's view, these amendments fail to secure a substantial improvement in the importer's position and may in fact make it more difficult to operate the system.

Those were the points I wished to make, Mr President, I should like to thank Mr Turner once more for his report.

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote¹

4. *Discrimination in the matter of passing on nationality*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-1166/83) by Mrs Cinciari Rodano, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on discrimination in the matter of passing on nationality.

Mrs Cinciari Rodano (COM), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, Parliament has already dealt with the interaction between Community law and national laws in the matter of acquisition and transmission of citizenship. I would refer to the resolution of 11 February 1981 which calls for the elimination of discrimination in this connection; I would also mention the adoption in September 1981 of the Malangré resolution on a Bill on British citizenship, again on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, which stresses the dangers of interference. I must also point out that on the Tuesday of this part-session, the request was renewed for harmonization of the legislations of Member States in the matter of the acquisition and transmission of citizenship.

In actual fact the legislations of the Member States in this connection — although extremely complex — are based on a common principle in respect of the acquisition of citizenship, i.e. the legitimate son

acquires the citizenship of the father and the natural son acquires the citizenship of the mother. The exceptions are France, Ireland, United Kingdom and Italy which have recently brought in changes.

As to the acquisition of citizenship by way of marriage, ordinarily a male or female citizen who marries a foreigner maintains his or her own citizenship. But here too there are exceptions, as in the case of Belgium, where the woman loses her citizenship unless she declares within six months that she wishes to retain it, and in that of Greece, where it is always lost, unless a similar declaration is made within one year.

In these countries, moreover, foreign wives automatically acquire the nationality of the husband; conversely, in no case does a foreigner marrying a female citizen from a Community country automatically acquire the citizenship of the wife.

Now it is the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee that such legislation does not respect the principle of equal treatment of the sexes as regards the passing on of nationality and marriage between spouses of different nationalities. The above situations continue to exist in the Community, even if, as demonstrated by the laws recently adopted in Italy on the passing on of nationality and the family-law legislation in Greece, there is a trend towards reform.

However, I must point out to the Assembly that the *de facto* situations that arise are often extremely distressing. Marriages in the Community between citizens of different nationality, whether following upon emigration or the movement of the workforce, are very common. It may happen, for instance, that a father leaves the country in which he was married. The children born of that marriage acquire the citizenship of the father. If he takes them away from the mother, she is deprived of the children without any possible say in the matter by a court of law. There are also exceedingly complicated special cases: I take it that my fellow Members have been able to consider these.

Furthermore, all these problems may and do result in obstructions both to freedom of movement and to freedom of establishment within the Community. For this reason I would draw the attention of members of the Commission to the proposals of the Legal Affairs Committee on which we base our position.

Article 3 of the EEC Treaty requires the elimination of obstacles to the free movement of labour. National legislation on the acquisition and passing of citizenship, as we have seen, may have a wider Community significance. Moreover, the case law of the European Court of Justice recognizes the role of international instruments in relation to the rights of the individual, including the principle of equal treatment of the sexes, among the sources of Community law. Accord-

¹ See Annex.

Cinciari Rodano

ingly, in the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee, the Commission could draw up, under Article 235 of the EEC Treaty, a recommendation to the Member States requiring them to harmonize their respective legislations with a view to attaining three objectives: equal rights in the passing on of nationality by the father or the mother, whether to children born within a marriage or to natural children; equal rights between husband and wife in passing on citizenship in the event of marriage, thus avoiding a plurality of nationalities.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — (NL) Mr President, I am a member of the Socialist Group, but I shall confine myself to speaking on my own behalf, because I mainly want to draw attention to the situation in Belgium with regard to nationality.

The problem of passing on nationality is a fairly complicated one, and there are often conflicts between those who attach great importance to legal security and those who primarily think of the social aspects. Often there is a conflict when the legal system in one of the different countries is based on *ius soli* and that in the other is based on *ius sanguinis*.

In Belgium, men and women have very unequal status as regards the right to pass on nationality, whether by descent or marriage. A husband can confer his nationality upon his wife, but the reverse is not possible. A child receives its nationality from the father, and from its mother only when she is unmarried and the child is not acknowledged by the father.

Serious consequences, for example, in cases where the custody of the child is at issue, may arise from the fact that the Belgian National Commission on the status of women has recommended that men and women should have the same rights as regards conferring nationality either on the children or on the spouse. This, of course, may mean that a child under age has dual nationality. I know that lawyers always look at this sort of thing with misgiving, but I think it is the only system capable of offering the child dual protection, and this, after all, is the most important thing.

We attach great importance to the integration of these laws, these arrangements, in view of the fact that the number of mixed marriages grows from year to year. This is due to the increased mobility of workers and also, perhaps, to the fact that the concept of nationality is tending to fade and we all prefer to acknowledge our European identity, which in itself is very desirable. I therefore urge support for Mrs Cinciari Rodano's recommendation that we give equal treatment to men and women as regards the right to hand on one's nationality and that we always bear in mind the solution that is more favourable for the child, even if this entails legal complications.

Mr Tyrrell (ED). — Mr President, first I would like to congratulate the rapporteur on her resilience at the

end of what has been for her an extraordinarily heavy week. Secondly, I would like to say that Community nationality is a very precious privilege. The illegitimate child should not be deprived of rights to nationality that a legitimate child enjoys. I prefer to base them on the principle that the rapporteur and the Legal Affairs Committee have advanced rather than on the rights of the parents who are responsible for the birth of the illegitimate child. Non-discrimination against the illegitimate child is the principle that we are here most concerned with.

There are technical problems, of course, which arise from the identification of the father of the illegitimate child. Various Member States have attempted to deal with these technical problems in various ways. That they can be dealt with and overcome has been established by a number of Member States which have, in fact, solved them successfully. What we are doing today is to call on those who have not yet grappled with this problem to bring their laws up to date in order to avoid the quite unfair, unnecessary and historic discrimination against the illegitimate child.

The rapporteur referred to the debate on the British Nationality Bill that this Parliament held in 1981. At that time I did prophesy that the British law would be changed in order to recognize the principles contained in the Legal Affairs Committee's report and I am, of course, only too happy to be able to stand here now and say that British law does now reflect those principles. Of course, nationality is a matter for the parliaments of the Member States. All we can do is make recommendations. That is the course which the rapporteur urged upon the Legal Affairs Committee; that is the course which this Parliament is now urging on Member States.

Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) As Mrs Cinciari Rodano's report makes clear, nationality law is an extremely complex area in which national provisions vary considerably. They may by their very nature affect nationals of other Member States — especially in the case of marriage between aliens — and may give rise to a number of problems. Yet we cannot ignore the fact that it is for the Member States to lay down the conditions on which a particular nationality may be granted; it is clearly very difficult for them to accept the idea of Community authority to harmonize national legislation on the matter. For even if the provisions in force in the Member States resulted in unequal treatment of men and women, the Community would not be entitled to intervene, since it has no general mandate to ensure that the Member States comply with the principle of equality between the sexes. Of course the European Community must respect fundamental rights, but this does not empower it to ensure that the Member States do so as part of national public policy.

Contogeorgis

It might also be pointed out that the differences in existing national legislation cannot affect workers' freedom of movement or the right of establishment, because every national of a Community State possesses the nationality of at least one EEC country.

