

Annex

# Official Journal

## of the

### European Communities

No 1-306

English edition

## Debates of the European Parliament

---

1983-1984 Session

Report of Proceedings  
from 14 to 18 November 1983  
Europe House, Strasbourg

## Contents

<b>Sitting of Monday, 14 November 1983</b> . . . . .	1
Resumption of the session, p. 1 — Minutes, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 3 — Action taken on the opinions of Parliament, p. 9 — Economic situation of the EC, p. 11 — Tax harmonization — Turnover taxes and taxes on tobacco, p. 18 — Annex, p. 28.	
<b>Sitting of Tuesday, 15 November 1983</b> . . . . .	33
Minutes, p. 34 — Decision on urgency, p. 35 — Pershing and Cruise — INF negotiations in Geneva, p. 35 — Council statement — European union — Enlargement of the Community, p. 61 — Deadline for tabling amendments, p. 68 — Council statement — European union — Enlargement of the Community (continuation), p. 68 — CAP, p. 74 — Deadline for tabling amendments, p. 88 — Topical and urgent debate (announcement), p. 89 — Question Time, p. 89.	
<b>Sitting of Wednesday, 16 November 1983</b> . . . . .	99
CAP (continuation), p. 100 — Welcome, p. 114 — CAP (continuation), p. 114 — Structural funds — agricultural structures, p. 129 — Topical and urgent debate (motions), p. 148 — Votes, p. 149 — Question Time, p. 155 — Annexes, p. 163.	
<b>Sitting of Thursday, 17 November 1983</b> . . . . .	204
Minutes, p. 205 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 206 — Votes, p. 231 — Cultural sector, p. 236 — Special measures in favour of Greece, p. 241 — European Centre for Craft Trades and SMUs, p. 244 — Results of Community sponsored R & D, p. 247 — Reactor safety — Nuclear fission technology, p. 250 — Migrant workers, p. 254 — Reduction of working time, p. 266 — Annex, p. 276.	

(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*)

**Sitting of Friday, 18 November 1983 . . . . . 286**

Votes, p. 287 — European Social Fund, p. 290 — Air pollution, p. 292 — Technology, p. 293 — EEC-Cyprus, p. 296 — Agenda, p. 298 — Adjournment of the session, p. 298 — Annex, p. 299.

*Resolutions adopted at sittings of 14 to 18 November 1983 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 342 of 19 December 1983.*



## SITTING OF MONDAY, 14 NOVEMBER 1983

## Contents

1. Resumption of the session . . . . .	1	<i>Aigner; Mr Andriessen; Mr Aigner; Mr Andriessen; Mr Eisma; Mr Andriessen . .</i>	9
2. Approval of the minutes <i>Mr Forth; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Beazley; Mr von der Vring; Mr Janssen van Raay; Mr Edward Kellett-Bowman . . . . .</i>	1	5. Economic situation of the EC — Report (Doc. 1-988/83) by Mr Bonaccini <i>Mr Bonaccini; Mr J. Moreau; Mr von Bismarck; Mr Welsh; Mr Alavanos; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Nyborg; Mr Bonde; Mr Papantoniou; Mr Albers; Mr Ortoli (Commission) . . . . .</i>	11
3. Agenda <i>Mr Barbi; Mr Arndt; Mr Lange; Mr Barbi; Lord Douro; Mr Enright; Mr Forth; Mr Provan; Mrs Elaine Kellett- Bowman; Mr Deleau; Mr Eisma; Mr Vandewiele; Mr J. Moreau; Mr Forth; Mr Baudis; Mr Gautier; Mr von der Vring; Mr Patterson; Mr Collins; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Markopoulos; Mr von der Vring; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Seligman; Mr Forth; Mr Thareau . . . . .</i>	3	6. Tax harmonization — Turnover taxes — Taxes on tobacco: Reports (Doc. 1-903/83) by Mr Rogalla, (Doc. 1-777/83) by Mr Beumer and (Doc. 1-907/83) by Mr J. Moreau <i>Mr Rogalla; Mr Beumer; Mr J. Moreau; Mr Seeler; Mr Schnitker; Mr Hopper; Mr Fernandez; Mr Hopper; Mr Delorozoy; Mr Cousté; Mr Paisley; Mr Rogalla; Mr van Rompuy; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Jurgens; Mr Lalor; Mr Welsh; Mr Tugendhat (Commis- sion); Mr Beazley; Mr Tugendhat . . . . .</i>	18
4. Action taken on the opinions of Parliament <i>Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mrs Squarcia- lupi; Mr Andriessen; Mr Enright; Mr Andriessen; Mr Cousté; Mr Andriessen; Mr</i>		<i>Annex . . . . .</i>	28

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

*President*

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

1. Resumption of the session

**President.** — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 28 October 1983.

2. Approval of Minutes

**President.** — The Minutes of the sitting of Friday, 28 October have been distributed.

Are there any comments ?

**Mr Forth (ED).** — I would like to ask your guidance, Mr President, as to whether you would like me to raise the matter of the Viehoff report now or when you, perhaps, touch on it later, because it is referred to in the minutes for Friday.

**President.** — Yes, I can deal with it now. I do not see any problem. I have received a letter from the chairman of that committee certifying that the number of members present was 7 and the number of members voting was 5. However, the number of members present determines the quorum. I have to assume, therefore, that the quorum was reached, that the vote was valid and that we can deal with the report.

**Mr Forth (ED).** — Mr President, I am curious about two things. How could anyone possibly know who was actually in the room at a given committee meeting at the time of a particular vote on a particular report. I think that needs clarification? I am not at all certain — knowing, as we all do, how our committees works — how someone could know which seven people were in a room when only five were recorded as voting.

The second is whether we now take it that the situation concerning who voted and was present at any given committee meeting and what that means for the future as well as for this particular occasion is entirely free, flexible and fluid.

I would also like to ask why we cannot simply send this report back to the committee and ask it to vote validly and properly on it, thus putting it beyond all doubt?

**President.** — My curiosity is as great as yours, but I have to go along with the conclusions of the chairman of the committee who has informed me that the number of members present was 7 and that the number voting was 5. The number of members present determines the quorum, and from that moment my problems are solved. A few others remain, I accept that.

**Sir Peter Vanneck (ED).** — Mr President, further to that point of order of Mr Forth, am I to understand that 7 people signed in for that committee meeting, or were there 7 votes, 5 for and 2 abstentions or against? How did it actually go?

**President.** — My understanding is that 7 members signed in and 5 voted.

**Sir Peter Vanneck (ED).** — Then, Mr President, I suggest that that is very unsatisfactory, because Members of this House will be aware that people do occasionally sign in and then are not present at the debate and are not present to vote. Of course, that is unusual, but I feel that a mere signature on the attendance paper surely should not constitute a quorum.

*(Loud laughter)*

**President.** — I have confirmation that at the moment of the vote 7 members were present, as I said, but only 5 took part in the vote. That means that a quorum was legally attained and that there is no problem as far as the validity of this report is concerned. Of course, we could change the Rules, but the Rules as they read now indicate exactly what I told you.