This being so, I do not see on what grounds the Commission could justify taking action under Article 235 of the Treaty. The Commission nevertheless acknowledges that Community citizens are liable to find themselves in difficult situations and is therefore willing to examine the issue and indeed recommend, if necessary, that the Member States take appropriate action on it.

IN THE CHAIR : MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote*¹

After the explanations of vote

Mrs Cinciari Rodano (COM), rapporteur. — (IT) I should like to thank all those who took part in the debate and in particular Mrs van Hemeldonck, who, to my mind, clinched certain points made in the report.

I must also say that I was a little disappointed with the Commissioner's reply, and I would associate myself with what Mr Sieglerschmidt said. We are urging that a recommendation be issued. We have a perfectly valid legal base for this in the combined provisions of Articles 3 and 235 of the EEC Treaty. We must also bear in mind that Community law incorporates fundamental rights. There can be no doubt, as Mr Tyrrell said, that a person's right to nationality must be regarded as a fundamental right acquired at birth.

Furthermore, as has already been pointed out, certain ideas with regard to possible harmonization have already appeared in documents published by the Council of Europe. We hope therefore that the Commission will not stop short at making a study but will go on to issue a recommendation.

(Applause)

5. Crisis in the tanning industry

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-1157/83) by Mr Gauthier, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the crisis in the tanning industry.

¹ See Annex.

Mr Gauthier (DEP), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, after Mr Pattison, Mr Treacy and Mr Cluskey drew Parliament's attention to the difficulty being experienced by the tanning industry in Motion for a Resolution Doc. 1-840/82, the Committee on External Economic Relations drew up and adopted a report, the conclusions of which I now present to the House.

The drop in production and consequently of jobs in this sector is increasing in all of the countries of the Community with the exception of Italy and, to some extent, Germany.

This situation is due to two types of cause. The internal causes, first of all, are the inadequate adjustment of supply to demand on the Community markets, poor industrial structures, obsolete equipment and outmoded methods of obtaining supplies. The external causes are, on the one hand, the fact that leather goods have to compete with the developments in the synthetic goods industry and the changes in consumer tastes and attitudes. On the other hand, third country producers of hides and suppliers of leather to the Community are tending more and more to reduce their exports of raw materials with a view both to increasing prices more or less artificially and particularly to conserving their own raw materials so as to finish them themselves and supply external markets with more sophisticated products, tanned hides, shoes, bags, etc.

This enables them to develop their own industry and to increase the added value of their exported products. This, unfortunately, is a natural evolution which there appears to be no way of preventing.

Nonetheless, the Committee on External Economic Relations believes that substantial improvements can be made in the situation of the Community tanning industry through a number of measures concerning supplies, production and marketing of leather. With regard first of all to supplies, it is absolutely necessary to abolish all the intra-Community restrictions on access to hides and skins well as all the raw materials necessary for tanning. Similarly, third countries which voluntarily limit their exports to the Community and maintain artificial shortages must be penalized. All those concerned both within the Community and abroad would benefit from an international agreement on leather aimed at the long-term stabilization of prices and a rational organization of the market.

At the level of production, the instruments of production must be modernized and adopted to needs. In some cases small highly specialized and flexible units which carefully monitor market fluctuation appear to be more effective than large factories with over-standardized production.

Finally, with regard to marketing it would be desirable to draw up a European hide and skin nomenclature

Gauthier

harmonizing the classifications of the Member States and it would be highly desirable to establish a European quality label. In short, whatever legal procedures are adopted, free access to sources of raw materials is essential if the European leather industry is to be saved.

Mrs Viehoff (S). — (NL) Mr President, the Socialist Group will support this motion for a resolution. I should like in particular to draw attention to paragraphs 3 and 4, which are based on Socialist amendments.

We call on the Commission to urge very emphatically, within the framework of economic cooperation with Brazil, that there be a drastic cutback on the present restrictions on the export of hides. Without hides the tanneries are doomed, and this will lead to yet more unemployment in Europe, not only in the tanneries themselves but also in the leather goods and footwear industries which are directly affected.

Mr McCartin (PPE). — Mr President, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party I support this motion for a resolution. Perhaps we would have felt a little happier if the proposals had been a little more positive and clear. This motion for a resolution first came before Parliament as a result of an initiative by Irish Members who are no longer here, one of whom became a Minister in the Irish Government. It was tabled in the wake of a severe loss of jobs in the Irish tanning industry. Since that time the situation has not improved nor is it likely to improve. There are no specific proposals here, in my opinion, to improve the short-term prospects for the tanning industry, which suffers from general economic conditions in Ireland and in Britain, formerly its principal market. It also suffers from underfinancing, lack of expertise and failure to modernize.

One point I should like to make is that in a Community which has such a well-developed agricultural policy and is now approaching self-sufficiency in animal products as well as cereals and milk, it is important that industry should seek to add the maximum value to these products. For that reason it is regrettable to see regions of the Community — in particular my own country of Ireland — producing these animal products in large quantities but failing to add sufficient value to make maximum economic use of the products in the regions where they are produced. For that reason, one of the proposals I should like to make — not as an amendment to this motion but to be taken at a later stage when structural directives, in particular No 353, are discussed — is the possibility of EAGGF assistance for the tanning industry which would be complementary to the common agricultural policy in the form of regional aid to a part of the Community heavily dependent on agriculture.

My other point is that it is very difficult for an entity like the European Community, while observing all its international agreements, to maintain employment in an industry where it produces the raw materials. This Community lacks raw materials for many of its industries, but in this particular one we have the raw materials. However, they are being siphoned off by the industrial policies of other countries which in turn destroy the prices for these products on their own market, returning with finished goods to undermine the industry in Europe. That combination of factors and also the environmental factor require positive measures by the Community to protect its own jobs and its own interests; to protect the source of its supplies in the Community and create a market price for them; to protect employment in the industry; and to protect our balance of payments. For all these reasons, it is important that we be more positive in our approach, in particular towards a country like Japan which pursues its own economic and trading policies regardless of our interests. We must inform Japan of the action we shall take if they persist in pursuing trading policies which are unfair and unreasonable, as is the case in this particular area.

I just want to make a serious recommendation to the Commission that it consider, particularly in a region such as Ireland which is highly dependent on agriculture, an interim measure for EAGGF funds to finance the restructuring of the tanning industry so that maximum value may be added to the very important natural resource of animal hides.

My group will support the motion for a resolution.

Mr Beazley (ED). — Mr President, Mr Gauthier's report is an excellent one in every respect: the resolution is short, clear and to the point, and there are no amendments to it. Furthermore, the explanatory statement is a mine of information. My group therefore supports it wholeheartedly.

The problem we face with the European tanning industry is a special one. This House is used to considering the problems which arise in industry and society from adjustment to new technology and lack of competitiveness. You might even say that once the problem is on a big enough scale, affecting nationalized industries across the Community, we are used to supporting them and to helping them to rationalize themselves over a period of time. That is not the problem with the tanning industry. This is a virile industry, led by healthy entrepreneurs who, from ancient times, have always been willing to go the other mile and find their own salvation. They are not asking for protection and State subsidies. As Mr Gauthier's resolution so clearly tells us, they are just asking for a square deal in terms of fair trade, that is, those of them who are left in the business.

Beazley

Even during the four years I have been in this Parliament, some of the best firms in my constituency, Bedfordshire, and its neighbour, Northamptonshire, where the largest part of the UK trade is handled, have disappeared. These were firms which were financially sound, producing outstandingly good products. Perfectionists, in fact, in some cases, with a history of competitive prices whose excellent quality was sought after worldwide. But they have gone! Many of their German, Irish, French and other Community colleagues have gone with them. They have not been merged into bigger and more efficient organizations; they have gone because their business is now done by other, non-Community firms whose terms of trade are different from those laid down by GATT and the other trading bodies to which free traders belong. The business will not come back so long as changes in trading methods are not made. Furthermore, their disappearance has taken employment and wealth creation from rural areas where people who had a good job locally now have to commute to towns in search of work or to stand in a dole queue.

I have little need to repeat to this House the reasons for the problem, which are set out in the report most fully, other than to say, in summary, that countries like Argentina, Brazil and India have protected their nations' local tanning industries by restricting the supply of raw hides to meet traditional exports, or else they have increased their export prices prohibitively while subsidizing at very high levels their local manufacture and putting its product on world markets at unrealistically low prices which are in no way justified by their real costs.

Japan, on the other hand, increases its trade imbalance with Europe by putting quotas on our imports of finished goods, with tariffs of 20 to 25 % against the EEC external tariffs of, I believe, 4 to 7 %. Without raw materials themselves, except for pig hides, they buy vast quantities of hides in the USA where they can afford to pay high prices because of the protection of their own market from competitive imports of finished products. In fact, from my personal experience with a Bedfordshire tanner whose factory is now closed, I have seen personally the very low level of their export prices which could not be sustained against their basic costs if they operated in a free market.

The Communist countries are another problem of a somewhat similar sort, whilst Spain, an aspiring future member of this Community, provides very limited accessibility to its raw hides for exports, offering mainly low-grade or surplus material, and protects its own market from imports from the Community with its normal astronomically high level of duty.

The net result of this most unsatisfactory state of world trade is that employment in the Community tanning industry has dropped between 1960 and 1980

from 96 500 to 59 300 workers and today is lower still. Britain's figures have dropped in the same period from 27 000 to 10 500 and today are approximately 8 500 to 9 000 workers. West Germany dropped between 1960 and 1980 from 28 000 to 7 250. Only Italy increased, and increased substantially, but has now dropped. In consequence, we have a trade employing less than a third of the people it employed twenty years ago, and continuing to contract.

Its volume has similarly dropped. Some countries have maintained volume. However, in Britain's case volume has halved over the last ten years, and the majority of Community countries have suffered significant reductions. It must be clear that in these circumstances there can be no profits to sustain the European industry with new investments and install more modern cost-saving machinery. Moreover, our European environmental laws mean that much investment must be channeled in that direction, a situation not paralleled by our competitors.

So what do we ask? The tanners will fight on, but there must come a point when even the bravest of them must close their firms. However, this would not be necessary if the Community used its full powers. It is not sufficient that Community firms alone should follow the practices of GATT, others must do so too. We do not ask for artificial protection, but Japan must break down its protectionist walls. Where dumping is suspected, the Commission must act vigorously or it will be too late. That is not just on intermediate and finished leathers, but on the uppers and other finished shoe parts as well.

Mr Commissioner, this is not an industry which Europe should lose. We need traditional industries like tanning, particularly in rural and non-industrial areas. How much do you pay to generate new businesses and to shore up uncompetitive industrial monsters? Give the European tanning industry a fair deal and it will create employment and wealth for European citizens.

Mr Maher (L). — Mr President, I too wish to congratulate Mr Gauthier on a comprehensive document containing a great deal of information which was not generally available before, certainly not to this Parliament. I hope it will attract wide notice amongst the public, because I can well support what the other speakers have said about the importance of the leather industry.

As Mr Beazley was pointing out, we in this Community, representing in many ways highly industrialized countries, are behaving more and more with regard to the leather industry like a Third World country exporting its raw materials to other countries and buying them back as finished products; and that is completely opposite to the trend we want to follow. Obviously, this is a serious problem.

Maher

I feel that the leather industry generally does not stick together in putting its own case and in promoting its own product. I am constantly depressed by the extent to which the products that are supplanting leather are not in fact substitutes but imitations. How often do we see, when we look at a pair of shoes, ladies' handbags and so on, that the makers are trying to give the impression that it is real leather? It is very difficult for the layman to distinguish between the real product and the imitation. It is very important that moves should be made by the Commission to ensure that there is a clear distinction, that the layman is not fooled by these clever producers and that he knows what he is purchasing.

I think this industry could learn a lesson from another industry that was in very deep trouble some years ago, i.e. the wool industry in relation to artificial fabrics.

The wool industry had run into serious problems from the competition of synthetic products, but it began to fight back, created a very strong woolmark and in fact is now doing very well in the face of strong competition. I think the leather industry could very well take an example from the wool manufacturers and fight back in the same way.

I wholeheartedly support what my countryman, Mr McCartin, said about the situation in Ireland. In a country that has over 6 million head of cattle, 4 million sheep and nearly 3 million pigs, the labour force in the leather industry has been reduced in 20 years from 20 000 to something like 700; we are unable to progress most of the hides we produce and yet we are trying to import industries based on raw materials from regions away outside the European Community. There is surely a case here for helping, as Mr McCartin has said, to maintain and even improve the labour content of an industry in a country where the raw material is plentiful.

Mr President, I would make another point of which I am reminded by the comments of Mr Beazley in particular. I am old enough to remember the time when many motor-cars were upholstered in real leather. Rarely do you see it today. I think the leather industry should make an assault on the motor-car industry, for we all buy motor-cars and yet we find when we sit in them that we are sitting on synthetic products. There is a lot that could be done here, and there is a certain elegance about real leather that is missing with synthetic products.

Indeed, Mr President, you know there are moves on foot to refurbish this Chamber in connection with the enlargement of the European Community — the Portuguese and Spanish will, we hope, be coming in in 1986. There is a proposal to replace all the seating accommodation: we shall have to have different chairs, and I would propose that we — and you, Mr President — have leather chairs, which would greatly enhance this very elegant Chamber. We should not be

sitting on artificial products: our *derrières* are too important and too valuable.

Mr President, my final point is — and I emphasize again what other speakers have said — that I believe the Community has a responsibility at least to ensure that producers of leather goods in other countries do not have an unfair advantage over us. In many other countries pollution laws are non-existent, and the producers of leather do not have to spend a lot of money on installing expensive equipment. Here, in this Community, we have to spend a large amount of capital in order to measure up to the anti-pollution laws, and for that reason we are often uncompetitive. I think that should be compensated for in order to ensure that we can compete favourably.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED), *chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations*. — Mr President, I find it very encouraging that this report from our committee has had such widespread support around the place. I am particularly glad of the vocal support of the Irish Members who started this off and happy that the report is in agreement with the agricultural interest here.