**Mr Beazley (ED).** — Mr President, if you interpret that Rule in terms of being present and having a

quorum, what is, in fact, the minimum number that can vote and put forward a resolution to this House?

**President.** — Mr Beazley, Rule 103 states:

A committee may validly vote when one-quarter of its members are actually present. However, if so requested by one-sixth of its members before voting begins, the vote shall be valid only if the majority of the current members of the committee have taken part in it.

In other words, if the two who did not participate in the vote had demanded the application of the rest of the Rule, no vote could have been taken unless half of the current members were present. But this seems not to have happened, so what happened was fully in conformity with Rule 103.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, with reference to the items which you now wish to adopt, certain deadlines have been set for amendments. For reasons which are known the documents were delayed. Would you rule that a flexible attitude will be adopted with regard to deadlines for tabling amendments to the relevant reports which e.g. were distributed last week?

**President.** — Mr von der Vring, you are a little precipitous; the deadline for tabling amendments will be discussed at the end of the debate on the agenda. However, we are fully aware of the problem.

**Mr Jansen van Raay (PPE).** — *(NL)* Mr President, I joined in the discussion last time too, and I must say that the way we go about taking decisions is unsatisfactory, and I will tell you why.

We are busily involved in various legal proceedings, including the action brought against the Council of Ministers, and one of the grounds for nullity is that fundamental formal provisions have been contravened. And one of these fundamental formal provisions has always been the rule on the quorum. What you are now in fact saying is that, rather than ascertaining in a proper manner who took part in the vote by consulting the report — the only way of obtaining this information — you now intend to have a committee chairman make a kind of deposition. I must tell you frankly that I am worried that, if the validity of the voting in this committee is ever disputed — and it would be the first time this has happened — we would lose the case.

The chairman's task is to ensure that a quorum exists on every occasion, and that is always very carefully done in the committees of which I am a member, the Legal Affairs Committee and the Committee on Transport. The chairmen of these committees always make absolutely sure at the beginning of the meeting that a

## Janssen van Raay

quorum exists — as Mrs Veil, who is not here at the moment, and Mr Seefeld, who is, can confirm — and each time a vote is taken, this must be clear from the number of members taking part in the vote. Mr Seefeld looks round and asks: 'Those against? None. Are there any abstentions? No.' His secretary then stands up and counts the members present, after which Mr Seefeld declares that a quorum exists, but the names of those members then appear in the report. That is a practical way of doing things. His counterpart on the other committee could have solved his problem in this way. What I find extremely unsatisfactory is that the members actually present and those listed in the report differ, since the report must always state who took part in the vote.

Mr President, I do not, of course, wish to dispute your judgement, but I would appreciate it if this matter could be referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, in view of the major repercussions it may have.

**President.** — I again note that Rule 103 reads as follows:

a committee may validly vote when one quarter of its members are actually present.

It does not state that 'one quarter of the members' must actually vote. They must be there! The information I have received from the Chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport is that 'one quarter of the members were present'. That is the only interpretation of the rules to be given here. I admit that that is a somewhat unsatisfactory situation and that it is desirable that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions should consider the matter but at the same time I must state that I think it would be difficult to give an interpretation of Rule 103 which would have implications beyond the text which we are now considering. That would presuppose an interpretation of Rule 103. I do not think that that is what you are asking for. You are simply asking for an interpretation by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and I am fully prepared to consult them.

**Mr Kellett-Bowman (ED).** — Mr President, I cannot accept that a vote was valid because someone cares after the event to make a statement about it. That is not acceptable parliamentary procedure. If it was required to show that a certain number were present, that should have been mentioned in the report put before the House. It was not mentioned, and the subsequent statement is inadequate. As I have pointed out to you on previous occasions when you were a Vice-President of this House, there are five ways of responding to a vote: for, against, physically abstaining, sitting on one's hands or being out of the room. On this occasion you are trying to presume that

sufficient people were present; that there were two there sitting on their hands. That is not good enough.

As to referring it to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, Vice-President Nikolaou, when dealing with the matter in the House when the situation arose, undertook to refer the matter to the competent committee. I understood that to be the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. The following morning when the ruling was handed down from the Presidency, Vice-President Estgen was in the Chair and he also undertook to see that the matter would be referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. It should go there, Sir, before any decision by the House is taken.

*(Cries of 'Hear, Hear!')*

**President.** — Mr Kellett-Bowman, I have only one remark to make. You say that one cannot conclude after the fact that the required number of Members was present. I do not think that that is in accordance with Rule 103. A chairman of a committee can only take a vote when he has a quorum, so we have to assume that there was a quorum at the moment that the vote was taken. That creates a number of problems of interpretation, I agree, but I have to assume that when the chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport took a vote a quorum was present. Otherwise he would not have done so because he would have been in contravention of Rule 103.

*(Parliament adopted the agenda)<sup>1</sup>*

### 3. Agenda

**President.** — At its meeting on 26 October 1983 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed.

At this morning's meeting the chairmen of the political groups instructed me to propose a certain number of amendments to the House.

First, in view of the very large number of items on the agenda, speaking time for all rapporteurs should be reduced to 5 minutes.

*(The President read the amendments to Monday's agenda)<sup>2</sup>*

*Wednesday:*

Voting time on Wednesday afternoon would be organized as follows:

<sup>1</sup> *Motions for resolutions (Rule 49 of the Rules of Procedure) — Petitions — Referral to committee — Documents received — Texts of Treaties forwarded by the Council — Request for a Member's immunity to be waived: See Minutes.*

<sup>2</sup> See Minutes.

**President**

- vote on the motion for a resolution by Mr Denis and others, winding up the debate on the oral question by the same authors on the special plan to combat drought in the Sahel which it had not been possible to put to the vote on Friday of the last part-session ;
- vote on the report which had just been discussed because of the question concerning the quorum in committee, i.e. the Viehoff report on the status of au pairs.

This vote was adjourned at the second October part-session. The Chairman of the committee responsible has stated that at the time the vote was taken seven members were present. It must therefore be put to the vote ;

- vote on motions for resolutions on which the debate has been closed.

**Mr Barbi (PPE).** — *(IT)* Mr President, unfortunately I was unable to attend the meeting of Group chairmen this morning, but I have been informed that Mr Arndt's statement on his report on own resources, in which he will simply inform Parliament about the Committee on Budgets decisions concerning the report, since the matter has already been discussed, and voting on the report have been deferred until Friday and will be included in the items for which urgent procedure has been requested by the Commission and the Council.

I think that such an important matter, one of the most important which Parliament has had to face and which is, in particular, a question on which Parliament must give its serious and considered views before the Athens summit, can not be relegated to Friday morning. I therefore request, Mr President, that Mr Arndt's statement should be brought forward, if possible, to Wednesday and that the vote on this important resolution should be placed on Wednesday's agenda.