This traditional industry, which has for centuries provided such beautiful products, has been suffering from discrimination by newly industrialized countries such as Brazil which have been having access to Community markets for finished products. We are a very open market in the Community, but they restrict the exports to us of their own raw material, putting our industries at a severe disadvantage. We have made representations to the Commission over the last few years about this and nothing has happened. I very much hope that in the vote which follows we will show that this is no longer tolerable. I hope that Parliament as a whole will call on the Commission formally in this resolution to persuade these countries to change their practices and not to operate in a one-sided way — newly industrialized countries have got to learn to give up this way of acting and open their trading practices — and also to persuade Japan — that very rich country — to open up the market for finished products which we cannot now sell to the Japanese because of the restrictions that they put on imports of leather.

The Committee on External Economic Relations is going to do a report on trade with newly industrialized countries, but we ask the Commission in the meantime to act positively and immediately on this report and protect this industry before it is too late.

Mr Contogeorgis, *Member of the Commission*. — (GR) Mr President, the Commission broadly shares the anxieties expressed in Mr Gauthier's very detailed report on the crisis in the tanning industry, which it accepts in the main. I should nonetheless like to comment on a few specific proposals contained in the resolution. For instance, let me point out that it would

Contogeorgis

be very difficult to establish a Community skin and hide supply system replacing free competition on the open market, because of the differences in trading practices and economic philosophy between the Member States.

The second remark I wish to make on behalf of the Commission is this: we must recognize the developing countries' right to seek to process the raw materials they produce as a means of increasing the added value of their exports. Mr Gauthier himself, in his statement, described this as inevitable. He is of course right to assert — and the Commission agree — that this must not be allowed to hamper international trade in raw materials. The Commission is also endeavouring to prevent that.

We are paying special attention to the problems with Japan. Talks have been under way for years to remove the many obstacles to the export of Community leather goods and other manufactured goods to Japan. Some progress has been recorded, though we continue to encounter quite a few difficulties.

More specifically, the leather problem — the export of finished leather products to Japan — is bound up with three factors: quotas (import restrictions), high customs tariffs and social conditions inside Japan.

As regards Brazil, a major producer of raw hides, we are currently holding talks to secure arrangements consistent with the Community's interests. In fact an expert-level meeting took place yesterday between the Commission and the Brazilian authorities.

Proposals include an international agreement designed to achieve greater stability in hide prices. It is an attractive idea. However, our experience with other materials such as cotton, tin or sugar, which have been subject to international agreements, demonstrates that it is extremely difficult to conclude such agreements even when there is a limited number of producers, which of course is not the case with hides. Implementing these agreements also poses many problems.

One matter touched upon was the adoption of anti-dumping measures. Of course the Treaties entitle the Community to take action to protect its industrial production if third countries engage in dumping practices. But the adoption of anti-dumping measures presupposes research based on a file containing all the relevant data and proving that dumping policies harmful to Community production are actually being applied. If such measures are to be taken, the leather industry itself will have to provide the Commission with the necessary evidence to enable it to start research on the matter immediately. Every stage of the procedure will be published in the Official Journal, and the Committee on External Economic Relations will be entitled to ask questions about it at all times.

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote*¹

6. IPDC

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-1154/83) by Mr Marck, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on the international programme for the development of communications (IPDC).

Mr Marck (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, this report comes not only at the end of the part-session but also at a very difficult time in the life of Unesco. You will be aware that there has been much discussion recently about Unesco's policies and that the latest threat by the United States to withdraw from Unesco has undoubtedly caused a considerable stir.

However, I should like straight away to make a very clear distinction between the programme for the development of communications and Unesco policy in general. I can by and large understand the criticisms levelled by the United States at Unesco's general communications policy, but these criticisms are not valid for the programme that we are considering just now.

The International Programme for the Development of Communications (IPDC) is part of Unesco's work, but is carried out in a special way which lays heavy emphasis on practical effectiveness and on a professional approach. I should also mention that only recently the United States expressed its willingness to support this project and even promised to step up its financial aid.

The IPDC was set up in 1980 for the purpose of drawing up an aid programme to expand the capacities of the developing countries in the communication sector without prejudice to their cultural integrity. This programme was designed to provide technical and material resources and also to improve the quality of the staff infrastructure.

The manner in which the aid was given and the form taken by the contributions was kept extremely flexible in the sense that all contributions, apart from the Unesco credits, could be made voluntarily and both on a multilateral as well as on a bilateral basis. Some countries, such as Norway, made financial aid available, while other countries contributed experts, scholarships or equipment. However, it must be acknowledged that the initial requirements were not fully met and that it was mainly the EEC countries that were rather reluctant to come forward with their contributions. This was the background to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Gaiotti di Biase.

Already however, a series of projects have been got off the ground after a searching selection process on the basis of criteria agreed by all the participating

¹ See Annex.

Marck

countries. There is, for instance, an interesting project in Africa relating to the establishment of a Pan-African press agency, which has its headquarters in Dakar and in which various African countries are participating. This agency has no intention — and this is a point that must be stressed — of competing with the international press agencies, but is intended mainly to play a complementary role by providing information with purely African dimensions from various African countries. After the initial teething problems there now seems to be excellent cooperation with the international press agencies.

In the light of all this I can fully support Mr Brok's amendment, which is intended to clear up any possible doubt on this matter.

An initiative of the same kind has also been launched in Asia and Latin America, where much help is expected from the professional training programme which has the backing and the cooperation of the professional associations of journalists. The programme seeks to avoid as far as possible any state interference and tries to meet the wishes of those who provide the financial backing.

The European Parliament and its Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport would definitely like to lend more generous support to this initiative. They appeal therefore to the Community and the Member States to step up their support in all the various possible forms, by, for example, granting scholarships, sending experts to train personnel, donating equipment and even providing technical and financial aid.

The IPDC is one of the few practical achievements that has emerged from the wide-ranging international campaign for better information, and for this reason the Community must not lag behind. I would hope therefore, Mr President, that the Members of this Parliament, even if they are not present in great numbers, will approve this motion for a resolution.

Mrs Viehoff (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, in the introduction to his report, Mr Marck explained what this was all about. I am pleased that he made a very firm distinction between the problems that are now being encountered at UNESCO and this programme.

I think it is important for us in the West to be given a clear understanding of the problems that have to be faced in the Third World, accustomed as we are to all the modern means of communication at our disposal, and to develop methods of collecting information, but at the same time of disseminating it. In those parts of the world where communications infrastructure is deficient, people are dependent on the information put out or supplied to them by the more privileged among them. This imbalance in the flow of information was the reason for this programme.

In the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, Mr Marck's report was adopted

unanimously, with two abstentions. And rightly so, I believe, if you endorse the principle of a free, more extensive and fairer exchange of information. So the purpose of the amendments tabled by my group is not to criticize or alter Mr Marck's report, but merely to make it more complete.

It did not seem to us at all satisfactory to show agreement with the programme without making more concrete proposals than those made in the resolution. We should not forget that, in addition to the 1 3/4 million dollars paid out from the Unesco budget, the programme has to be financed by voluntary contributions from a number of individual countries — and I want to make that very clear.