**President.** — I greatly regret that it is not possible to determine now when the Arndt report will be taken, as the Committee on Budgets is meeting this evening to decide on the compromise amendments. As soon as I have received these amendments Members will have to be given the opportunity of tabling their amendments, which makes it highly unlikely that it will be possible to take the report on Tuesday. The earliest it can be taken is Thursday or perhaps Wednesday at the end of the afternoon. In view of the deadline it is practically impossible to debate the report tomorrow.

**Mr Arndt (S).** — *(DE)* There will be no new amendments from the Committee on Budgets, only old ones or old ones which have been revised slightly. I would consider it inappropriate for completely new amend-

ments to be tabled. All the motions which have been tabled so far stand. We hope that if the compromise proposal is adopted in the Committee on Budgets, most of the Members who have tabled amendments will withdraw them, but if they do not do so the amendments will stand. The amendments of the Committee on Budgets are not new ones, they are only a compromise proposal based on existing old amendments which I could put forward here individually.

**President.** — It means in any event, that we shall know tomorrow morning at the earliest what the Committee on Budgets is proposing. That also means that we shall not be able to decide until tomorrow morning; but not now.

**Mr Lange (S), Chairman of the Committee on Budgets.** — *(DE)* We could follow up Mr Barbi's suggestion to some extent by deciding provisionally. If things go well tonight in the Committee on Budgets we shall inform you very quickly. We hope that very few changes will then be necessary and that it will be possible to distribute them to the Members very quickly. I recommend therefore that the vote on the amendments to the Arndt report be placed on the agenda for Wednesday.

**President.** — Mr Lange, we all accept that this is an important report which is directly concerned with the principal items on this week's agenda, namely the preparations for the Athens Summit. If urgency is agreed tomorrow morning, it will also be decided that it will be dealt with this week. If it then appears that it is only a question of voting, we shall endeavour to hold the vote during voting time on Wednesday. However, we can only decide that if the amendments which still have to be decided on this evening are available.

**Mr Barbi (PPE).** — *(IT)* Mr President, I agree with the procedure which you propose to follow as long as the House decides here and now that the vote will take place on Wednesday and not on Friday.

**President.** — Mr Barbi, Rule 59 stipulates :

Except in the cases of urgency referred to in Rule 48 and 59, a debate and vote shall not be opened on a text unless it was tabled not later than 12 days before the beginning of the part-session and distributed at least 24 hours previously.

This means that we shall have to know tomorrow morning what stage has been written before deciding formally to take the report during voting time on Wednesday. However, I am quite prepared to do so. We are dealing with a formal question at the moment and it is sometimes important to take formal considerations into account.

**Lord Douro (ED).** — Mr President, I am afraid I do find your ruling a bit confusing. The Arndt resolution in its original form still exists and has not in any way been changed. Therefore it was tabled a long time ago and, indeed, at the last plenary session it was simply referred back to committee to be re-tabled at the following session. All that the Committee is doing tonight is to agree some committee amendments which will, as Mr Arndt says, be a compromise between some old amendments which have been in existence for a long time. So I do not see that you have a problem with Members who are not members of the Committee on Budgets being able to table amendments. They can do that to the existing text which will not be changed. The existing text still exists and will still exist after tonight's meeting of the Committee on Budgets.

**President.** — Yes, but that is not the problem. The problem is that the Arndt resolution has been referred back to committee. That means it has to be tabled again, and it has not yet been tabled. That is my only formal problem. Tomorrow morning I assume it will be tabled. We can decide on it and agree on the time when it should be dealt with. However, it is difficult to decide formally on something that has not been tabled. That resolution has first to be dealt with by the committee tonight.

**Mr Enright (S).** — Mr President, I was going to make exactly the point that you so sensibly have made.

**Mr Forth (ED).** — Mr President, I do not want to delay the House unduly but I think you formally proposed that the Viehoff report should be on the agenda for Wednesday. Could I formally oppose that, Mr President, just so that I can carry my objection in principle to what has been done through to its logical conclusion?

**President.** — We were in fact discussing Wednesday and the question of the tabling of the Arndt report but we shall deal with that tomorrow morning. There is a proposal not to accept the Viehoff report for Wednesday. We shall vote on that.

*(Parliament decided to keep the Viehoff report on the agenda)*

**Mr Provan (ED).** — On a point of clarification, Mr President. I think you said that on Wednesday at voting time we would consider resolutions on which the debate had closed.

Can you give us any indication as to whether that will include the agricultural resolutions in the Curry report or whether that will, in fact, be voted on Thursday?

**President.** — Unless there are unusual circumstances, but that is planned for Thursday.

*Thursday:*

The oral question to the Council (Doc. 1-932/83) by Mr Sieglerschmidt and Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group on the right to vote in the European Parliament elections of 14-17 June 1984 by Community citizens who are not nationals of the Member State in which they are resident, included in the debate on the report by Mrs Nielsen on the problem of migrant workers has, on a proposal from the political group chairmen, now been included for joint discussion with this report.

I propose to the House to withdraw from the agenda of this sitting the report by Mrs Pruvot (Doc. 1-970/83), and the Vandemeulebroucke report (Doc. 1-765/83).

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman (ED).** — Mr President, I regard the matter of voting for European citizens in the European elections as a matter of very considerable importance, but it does not seem to me to slot in very happily with this particular Nielsen report on the problem of migrant workers. I would respectfully suggest that the two are taken separately. We attach very considerable importance in my country to getting the vote through, but we also attach importance to discussing the Nielsen report — but not together.

**President.** — That is exactly what has been proposed, Mrs Kellett-Bowman. Originally it was tied in as a footnote to the Nielsen report, which is somewhat curious, but that is the normal way we deal with oral questions with debate. Because of the difficult link between the two problems we now have a joint debate, but they are separate items in that debate.

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman (ED).** — I want two separate debates, Mr President. I do not want them joined at all. Why join them? They are so disparate. You might as well join apples and pears! I am suggesting that we have two separate debates.

**President.** — You want to unlink them further than we have already done? I have no problem there. Then we will take them completely separately.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

**Mr Deleau (DEP).** — *(FR)* Mr President, the Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, Jacques Moreau, asked you in a letter 10 days ago to bring forward the debate on the report which I am due to present on behalf of the Committee on the European Centre for Small and Medium-sized Undertakings and Craft Industries.

**Deleau**

I have learned that this request was not met this morning by the Bureau, and I regret that. But none theless I would like to explain why we wished this report to be taken sooner.

As you know Mr President, I represented you last week in Tilburg, in the Netherlands, and I must leave on Wednesday for Edinburgh to do exactly the same with our British friends. And so I cannot be in Edinburgh and at the same time introduce this report here in the House.

And so I request, Mr President, that you ask this House to allow me to introduce this report either this evening or tomorrow.

**President.** — Mr Deleau, your request was received and discussed at length this morning. However, it is not possible to find the necessary time for it on either Monday's, Tuesday's or Wednesday's agenda. You are one of the first on the list of debates for Thursday. There is no way of changing that. If you go to Edinburgh the only thing you can do is have someone present the report on your behalf. I cannot see any other solution.