Among the EEC countries only France, Italy and the Netherlands are making contributions. If you wish not only to carry out a programme but also to assist the Third World countries in developing their own communications and not simply — albeit sympathetically — make technical resources available to them, then you must provide them with the necessary funds for such a programme. I think we can say we are agreed on this, but actually we are dealing more in fine words and pious intentions than in giving real support for this programme.

Mr President, we shall not support Mr Brok's amendment for the simple reason that we do not understand why it should be added to Article 3 when it only makes Article 3 less clear.

Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission. — *(GR)* Mr President, the Commission has followed with great interest the discussions held by two parliamentary committees on the international programme for the development of communications. I have taken this opportunity of preparing a brief review of the Commission's work in the communications sector. The hallmark of this work, it will be remembered, is the fact that the projects to be financed each time are selected on an entirely independent basis by the developing countries associated with the Community. In particular, considerable financial resources have been expended on the telecommunications sector over the past 25 years, especially since 1975, under the first Lomé Convention. In the telecommunications sector alone, 47 000 000 ECU were allocated to the ACP States for national or regional projects prior to 1980 and financing has continued under the second Lomé Convention. So much for Community action in the telecommunications sector.

Despite its importance, the international programme for the development of communications is not, of course, the only source of financial aid to developing countries in this area. The Community is accordingly prepared, at the request of the developing countries associated with it, to participate in joint financing

Contogeorgis

schemes in this and other sectors, in conjunction with other forms of support. For instance, the feasibility study for a satellite telecommunications system in Africa calls for a broader spectrum of financial backers, which could include the Community. The Community is also prepared to pursue its action in accordance with the needs and requests of the developing countries.

That is why I am not as pessimistic as Mr Marck is in the conclusion of his report, because the international programme for the development of communication, despite its comparatively limited scope, is supplemented by other forms of financial backing, and the West has many arguments with which to counter possible criticism in that area.

Of course it is not for me to take a decision on the proposal addressed to the Member States at the end of Mr Marck's report, regarding it as absolutely essential that they should support the international programme for the development of communications and play a greater part in financing it. On the other hand, I may say that paragraph 4 of the resolution poses no problem at all to the Commission. Perhaps I should simply remind you that in accordance with the requirement I mentioned earlier, namely, the free selection by the developing countries of the projects submitted to the Community for financing, it will almost certainly be impossible to undertake joint action before 1985 because the resources available at present, at least for the ACP States, have been fully allocated and no provision has been made for their use on one of the projects included in the international programme for the development of communications.

We shall therefore have to await the completion of the draft agreement which is to replace the second Lomé Convention in order to see whether the ACP States mention joint financing with the international programme for the development of communications.

Lastly, if Parliament requests it, the Commission will always be willing to supply details of its achievements and intentions in the very extensive and important sector of communications.

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote*¹

After recital B — Amendment No 2

Mr Marck (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, we did not discuss the amendments in committee, but I must honestly say that I personally feel that this amendment is unnecessary in that there are no grounds for a figure of 12 million ECU. In fact, at this point it is simply not possible to give an accurate estimate, and I should prefer to see no amount mentioned.

After paragraph 3 — Amendment No 1

¹ See Annex.

Mr Marck (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) I am in favour.

Mrs Viehoff (S). — (NL) Mr President, I must make a serious protest against the way in which Mr Marck gives his opinions on the amendments. On the first amendment voted, he said, 'This has not been discussed in the committee.' I have a number of problems with this amendment, but he can give no explanation. On the second amendment that we voted, however, of which he is in favour, he does not say that that was not discussed in committee. Yet both amendments are in the same boat. It seems to me that, as rapporteur for the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, he should take a more neutral stance.

Mr Marck (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) I said at the very outset, Mr President, that none of the amendments had been discussed in committee. The opinions I am giving on the amendments, both that by Mrs Viehoff and that by Mr Brok, are personal opinions and do not therefore come from the committee.

President. — I take note of what you have said, Mr Marck, though you do realize, of course, that when I ask you for your opinion, I do so in your capacity as rapporteur.

7. Deadline for tabling amendments

President. — I propose to the House that the deadline for tabling amendments to all the items on the agenda for the February part-session, with the exception of the Spinelli report, be fixed for 12 noon on Thursday, 9 February 1984.

With regard to the Spinelli report, I would remind the House that the deadline for tabling amendments is fixed for 6 p.m. on Monday, 23 January.

Mr Seligman (ED). — Mr President, could you not extend the deadline for tabling amendments from 12 noon to 2 p.m. on Thursday to allow my group, which will be meeting until 2 p.m. Strasbourg time, to get all our amendments in?

President. — We cannot change that. The deadline for tabling amendments is always fixed for 12 noon. However, as you probably know, it is applied rather flexibly.¹

8. Adjournment of the session

President. — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

I wish you all a safe return journey and thank the *rari nantes in gurgite vasto*.

(The sitting was closed at 12.05 p.m.)

¹ Written declarations entered in the register (Rule 49) — Forwarding of resolutions adopted during the sitting — Dates for next part-session: see Minutes.

ANNEX*Votes*

The Report of Proceedings records in an annex the rapporteur's position on the various amendments as well as explanations of vote. For details of the voting the reader is referred to the Minutes of the sitting.

SÄLZER REPORT (Doc. 1-1150/83 — AIDS): ADOPTED

* * *

PHLIX REPORT (Doc. 1-1153/83 — FRONTIER CONTROLS): ADOPTED

* * *

VAN HEMELDONCK REPORT (Doc. 1-795/83 — CHILD RESISTANT CLOSURES): ADOPTED

* * *

COHEN REPORT (Doc. 1-1147/83 — 6th UNCTAD): ADOPTED

* * *

MUNTINGH REPORT (Doc. 1-1168/83 — COMBATING OF ACID RAIN): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was :

- IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 6, 7, 11, 13 to 16 ;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 5, 8, 12, 17 to 19.

Explanations of vote

Mr Muntingh (S), rapporteur. — (NL) In the resolution, as it is now being adopted, there is an element to which I, in common with the other eight Dutch Socialists, cannot reconcile myself. It is the part that refers to nuclear energy. We feel that nuclear energy can afford no solution in this context, and we take this view for a number of reasons.

Firstly, if we are to turn to nuclear energy to solve the problem of atmospheric pollution, it will be all of 10 years before it begins to make any impact.

Secondly, we believe that the money would be spent much more wisely on setting up cheaper purification plants than on investing in nuclear energy.

Thirdly, we see no point in replacing one environmental problem, that of atmospheric pollution, with another environmental problem, namely, that of nuclear waste and radioactive emissions from nuclear power stations.

These are three clearcut reasons why we must dissociate ourselves from recital V. However, as far as the rest is concerned, we are, of course, in favour of the motion for a resolution.

Mr Hutton (ED). — I am supporting the pressure in this report for work on the alleviation of acid rain. However, I do caution Members about going off the deep end in their enthusiasm. There is no doubt in my mind that acid rain is a contributing factor to some and perhaps to most of the acidity in our loughs and streams. There are many of them in the part of the south-west of Scotland which I represent, and they are among the most seriously affected in the United Kingdom. But I hope that the rather simple views about the complicated mechanisms involved, which have led some scientists and much of the media into rather wild generalizations and extrapolations, will not be echoed by Members of this House. For example, there have been some extraordinary and extreme claims — not here, I should say — about the effects of acid rain on crops. In the United Kingdom there are no documented cases of acid rain reducing yields. There are areas in the east of Scotland, for example, where the sulphur deficient soil positively benefits from acid rain. In fact, the fertiliser value of acid rain in the United Kingdom is nearly 50 m ECUs.