**Mr Eisma (NI).** — (NL) Mr President, you announced that the Pruvot and Vandemeulebroucke reports would be removed from the agenda, but can you tell us why?

**President.** — It was requested by the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

**Mr Vandewiele (PPE).** — (NL) Mr President, I would ask the Chair to draw the Bureau's attention to the very important report on tourism that has been drawn up by Mrs Viehoff. Mr Beumer, chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, should normally have spoken on this subject but he is unable to be here. I would find it regrettable if we had to debate the important Viehoff report on tourism on Thursday night, firstly, because we have only received the report today, it did not arrive until today and has not been distributed to Members, secondly, because I have not yet seen one of the amendments and, thirdly, because I am joint rapporteur. I have been involved in the preparations for years, and I appeal to Mrs Viehoff to request the Assembly to postpone the debate on this report until next month.

**President.** — You can rest assured that tourism will not be dealt with on Thursday night. As I read the agenda it will be placed on Friday morning's agenda. The best we can do is place it on Friday's agenda at the earliest. And there is a fair chance that it will be held over until the beginning of the next part-session considering the length of the agenda which, as things stand at the moment, has been scheduled for Thursday.

**Mr J. Moreau (S), Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.** — (FR) Mr President, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs I wish to support Mr Deleau in his request. He has explained the reasons for his absence on Thursday and knowing how conscientious he is I fully understand these reasons. That is why I am rather surprised that the Bureau thought fit to refuse to consider this request on behalf of the Committee to take Mr Deleau's report earlier.

It is indeed imperative that this report, even though some Members may not consider it urgent, be adopted as soon as possible to give a legal basis to the request made by Parliament to write in a budgetary line before allowing this institute to be founded.

**President.** — I agree; but I must point out that because of the nature of the debates it is impossible to enter the Deleau report on Tuesday or Wednesday. Therefore the only possibility left to me is today. The debates will be on reports from the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. If you propose to withdraw one of these reports, to hold it over until Thursday and to replace it by the Deleau report, I shall be happy to do so. But I have not received any such proposal from the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

Therefore if you propose that one of the four reports by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs be withdrawn, I shall be happy to comply.

**Mr J. Moreau (S), Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.** — (FR) Mr President, this is very awkward because for once today's reports present a certain whole. The four reports deal with problems of taxation, and I think it would be foolish to withdraw one of them because we wanted to have a joint debate on taxation. You are really putting me in a very awkward position in view of the fact that I am constantly asking for a certain logicity in our debates.

**President.** — Are you proposing that it be entered on today's agenda, Mr Moreau?

**Mr J. Moreau (S), Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.** — (FR) I do not think that, this report will give rise to a lengthy debate and so I believe it could be included in today's order of business. I do not know how many Members wish to speak on this report, but I do not think they will be numerous. The most important thing is for the House to adopt this report.

**President.** — In that case I propose to enter it at the end of today's agenda. If it is not considered, it will be taken automatically on Thursday.

**Mr Forth (ED).** — Mr President, I do object. I very much welcomed your original ruling which followed what I think we had established in this House, namely that where a rapporteur could regrettably not be here, it fell to the chairman of the committee to make the appropriate arrangements for the report to be taken. That is the position that the House had agreed. What is now happening is that for the personal convenience, not just of the rapporteur but of the chairman as well, this rule is going to be set aside and we are causing great upset to the agenda. Therefore, I hope that the House will adhere to your original ruling and support your original ruling and not accept what is now being proposed.

*(Parliament approved the President's proposal)*

**President.** — The report is therefore entered at the end of today's agenda. It may, however, be taken on Thursday.

*Friday:*

The Papaefstratiou report winding up the conciliation procedure with the Council on the revision of the Social Fund has been entered after the vote on the reports on which the debate has been closed.

The 'environment' Council will probably be present at Friday's sitting at which time we shall consider the matters carried over from the two October part-sessions, i.e. the following oral questions:

- by Mr Johnson, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group, to the Council on the protection of the environment and the development,
- by Mr Gautier and others, to the Commission, on motor vehicle exhaust gases,
- by Mr Collins, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, to the Council, on consumer protection.

**Mr Baudis (PPE).** — *(FR)* I should be obliged if you would include on Thursday's or Friday's order of business the report on behalf of the Committee on Transport on the proposal from the Commission of the European Community to the Council for a regulation on granting financial aid under the pluriannual programme on transport infrastructures. The Council is due to take a decision at the beginning of December. If we want Parliament's opinion to be considered we must take this report during this part-session.

**President.** — Thank you for your comment Mr Baudis. The Council has submitted some 10 requests for urgent procedure tomorrow, the Commission has submitted a few and your report is one of them. We shall vote tomorrow morning to see whether or not the House decides to enter it on the agenda.

**Mr Gautier (S).** — *(DE)* Our question was to be on the agenda for Friday at the last part-session. This time it is again on the agenda for Friday. Unfortunately another important political decision is to be taken on Friday: the German Social-Democratic Party is to decide on the list of candidates for the European elections and on the installation of missiles on Europe.

Since the question was put by Social Democrats alone and none of us is able to be here on Friday morning, regrettably the Commission would have to reply without us, which we do not want. I hope therefore that you will help us out of our dilemma. I am not requesting that the matter be placed on the agenda for some other time, only that it be discussed at the next part-session. Unfortunately we only have a party conference every two years!

**President.** — I feel we should avail of the rare opportunity presented by the Council's readiness to answer questions on the environment on Friday and that you should try to find someone to deputize for you as questioner, in view of the fact that the presence of the Council on a day other than Tuesday is a very rare exception.

**Mr Gautier (S).** — *(DE)* I believe that you are a President who appreciates political considerations. You know that the question of legislation on exhaust gases was originally raised by the German Social Democrats when we were still in power and that this question is being discussed nationwide in Germany. We consider it politically unthinkable for a debate of this nature to be held here when it is impossible for Social Democrats to be present, even though, as you know, we are normally always here on Friday mornings. I therefore ask you to treat this as a political question, not a technical one.

*(Parliament rejected the proposal to delete the item from the agenda)*

**Mr Gautier (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, technically speaking, how can you do this if none of the questioners will be here on Friday? I am very much against — and I should like to say so quite openly — a Conservative for example introducing our oral question in Parliament. But perhaps you could verify the result of the vote by the electronic voting system.

**President.** — Mr Gautier, if the question is withdrawn, the problem will be solved.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, would you please verify the vote electronically, as according to my count the majority was in favour of Mr Gautier's motion.

*(The result of the vote was checked electronically)*

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — On a completely different matter: could you tell me when copies of the Papaefstratiou report will be available in all languages? In committee, we had to vote, exceptionally, on a French text without any English text. I hope that will not happen in the plenary, and secondly, when will the deadline for amendments be?

**President.** — The deadline for amendments will be tomorrow at 1 o'clock in the afternoon.

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — And will we have copies of the report before then, please?

**President.** — I suppose you will.

**Mr Collins (S), chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.** — Two things: I understand that the Council will be asking for urgency on the Squarcialupi report on air pollution. I trust that that will be taken not late on Friday, but early on Friday, as it will be needed for the Environment Council towards the end of this month.

If I may make a second point while I am on my feet, it will save time. The oral question by myself, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on misleading advertising, is down, again because Council will be discussing this on 12 December; they would be very unfortunate indeed if this were to slip off the end of the agenda on Friday, and I would therefore respectfully ask you to ensure that this is taken earlier on Friday than would allow that to happen. The point is that the Parliament really must stamp its authority on this particular matter. The Council has spent a long time arriving at even a near-conclusion, and that is the point of the oral question. So I would hope it will be taken rather earlier on Friday than might otherwise be the case.

**President.** — Mr Collins, that has all been arranged. Only one problem remains. We have to vote on urgent procedure for the Squarcialupi report tomorrow morning and that will determine the agenda for Friday. But, as the President-in-Office of the Council will probably then be present, the questions and the Squarcialupi report will be taken together.

**Mrs Viehoff (S).** — (NL) Mr President, I asked for the floor when Thursday's agenda was being discussed, but then you passed on to Friday.

There are two things: firstly, I believe I heard that Mrs Pruvot's and Mr Vandemeulebroucke's report have been removed from the agenda. But I have not heard you say anything about Mr Hutton's report. A request has been made on behalf of the Socialist Group that it too should be removed from the agenda and debated at a future part-session with Mr Eisma's

report. Both reports concern voluntary work, Mr Hutton's relating specifically to young people, Mr Eisma's to the subject in general. The two reports are also based on the same motion for a resolution, No 1-942/81 tabled by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase. It seems more sensible to us for the two reports to be debated together at one part-session. That is the first point.

I believe you must have received a letter containing a request that the report on tourism be debated earlier on Thursday, partly prompted by the request made by the Commissioner concerned, who can only be here on Thursday and would like to be present for the debate on the report.

To come back to Mr Vandewiele's request: all the committees involved in the report on tourism have submitted their opinions. It will not take him long to look at the amendments he has not seen, because there are only two as far as I know. I would therefore ask you once again: have you received the letter requesting that the report on tourism be taken earlier on Thursday, and would you be willing to put this request to the vote?

**President.** — Mrs Viehoff, the last request is impossible, and with regard to the Hutton report, it was discussed this morning by the political group chairmen. According to our information, the Hutton report and the Eisma report are not identical. That is what we based our opinion on when fixing the agenda with the agreement of all group chairmen and that is what the proposal now before you states. As the information is correct, I am quite prepared to withdraw the proposal in order to deal with the Hutton report this week. However, I repeat, the information indicated that the two reports were not identical.

**Mrs Viehoff (S).** — (NL) Mr President, I did not say that they are identical. What I said was that in some respect they concern the same subject and that the two reports are based on the same resolution, No 1-942/81 tabled by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase. You can see this from both working documents, because Mr Eisma's report is ready: it is already in the form of a working document. In it you will see that both reports are based on the same resolution. I think it would be more sensible for us to coordinate our activities somewhat better and have joint debates on related matters.

*(Parliament approved the request)*

**President.** — The Markopoulos report will be the subject of an urgency vote tomorrow morning, just like the Squarcialupi and other reports.

**Mr Markopoulos (S).** — (GR) Mr President, I should simply like to know what has become of the request from the Council and the Commission for urgent debate on the report which I drew up on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research. I was informed that such a request had been made.



**President.** — Mr Markopolous, the Council requested urgent procedure on your report. This request will be submitted to Parliament tomorrow morning. Therefore the requests for an opinion from other Committees are no longer applicable.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — (DE) Mr President, I should like to come back to the question of Tuesday. My group submitted a request — which, perhaps, was not passed on to you — that in the debate at 3 p.m. the Curry report should be taken separately from the four other reports which deal with structural questions. Otherwise this debate will be a mess. It would be better to take the Curry report first and then deal with the structural proposals. The Socialist Group decided to submit this request to you, but it does not seem to have been passed on.

*(Parliament approved the request)*

**Sir Peter Vanneck (ED).** — Mr President, before we come to the urgencies as we conclude the debate on the agenda as it stands, may I make a plea with regard to the way in which the agenda is always readjusted on the Monday afternoon? It is bad enough when items are taken out, because one might easily have constituents or pressure groups, trade unionists or what have you, around and about who have come over specially for a particular debate only to find that it has been taken out. However, it is far far worse if things are put in, because then one has not got the documents and one is not organized. I think that it is most unfair to the Members concerned if a debate on a subject is suddenly introduced on to the agenda. So please, especially with the pressure of work, take things, out if you must, but do not add.

**President.** — I have to say that hardly any new item has been added to the agenda. The only such element is the Papaefstratiou report on the conciliation with Council on the Social Fund, which is a formal obligation, and there we depended on the state of work in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. Of course, there are the urgencies, but the urgencies are a phenomenon we always have to cope with.

**Mr Seligman (ED).** — On the Markopoulos report why do we have to wait until tomorrow morning? A number of scientists are coming from all over Europe to hear that debate, and I should have thought we could decide tonight on those urgencies requested by the Council.

**President.** — Mr Seligman, we only put items on the agenda if the work in committee has been finished a number of days before, so that the documents are at your disposal in sufficient time for the plenary sitting. That was not the case, as far as I know, with the Markopoulos report. That is why it has to be dealt with as an urgency.

I have received from Mr Forth and nine others a request, under Rule 56 of the Rules of Procedure, to withdraw the report by Mr Thareau (Doc. 1-923/83) on the new guidelines for the Community's structural policy in the agricultural sector.

**Mr Forth (ED).** — Mr President, we know that we are now operating under great pressure during sessions, and I believe that here we have the opportunity to take advantage of the movement of events. This report was originally designed to give the Commission guidelines on how to go about making proposals for restructuring agriculture. As we all know events have overtaken us, and the Commission has made its proposals. Therefore, it is patently clear to me at least that this report no longer has a place on our agenda and is no longer required. I therefore propose that in order to save ourselves a lot of time and make space on our agenda, that we withdraw this report and acknowledge the passing of circumstances and events.

**Mr Thareau (S).** — (FR) Mr President, it will come as no surprise to you to learn that I as rapporteur of the Committee on Agriculture rise to speak in favour of keeping this report on the agenda, the proper place for all reports on structures. The Committee on Agriculture prides itself on looking farther ahead than the Commission's proposals and it is perfectly entitled to put forward initiatives which should force the Commission to advance its proposals.

We consider it very important that this report be taken in the House before the Athens summit.

*(Parliament rejected the request and adopted the agenda as amended)*<sup>1</sup>

#### 4. Action taken on the opinions of Parliament

**President.** — The next item is the statement by the Commission of the European Communities on the action taken on the opinions and resolutions of the European Parliament.<sup>2</sup>

**Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission.** — (NL) I should like to begin by drawing the Assembly's attention to a matter that was not discussed at the last two part-sessions and should not really figure under this item of the agenda because it concerns a resolution adopted by the European Parliament on its own initiative. But, having consulted the committee chairmen this morning and in view of the urgency of this matter, I feel I must ask you to consider it for a moment.