We have got to take care that we know what the causes of the problem are in each area and that the measures we take to control emissions will achieve the improvements that we seek. In supporting the report I think it is wise to note that the problem has not yet reached the stage of panic but rather calls for carefully considered haste.

Mrs Weber (S). — *(DE)* Yesterday I outlined the reasons why I do not feel that nuclear energy affords a solution to this problem. I am speaking also on behalf on my colleague Mrs Seibel-Emmerling. The clause to which I refer creates, in our view, the totally false impression that the problem can be solved by means of nuclear energy. That is not the case. Another reason why we do not approve of this clause is that the job situation of workers in the coalmining sector should not be completely overlooked when we are speaking about environmental matters. Nevertheless, the fact that the report contains one clause with which we are not satisfied is not sufficient justification for not voting in favour of it. I should like to make this point particularly to certain colleagues who found in the course of this week that they could not vote in favour of a perfectly good report just because there was one phrase in it that did not please them. I feel therefore that in voting in favour of this report we are showing our willingness to cooperate.

Mr Simmonds (ED), in writing. — European countries must work together to combat the problem of acid rain, which costs more than £ 36 million annually and could lead to the loss of about 47 000 jobs in forestry and timber processing throughout the Community. Coordinated action by the 10 Member States is necessary, and I welcome the ambition of the proposals before Parliament to reduce sulphur dioxide emissions into the atmosphere by 60%, nitrogen oxides by 40% and other pollutants by 40%. Unless the Community implements this major programme in the near future, much of the good work that has been done in the United Kingdom to grow its own timber — at present we import more than 90% — will be wasted, because today's plantings will have little chance of maturing to useful trees.

Mr Wurtz (COM), in writing. — *(FR)* The French members of the Communists and Allies Group consider that the problem of atmospheric pollution is a serious one. Although for the moment French forests do not appear to be affected by acid rain, in the same way as those in the Federal Republic of Germany it is something which could take place very soon.

This is why, at the October 1983 budgetary session, we proposed an amendment seeking to enter a payment appropriation of 20 million ECU to support Community action for the protection of forests. This was rejected by a majority of the House and an appropriation of a mere 5 million ECU was adopted.

Since atmospheric pollution does not respect frontiers, we are, therefore, in favour of joint action to deal with this scourge which, over and above the special problem of the decay of the forests, concerns the quality of life and the health of peoples of our countries.

Pollution may not respect frontiers, but the same is not true of the industrial lobbies. They have already shown in the past that they know how to manipulate legitimate ecological concerns with a view to side-tracking them and eliminating dangerous competitors. We feel that Mr Muntingh's report does not take account of the fact that the necessary struggle for a better environment should not be used as a pretext for calling into question industrial development and employment in our regions.

For our part we believe that the fight against pollution is an area of economic activity which can stimulate technological innovation and create new jobs. This is the reason for the amendments which we have tabled.

Since these were not adopted and since the ambiguities in the report that we are discussing have not been removed we shall abstain in the vote which will follow.

* * *

**VANNECK REPORT (Doc. 1-1128/83 — RADIATION PROTECTION):
ADOPTED**

* * *

**SCRIVENER REPORT (Doc. 1-1082/83 — SAFETY AND HEALTH AT WORK):
ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was:

- IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 11 to 18 and 34;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 10, 24 to 28 and 33.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Squarzialupi (COM). — *(IT)* It seems very strange to us that a Parliament, when considering an action programme for the safety of workers, should reject a request that suggestions be welcomed from the workers themselves. Nobody knows better than the person himself, concerned as he is for his own health and safety, what will benefit him and what will do him harm.

It was only a question of suggestions, of profiting from experiences gleaned over many decades of working life, which could therefore be of value for any health and safety programme.

We are amazed that amendments along these lines should have been rejected, particularly by certain quarters. We are also amazed at the rejection of a request for harmonization of legislations with regard to the type-approval of machines so as to make them equally safe in all European countries and so that they could therefore circulate without any barriers to trade.

Notwithstanding all of this, and in the belief that perhaps on another occasion our proposals will be given a more favourable hearing, we shall vote in favour.

Mrs Hammerich (CDI), in writing. — *(DA)* Although there are many commendable points both in the report and in the action programme, we cannot support it for the following reasons:

We are, in general, against the EEC issuing legislation on the working environment, even in the form of a minimum directive. On the one hand the working environment is a sovereign national affair and a matter for agreement between the labour market partners,

and on the other, in our experience, the limits for dangerous substances and other items which adversely affect the working environment laid down by the EEC are lower than those which apply in Denmark or called for in Denmark by the trade unions which represent those persons who are exposed to unpleasant conditions and dangers at work.

Even a minimum directive acts as a brake on development where safety and health at work are concerned.

The other action programme puts great emphasis on research. We are in favour of international research, but the EEC is not the right forum. Denmark's economic resources were better used (a) when directed towards national goals and (b) in a *genuinely* international forum, such as the ILO.

For these reasons we cannot vote for the report.

Mr Kyrkos (COM), in writing. — (GR) Workers have the right to better safety and health standards at work and employers have a duty to provide them. But improving these standards is also a moral and humanitarian imperative of which we must all be aware if we are to help carry it out.

We shall support Mrs Scrivener's report, as we have in the past supported all proposals aimed at strengthening safety and health care measures, despite some reservations regarding the lack of proposals for practical action indicative of a genuine political resolve.

I fully endorse Mrs Scrivener's remark about the absence of a timetable for the implementation of Community policy on workers' safety and health. I would add that it is high time the Commission realized this, established time-limits for the application of the European Community's action programme and explained the goals it has set itself in this area to ensure that they do not remain mere wishful thinking.

We wish our vote to highlight the need for every firm without exception — including building firms — to be equipped with an occupational health unit run by a board comprising a majority of workers. These units should be staffed according to size by a suitable number of doctors, nurses and safety engineers whose job is to monitor the workers' state of health and see to their safety by means of periodical tests at prescribed intervals.

Setting up and operating these occupational health units will call for close cooperation between management, specialists and workers or their representatives — since the workers are the ones directly concerned. Decisions will have to be made collectively and steps will have to be taken to ensure the independence of the health unit staff; otherwise, employers will press for correct solutions only insofar as they do not affect their own interests and the health and safety staff will play along with the management.

On no account must the workers be expected to bear the cost of organizing the occupational health system, which is the social responsibility of the management. If the latter is unable to meet the cost, it will have to enlist the aid of the State, which may in turn receive assistance under a Community programme. Besides, the cost of setting up the occupational health and safety system is minimal by comparison with the ensuing gain in working years and human lives (whose worth is incalculable) and in terms of greater productivity and smaller expenditure on medical care and rehabilitation.

We shall vote for the proposal in the light of the above remarks.