<sup>1</sup> Urgent procedure — Deadline for tabling amendments — Speaking time: See Minutes.

<sup>2</sup> See Annex.

**Andriessen**

Last January Parliament adopted a resolution calling for direct Community aid to Namibia. During the debate on this resolution the President of the Commission took the view, on the Commission's behalf, that, until the conditions set out in United Nations Resolution 435 had been satisfied, serious difficulties would be encountered in the granting of direct aid.

Resolutions concerning Namibia are being discussed within the United Nations at the moment. These resolutions originate from the United Nations Council for Namibia, the only body with legal authority over the territory of Namibia until it achieves independence. Among other things, these resolutions criticize the granting of direct aid to Namibia, as the European Parliament, for example, has proposed. I consider it my duty to bring this situation to Parliament's notice and also to inform it that the Commission can, of course, hardly do more than reassert its view that aid to Namibia can only be granted in accordance with the guidelines adopted by the United Nations.

**President.** — May I intervene at once to express, first of all, my gratitude for the statement that you have made in Parliament's resolution of January last on Namibia. I was able to note the pieces both here and in New York and I can only confirm what you have said. With regard to the debate on Namibia I should like to point out that, after reading what happened as a result of the resolution on humanitarian aid, that it was in no way the intention of the author of the resolution to define the position of Parliament and the EEC on the legal status of Namibia. The deep concern expressed by the UN Security Council with regard to Namibia concerning the resolution which had been adopted earlier appears to me to have been premature.

This view was confirmed at the discussions I had this morning with the group chairmen. If this position can be adopted by the plenary sitting I can assure you that, this week I shall point out more clearly to the Secretary-General of the UN, Mr Perez de Cuellar, that in Parliament's view there is no question for defining the legal status of Namibia and that the resolution must be read in context. Any objections?

That is agreed.

**Mrs Squarcialupi (COM).** — *(IT)* In October the European Parliament unanimously adopted a resolution pursuant to Rule 47 on dangerous products and substances. Mr Narjes who replied on behalf of the Commission, expressed some doubts about one paragraph of the resolution which I repeat, Parliament had adopted unanimously, and more precisely about paragraph 2 (a) and (b). He also said that this matter would be further examined as Parliament had not yet given its opinion.

I should like to ask the Commission if it can explain the doubts it expressed in October and if it can, there-

fore, guarantee that the Commission will agree to our requests.

**President.** — Can you answer that question, Mr Andriessen?

**Mr Andriessen.** — *(NL)* I cannot give a definite answer to this question at the moment, Mr President.

**President.** — I take it, therefore, that this is something which will be taken up later by the Commission and the relevant parliamentary committee.

**Mr Enright (S).** — Under item D — emergency aid for third countries — will the Commission state whether it has considered this month granting emergency aid for Grenada as soon as the invading forces have withdrawn, in order to assist that country to get back under democratic control?

**Mr Andriessen.** — *(NL)* The Commission adopted an interim protective measure at the time of the events in Grenada. As soon as the situation becomes clearer, normal relations will, of course, be resumed with Grenada.

## IN THE CHAIR : MR KLEPSCH

*Vice-President*

**Mr Cousté (DEP).** — *(FR)* In the July debate on temporary employment Mr Richard said that he would examine all the amendments with the Commission. I ought to remind you that these amendments are somewhat contradictory despite the excellent work done by the rapporteur, Mr Patterson. In those circumstances I should like to ask Mr Andriessen if this directive will be withdrawn or if it will be the subject of a communication from Mr Richard, and if so, when?

**Mr Andriessen.** — *(NL)* We exchanged views on this matter during the last part-session. In the meantime, Mr Richard has written to the rapporteur to say that it is taking longer than usual to adopt a final position in this matter. I can assure you that, as soon as it is known what this position is, the committee and Parliament will be informed.

**Mr Aigner (PPE).** — *(DE)* Concerning Christmas butter: Parliament has twice voted under the urgent procedure. I should like to hear the Commission's views and decision. What has happened about this?

**Mr Andriessen.** — *(NL)* This subject has also been discussed a number of times and, like the first question, it comes under the heading of own initiatives. Parliament will be debating agricultural matters at length this week. Mr Dalsager will be taking part in the debate and is prepared to inform the Assembly of the Commission's opinion as it stands at the moment.

**Andriessen**

It seems to me that one of the arguments that has led to the Commission adopting the position it has was that it would be better for the dairy policy the Commission wants to pursue to be discussed during this debate than under this item of the agenda.

**President.** — I should like to point out that Mr Dalsager will make a statement on this during the discussions on agricultural matters.

**Mr Aigner (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr Commissioner, I find it somewhat strange for a report to be adopted unanimously in committee and by a three-fifths majority in plenary, for there to be a request under the urgent procedure, and for the Commission still not to give an opinion. A very strange thing happened Mr President: the Commissioner said here that the money needed for the Christmas butter scheme was not available, but Mr Dalsager blurts out in committee that it had never been a question of finance!

I think that Parliament is entitled to hear an opinion from the Commission and I request that the Commission now give a detailed opinion on this matter in this debate and that it reconsider its view.

**Mr Andriessen.** — *(NL)* Let me just say this: of course, Parliament has a right to hear the Commission's views. That is not the issue. The question is whether Parliament has a right to hear the Commission's views while this item of the agenda is being discussed. Mr President, it has been agreed that the Commission's statement will be made during the debate on agriculture this week and not under this item of the agenda. I therefore abide by what I have said.

**Mr Eisma (NI).** — *(NL)* I have another question that concerns page 3 of the Commission's document and Mrs Squarzialupi's report on cosmetic products. The Commission says that account is in essence taken of the amendments proposed by the European Parliament.

May I ask what is meant by the confusing expression 'in essence'? Does it mean that in fact two of the amendments adopted by this Parliament and welcomed by the Commission have been incorporated in the directive, in the Council decision? I should like to know precisely what is meant, because the term 'in essence' does not tell me great deal.

**Mr Andriessen.** — *(NL)* In answer to this question, the Commission is able to confirm that account will be taken of the amendments.

### 5. Economic situation in the EC

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-988/83) by Mr Bonaccini, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-983/83-COM(83) 628/fin.) concerning the adoption of the annual report on the economic situation in the Community and establishing economic policy guidelines for 1984.

**Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President, four months ago I had to present another report, which was adopted by the Parliament, on the evolution of the economic situation. I think that it is not worth repeating now what was said then. However we must realize that in 1983, in spite of all the efforts made and some minor achievements, the convergence of economic policies still did not take place. This realization, coming almost at the end of the ten-year period since the 1974 decisions, is not, unfortunately, reassuring.

In 1983 there was further evidence of significant and at times unexpected changes both in the strictly economic and social world context and in the political context within which economic development must take place. These were met by policies and measures which were to a great extent rooted in the experience of the 1960s. It is obvious that I am referring to the decisions on these matters taken by the Council of Ministers.

Therefore, establishing guidelines for economic policy in 1984, the year in which the first term of office of the directly-elected European Parliament comes to an end, might seem an unreal undertaking which is forced on us as a matter of parliamentary ritual, especially if we consider the disappointing news which has just reached us concerning the outcome of the meeting of the Council of Ministers in Athens which shows that the prospects for a renewal of the European Economic Community have suffered further setbacks.

Point 16 of the motion for a resolution draws attention to the responsibilities of the Council and invites it to demonstrate the will to conform in practical terms to the guidelines set out in the Commission's report. Moreover, point 4 of the resolution states that Europe should retain the essential strength to give fresh impetus to growth at the highest levels of efficiency and competitiveness and to ensure the possibility of a healthy and progressive recovery of its economy in spite of the limited prospects for growth and the various negative features and uncertainties surrounding it.

Points 18 to 21 deal with macroeconomic measures, which is why I shall not discuss them in detail here. They are measures which seek to bring about a convergence of performance and of the economy seen, therefore, not in terms of complete uniformity of behaviour but as an alignment which could result from the

**Bonaccini**

common pursuit of basic objectives and also from discriminating and flexible behaviour on the part of the major macroeconomic powers and approaches in line with particular national circumstances.

We must create the general conditions which will allow us to confront at one and the same time two major obstacles to the development of the European economies: the persistence, in some cases, of high levels of inflation and the scarcity, or even lack, of proper measures to stimulate the production of genuine resources.

The main points of the analysis of the economic situation are contained in the various recitals of the motion for a resolution, particularly under A and B. It would be a completely futile and, I would say, almost useless exercise at this point to attempt to make forecasts and to ask what the future holds rather than deciding what will happen on the basis of sound fact.

Recital F of the motion for a resolution uses these words to describe the action which must be taken: 'it is increasingly necessary to focus attention on the structural adjustments needed to create a context favourable to improving the employment situation' in order to increase 'the competitive capacity of European economies, so as to halt the decline in our industries'.

We have moved into an age which I shall call the 'age of restructuring'. Ladies and gentlemen, we cannot begin a new phase of development unless we restructure. This may seem an obvious thing to say, but it is applicable to the different areas from industry to monetary measures and from finance to the need to seek for new products, new methods and innovations in every field.

A certain number of indications for possible common initiatives are contained in paragraph 13 and, since the President is inviting me to conclude, I should like to say that these indications of contributions to the stimulation of production are accompanied by the support which must be given to them. Working time, information and worker consultation create the conditions which will lead to a more broadly-based consensus.

The main objective of our economic policy must remain that set out in paragraph 1: to create all the conditions which will allow unemployment to be conquered. We cannot resign ourselves to unemployment at a stable level of 10%; we must sharpen our wits, strengthen our desire to progress and, as we are doing at the moment with ever increasing justification ask the Governments and the Council of Ministers to provide the positive response which the people of Europe expect.

**Mr J. Moreau (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Bonaccini's report is being debated several weeks before the European Council in Athens, and it is the last time in this term of office that our Parliament will debate the economic situation in the Community in the context of the agreement on convergence.

Our colleague's report reflects the present situation in the Community and I wish to congratulate the author for all the work he has put into drafting a text which is as realistic as possible and the the same time acceptable to the majority in this House.

The fact that he has not been entirely successful is obviously due to the fact different views exist, even although they are not as divergent as in the past, and to the attitudes of the different political groups in this House.

The economic situation in the Community is full of contrasts. One can detect the first faint signs of an economic upturn, but none of us can forecast how long this upturn will last. Indeed, despite certain improvements on the inflation front and in external trade, and despite a certain real convergence of economic policies, we see that the unemployment figures are still rising. Europe is still subject to external influences and experiencing many difficulties in mastering its economic and monetary development.

We are all, I think, convinced of the need for a policy of controlled economic renewal founded on a healthy basis; and like the rapporteur, we also appreciate the importance for overall demand of the Member States' exports.

We regret, however, that the report was not more explicit or daring on this point.

We also support the idea of channelling savings into productive investments and encouraging innovations. But I personally wish to highlight three points which I consider essential to assuring steadier growth, economic renewal and a drop in unemployment.

We must make more specific progress in the monetary and financial fields, and my colleague Mr Papantoniou will develop this point in greater detail.

The competitiveness of the European economy is a key issue, as the rapporteur says, and that can only be improved if we have a basic change in the structures of our production apparatus.

There is no point in my going over all the proposals made in the report. I wish to pick out the need for European cooperation in research, in development and in industry in the advanced technology sectors and the sectors of the future. We consider the Esprit programme an important step in the latter case, and we should think of extending this step in the months and years ahead.

**Moreau**

But there will be no improvement in competitiveness unless there is a greater combined effort by the different parties involved in the production system. That is why we think greater advance should be made in consulting workers in the factories, and I am sad that the text of the report has been changed on this point.

Without attributing imaginary advantages to the reduction in working time, I nonetheless believe that an ambitious policy of readaptation and reorganization of working time could have an effect on both employment and competitiveness.

My group will abstain on this report, not because of any objection to its contents — we agree with nearly all the statements in it — but we would have liked to see this House affirm more convincingly and more decisively the need for a renewal which is so necessary if we want to complete the structural change referred to by Mr Bonaccini and to begin to solve the problem of employment facing our Community in such flagrant terms.

**Mr von Bismarck (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, although the subject calls for much longer discussion, I can only deal with it briefly in the time available. The fact that the rapporteur was only allotted five minutes speaking time seems to me to be discrimination against the subject matter.

Firstly, on behalf of my group, I should like to praise the courage, the consistency and the care with which this report has been drawn up. Therefore — I should like to say this to the previous speaker — Mr Bonaccini's report is not excessively long, it is encouragingly short because we do not have to make any substantial amendments. I consider that this proposal is particularly successful in the context of the Council Decision of 1974 because it emphatically points the way to the realization of a truly socially committed and social market economy in this European Community of ours. It makes no attempt to claim that two and two make five and says quite clearly that in economic policy, which must be subordinate to social policy, two times two are four!

The rapporteur's observations in paragraph 16, to which he has already referred are important, and I should like to express my support for them. It says that the Council should read it and act accordingly! I should like to add a recommendation that the Council finally regain its ability to make decisions by introducing a system of majority voting so that it is able to implement matters which the majority recognize as right, otherwise all the good proposals which the Commission has made are a complete waste of time.

Second point. Growth is mentioned in many places and the report also says that growth is not enough. I must point out in all seriousness that growth can take many forms, perhaps this could have been included in

the report. It is only new products, new markets and new services that will create new jobs. Once the market is saturated there is a tendency to cut down on labour. Only new products can solve this problem and we should perhaps put this point to the Council very strongly. I hope that the Commissioner will go into this further. It must also be remembered that new products require a higher stake and involve an increased market risk as a result of which the investment required has to be greater. As a proportion of costs the risk capital is much greater in the case of new products. For this reason the need to obtain and guarantee risk capital are the key factors in this situation.