* * *

**SHERLOCK REPORT (DOC. 1-1127/83 — PROTECTION OF WORKERS):
REFERRED TO COMMITTEE**

* * *

MAIJ-WEGGEN REPORT (DOC. 1-1173/83 — POLLUTION IN THE NORTH SEA): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was :

- IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 1 to 5, 8 to 10, 13 and 14;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 6, 7, 11, 15 to 17.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) Yesterday's debate gave rise to a rather lively discussion about the preference expressed by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for a central Convention. I am glad that the idea is receiving support today. I think it is a good idea. However, I am equally convinced that it may well be a number of years yet before it comes to fruition. That is why I am also very pleased with the amendments tabled by Mr Sieglerschmidt, which outline a number of avenues that can be explored in the meantime. I think that we have thus been enabled to arrive at a laudable compromise between those who look for short-term results from this resolution and those who entertain more long-term expectations. Finally, I would hope that we can bring as large a majority as possible behind this resolution.

Mr Kirk (ED). — (DA) I shall vote for the report since I think that it is extremely important to take action at Community level against the pollution of our seas, in particular the North Sea. One notes with regret that the environmental policy pursued by the Member States, or at least by some of those who belong to the Oslo Convention, lacks conviction. Consequently, parallel to the efforts made under the Oslo Convention, we must take action at Community level to protect and safeguard the environment. I should like to stress that two things in particular should be noted. There is deliberate pollution and accidental pollution. Deliberate pollution can be controlled in the long term, and to this end we call on all the Member States to make a determined effort. But the Community and the Member States should do everything possible to limit the damage caused by disasters or accidents. Last week a disaster occurred in the North Sea when 80 barrels of a highly toxic substance were lost overboard from a Danish vessel. We must insist that this sort of substance must under all circumstances be recovered. We must do everything, irrespective of the cost, to recover it from the sea. We shall be acting irresponsibly towards the environment and towards those who work on the seas if we do not do everything humanly possible to remove dangerous substances.

Mr Muntingh (S). — (NL) During the debate last night, we found ourselves indeed in the midst of stormy seas. The point was that Mrs Maij-Weggen, as rapporteur, gave a somewhat different interpretation of the question whether or not we are to have a North Sea Convention. She was convinced — and she has stated this repeatedly in the press — that the Parliament and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection were in favour of a North Sea Convention. We in the Socialist Group cannot subscribe to this interpretation. We adhere to the interpretation as it stands, word for word, in the text of the resolution: 'Calls on the Commission, in preparation for the forthcoming Conference on the North Sea, to study ...' This does not mean that we are opposed to a North Sea Convention — on the contrary, it may be a very good thing — but we first want the Commission to offer us some well-considered views that will enable us to form an opinion on the need for new legislation to deal with the problem of pollution of the North Sea. If it appears that a North Sea Convention is a good thing, we shall certainly accept it. For the moment, however, we prefer to put our stakes on two horses. The other horse is the Marpol Convention, which, thanks to the Legal Affairs Committee — more specifically, Mr Sieglerschmidt and Mr Turner — has been included in the resolution. The resolution is clearly following two tracks — on the one hand, the Marpol Convention, and on the other, the North Sea Convention. That we in the Socialist Group can certainly support.

One brief remark with regard to paragraph 4 (i), calling for improvements to nuclear plants. It should be made clear that a part of the Socialist Group does not find this very happily formulated, and in particular the Dutch Socialists cannot accept the terms used. We are, however, happy to congratulate the rapporteur on the probable adoption of her report, since in view of the amendments that have been adopted, the Socialist Group will be voting for the resolution.

Mr Nyborg (DEP), in writing. — (DA) I wish to say a word of warning against this report since it in some way distracts attention from what is essential. It operates with an overall solution: a new, central North-South convention, which puts everything under one hat. This would mean setting up a new board and a new central secretariat. However, the facts of the matter are — so Danish experts tell me — that we have the conventions and the bodies we need. I am thinking here of the Oslo, Marpol and Paris Conventions. The problem is how far the spirit and the letter of these conventions are observed. What is the use of a Paris convention on marine pollution from land-based sources if states and undertakings constantly find that they do not have the means to pay for effective decontamination of the water they discharge? What is the use of an Oslo convention on dumping if certain countries continue to believe that they can use the sea as a dumping ground for waste products? Of course, the best possible protection must be provided for the North Sea, but will we be using our resources most effectively by duplication of work. Duplication of work is precisely what this proposal will lead to. As is well-known, West Germany has taken the initiative to hold a North Sea Conference this year. I can state that it was already clear at the preparatory meeting that the North Sea countries — and the Commission — agree that a new convention is not necessary at the present time. The Maij-Weggen report deals — as far as I can see — with combating the pollution of the North Sea. Why therefore does it contain a reference to fisheries policy (paragraph 3 (a)) and to working conditions of personnel on offshore installations (paragraph 3 (d))? These paragraphs are out of place in the context.

* * *

PROTOPAPADAKIS REPORT (Doc. 1-1149/83 — SAFETY OF HOLIDAY-MAKERS AND OTHER TRAVELLERS): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke :

— IN FAVOUR OF all the amendments.

Explanation of vote

Mr Simmonds (ED), in writing. — I welcome this report and its demand for common standards for fire precautions in hotels and boarding-houses throughout Europe. At present some European countries' standards are dangerously low, whilst hoteliers have had to spend vast sums on fire precautions to protect their clientele. This is an unfair and dangerous discrimination against our tourist industry, particularly in the Isle of Wight.

I welcome proposals for stricter regulations and effective policing throughout Europe for coaches and other hire vehicles. Every summer we read of ghastly accidents involving drivers who have been at the wheel for too many hours and too many miles. Coordinated action is needed throughout Europe to provide greater safety and reassurance for tourists.

The example that has been set by British safety standards is one export that we should be actively promoting to the Continent.

* * *

**TURNER REPORT (Doc. 1-1161/83 — CLASSIFICATION OF GOODS):
ADOPTED***Explanation of vote*

Mr Patterson (ED). — I shall vote in favour of this report, partly because I was moved by the eloquence of the rapporteur and partly because I was moved by his charity. He described the extraordinary situation which he outlined as being due to human failure. That is charitable, because bureaucracies have all sorts of failings which go very much further than the human and, indeed, are almost inhuman. I find it quite incomprehensible that a situation is allowed to arise where the information provided by one office is not accepted by or squared with the information provided by another office in the same country. As the Commission has accepted, in principle, all the amendments of the Legal Affairs Committee, perhaps we can urge them to try harder to get these inhuman national bureaucracies to admit and accept their failings and to adopt the report of the Legal Affairs Committee. I urge Mr Contogeorgis to make extra efforts.

I shall vote with enthusiasm for Mr Turner's report.

* * *

**CINCIARI RODANO REPORT (Doc. 1-1166/83 — DISCRIMINATION IN THE
MATTER OF PASSING ON NATIONALITY): ADOPTED***Explanations of vote*

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — *(DE)* The Socialist Group greatly welcomes this report and this motion for a resolution, which it hopes Parliament will adopt unanimously in the knowledge that what Commissioner Contogeorgis has said is correct, namely, that it is difficult to implement such matters in law since nationality — to put it rather poetically — is one of the last bastions of the State, and therefore harmonization will not be too easy. In view of the ever-increasing mobility in the Community — one has only to think of the free movement of workers — it is urgently necessary to make further progress here and to find sensible solutions to the problems of mixed-nationality marriages. One must also bear in mind that a European agreement exists to prevent dual nationality. Through the Council of Europe all Member States are partners to this agreement. Naturally the automatic transfer of nationality — be it through the mother or the father — often runs counter to this arrangement since it can often give rise to dual nationality.

On behalf of the Socialist Group I should like to ask whether the problem of avoiding dual nationality in all circumstances should not be looked at carefully, particularly in view of migrant workers from third countries. In this way we might be able to solve many problems more easily.

Nationality in mixed marriages may derive both from the father and from the mother. In my opinion the best thing would be if dual nationality could be avoided by arrangements whereby the parents can decide which of their two nationalities the child may have.

Mr Kallias (PPE), in writing. — *(GR)* I shall vote for the resolution contained in the Cinciari Rodano report (Doc. 1-1166/83) because it contributes to the achievement of equality between the sexes.

I believe unconditionally in equality and have been actively supporting it for the past forty years.

This statement will serve to clarify my abstention during the vote on the other Cinciari Rodano report (Doc. 1-1129/83) as a whole. The abstention was decided by my group and merely reflected reservations on very minor provisions adopted at the last moment; it had nothing to do with the basic content of the resolution.

I voted for the underlying principle and all the main provision of the resolution during the paragraph-by-paragraph vote, as did the entire PPE group.

* * *

GAUTHIER REPORT (Doc. 1-1157/83 — CRISIS IN THE TANNING INDUSTRY): ADOPTED

Explanation of vote

Mr Pearce (ED), in writing. — I intend to vote for this resolution, even though I wish it had been stronger. A major tanning company in my constituency has made representations to me concerning the severe trading conditions which it faces, which are similar to those outlined in Mr Gauthier's report.

I believe that while the Community cannot force Brazil to export hides, it can and should take retaliatory action against Brazil in terms of quotas and customs duties until Brazil reduces the quite unreasonably high duties which it imposes on the Community's export to it.

* * *

MARCK REPORT (Doc. 1-1154/83 — IPDC): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was:

- IN FAVOUR OF Amendment No 1;
- AGAINST Amendment No 2.

Explanation of vote

Mrs Ewing (DEP). — I support the motion and would urge the Commission to use the opportunity of the imminent visit to Lomé and Brazzaville to try and tie this matter up in some concrete way. I have spoken on this subject twice at ACP meetings. The Lomé members are very anxious to obtain concrete assistance towards providing better communication at their end.

I would like to give one example by way of illustration. The joint delegation from this Parliament and the Lomé countries to the frontline states visited Lesotho last year and met the Prime Minister of that country. He informed us that he had to rely on the South African news agency to report on attacks against him personally, his house and his country. That is clearly a situation where you cannot expect, with the best will in the world, a very impartial view of what took place in Lesotho. That is just one example. It makes it absolutely necessary that the case for these countries be put by their own agencies, but they lack the skills and a lot of training would be needed. I think the Community ought to be able to help.

**Salg og abonnement · Verkauf und Abonnement · Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές · Sales and subscriptions
Vente et abonnements · Vendita e abbonamenti · Verkoop en abonnementen**

BELGIQUE / BELGIË

Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad

Rue de Louvain 40-42 / Leuvensestraat 40-42
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel
Tél. 512 00 26
CCP/Postrekening 000-2005502-27

Sous-dépôts / Agentschappen:

**Librairie européenne /
Europese Boekhandel**

Rue de la Loi 244 / Wetstraat 244
1040 Bruxelles / 1040 Brussel

CREDOC

Rue de la Montagne 34 / Bergstraat 34
Bte 11 / Bus 11
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel

DANMARK

Schultz Forlag

Møntergade 21
1116 København K
Tlf: (01) 12 11 95
Girokonto 200 11 95

BR DEUTSCHLAND

Verlag Bundesanzeiger

Breite Straße
Postfach 10 80 06
5000 Köln 1
Tel. (02 21) 20 29-0
Fernschreiber:
ANZEIGER BONN 8 882 595

GREECE

G.C. Eleftheroudakis SA

International Bookstore
4 Nikis Street
Athens (126)
Tel. 322 63 23
Telex 219410 ELEF

Sub-agent for Northern Greece:

Molho's Bookstore

The Business Bookshop
10 Tsimiski Street
Thessaloniki
Tel. 275 271
Telex 412885 LIMO

FRANCE

**Service de vente en France des publications
des Communautés européennes**

Journal officiel
26, rue Desaix
75732 Paris Cedex 15
Tél. (1) 578 61 39

IRELAND

Government Publications Sales Office

Sun Alliance House
Molesworth Street
Dublin 2
Tel. 71 03 09

or by post

Stationery Office

St Martin's House
Waterloo Road
Dublin 4
Tel. 78 96 44

ITALIA

Licosa Spa

Via Lamarmora, 45
Casella postale 552
50 121 Firenze
Tel. 57 97 51
Telex 570466 LICOSA I
CCP 343 509

Subagente:

Libreria scientifica Lucio de Biasio - AEIOU

Via Meravigli, 16
20 123 Milano
Tel. 80 76 79

GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG

**Office des publications officielles
des Communautés européennes**

5, rue du Commerce
L-2985 Luxembourg
Tél. 49 00 81 - 49 01 91
Télex PUBLOF - Lu 1322
CCP 19190-81
CC bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/200

NEDERLAND

Staatsdrukkerij- en uitgeverijbedrijf

Christoffel Plantijnstraat
Postbus 20014
2500 EA 's-Gravenhage
Tel. (070) 78 99 11

UNITED KINGDOM

HM Stationery Office

HMSO Publications Centre
51 Nine Elms Lane
London SW8 5DR
Tel. 01-211 3935

Sub-agent:

Alan Armstrong & Associates

European Bookshop
London Business School
Sussex Place
London NW1 4SA
Tel. 01-723 3902

ESPAÑA

Mundi-Prensa Libros, S.A.

Castelló 37
Madrid 1
Tel. (91) 275 46 55
Telex 49370-MPLI-E

PORTUGAL

Livraria Bertrand, s.a.r.l.

Rua João de Deus
Venda Nova
Amadora
Tél. 97 45 71
Telex 12709-LITRAN-P

SCHWEIZ / SUISSE / SVIZZERA

Librairie Payot

6, rue Grenus
1211 Genève
Tél. 31 89 50
CCP 12-236

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**European Community Information
Service**

2100 M Street, NW
Suite 707
Washington, DC 20037
Tel. (202) 862 9500

CANADA

Renouf Publishing Co., Ltd

2182 St Catherine Street West
Montreal
Quebec H3H 1M7
Tel. (514) 937 3519

JAPAN

Kinokuniya Company Ltd

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome
Shiniuku-ku
Tokyo 160-91
Tel. (03) 354 0131

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprise:

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg.

Annual subscription 1983/1984 ECU 52.59 BFR 2 400 IRL 37 UKL 29 USD 49

Single issue: price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage

ECU 19.29 BFR 880 IRL 13.20 UKL 11 USD 19.25



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

L-2985 Luxembourg



AX-AA-83-013-EN-C