Third point: the only safe employment is profitable employment and the only profitable employment is in profitable undertakings. Those who jeopardize profits jeopardize employment. Those who abolish profit abolish employment and anyone who obstructs a return to adequate profits — this is the problem of today and it was clearly stated in committee — obstructs the creation of new employment. An essential point and one which cannot be stressed enough!

Fourth point: competition. Competition is the only way to remain competitive. In considering competitiveness we have to think of individual undertakings and if the market is right they will generate competitiveness. What is the main obstacle? The internal market. As a result of the most varied kinds of protectionism the internal market in its present form makes us incapable of competing against America and Japan. Why are we unable to do so? Because the general costs — which in some cases amount to 10 to 15 per cent; in the case of research costs it goes much higher — can be divided by six in America but perhaps only be two in our case. This means eight percentage points on the bill whereas not more than 2 to 3 per cent of turnover is the usual figure in export business. The internal market is therefore the key to recovery and the Council would do well to think of this in its decisions because it will not improve unless the Council takes action.

The last speaker referred to the reduction of working hours: unfortunately no-one ever does any calculations on this! Regrettably it is never looked at closely, and unfortunately it is a great illusion to expect that employment will be created in this way. On the contrary: there is a far greater probability that we shall thereby generate costs which will reduce profits still further. My group emphatically rejects this idea, it is no solution to our problems. One request, Mr President: in future we should ensure that in this debate on the annual economic report the principal speaker is allocated at least 10 to 15 minutes speaking time, instead of giving each political group five or six minutes, so that we can do justice to the matter.

*(Applaus)*

**Mr Welsh (ED).** — Mr President, we too would like to offer our congratulations to Mr Bonaccini on the fair-mindedness and the skill with which he has drafted his resolution.

This is one of those times when, perhaps, we should pause for a moment and count our blessings. It is always very difficult to prove a negative, but those who constantly damn the Community with ineffectiveness might well ask themselves what would have happened over the last three or four years if there had not been a Community at all. I suspect that the problems we are contemplating today would have been very nearly insoluble.

We can also count our blessings in that there is at last a degree of convergence in the way that the Member States are managing their economies. For that, Vice-President Ortoli himself must take a great deal of the credit. So when looking at this report, do not let us assume that everything is necessarily bad. We are beginning to see some fragile signs of recovery, and that is something to rejoice about. However, it is indeed a fragile recovery. In fact, the Commission document is not entirely clear as to whether it is a recovery at all. At very best, we can say that we have moved out of reverse gear and into neutral.

Because it is so fragile, my group cannot accept the terms of paragraph 21 as we do not believe that there should be any excuse, any scintilla of a reason, for letting up on the prudent economic strategies that most Member States have implemented over the last few years.

I am very surprised that our Socialist friends are not going to vote for this report. Paragraph 13, I think, contains an excellent agenda for action. If every one of the points of that particular programme were implemented, we would have a recovery that we could feel confident in. The most significant thing the Community can now do is to get on with the job and implement the set of proposals in the Bonaccini resolution. We wish Mr Ortoli good luck and God's speed in doing that.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — *(GR)* Mr President, we would have liked to be more indulgent towards our colleague Mr Bonaccini than Mr Welsh has been, especially since we belong to the same group, but we cannot do it. We disagree with the philosophy of the report, and more so still, with that of the Commission. Mr Welsh said that the Bonaccini report contains many positive features. I shall mention one of these, which the Commission also mentions, namely that the real cost of labour, corrected for inflation, fell by 1 % in 1982 and it is expected that in 1983 it will fall still further. The Commission welcomes this redistribution of incomes, which increases the profitability of companies.

The problems arising are much more severe for Greece. In the short time I have available, I just want to condemn the fact that the Commission's report states that Greece should implement strict policies in the sector of incomes and budgetary management, and that in particular the wages policy should aim at reducing the real cost of labour per employee, by an appropriate restriction of cost-of-living adjustments. We consider this to be an unacceptable provocation, because it is a repetition of what happened in 1982, and of the Commission's interventions, and this, moreover, at a time when Greece's incomes policy is being formulated. We cannot understand how Greece could possibly consider economic union based on a policy like that. We call upon the government to reject these pressures in both word and deed, and upon working people to intensify their struggle for Greece to break away from the EEC.

**Mrs Tove Nielsen (L).** — *(DA)* Mr President, the Liberal Group welcomes the report of which Mr Bonaccini is rapporteur. We think that in it he has grasped the essential aspects, both in his analysis of the period we have been through, — and particularly in the future perspectives which he indicates.

We shall not be over optimistic, but on the part of the Liberal Group we would like to say, however, that if there is a will, then we too can put our mark on the future through the economic recovery which we now can glimpse. But it requires the will to use the correct means and in our opinion the report points to them.

We are well aware that the existing large unemployment figures must be reduced as much as possible. We are of the opinion that we can achieve this by putting the economy in order, and we fully agree that what the Community needs in this area is integrated actions. We must restructure our industrial sector, we must make everything much more flexible with a view to meet those challenges which Europe is facing at the present time. I am of course, thinking first and foremost of technological development, which quite naturally leads us to the fact that we must see to it that the citizens of the Member States are retrained. We must ensure that they really are trained to meet the requirements of the present time. We must have occupational and geographic mobility.

When we talk about changing structures, then it is quite obvious that precisely in those undertakings which come under the heading of small and medium-sized undertakings offer the best opportunities to meet the challenges which face us. Within these it is much easier to change things in the course of a very short time in order to carry out new tasks, produce new products, and thus enter the large world market. Mr President, improved competitiveness is the key to the economic recovery which we need so very much.

**Mr Nyborg (DEP).** — *(DA)* Mr President, many nice things have been said and I can agree that, there is no doubt that the Commission, under the leadership of Mr Ortoli and his staff, have done a fine piece of work; and the same can be said for the Parliament's rapporteur, Mr Bonaccini.

But let me switch to a question of procedure. We have here an excellent report. On its cover it says that it is about the adoption of the annual report on the economic situation of the Community and the fixing of economic policy guidelines for 1984. And I ask you particularly to note the latter. What is the use of giving an opinion on economic guidelines for 1984? All the national Parliaments have debated their budgets for 1984 a long time ago, and not even at the final adjustments will they have the possibility to take account to this excellent document from the Commission and the Parliament. Therefore I shall urge the Commission to see to it that in the future this report on the economic situation and the guidelines for the following year is produced several months earlier than is now the case, so that the national governments to whom these are directed, also can take them into account when they are drawing up their budgets for the following year.

**Mr Bonde (CDI).** — *(DA)* Mr President, for many years we have received from the Commission their so-called compulsory economic guidelines containing recommendations for the economic policy of the Member States. The advice given to Denmark has been rather monotonous year after year: cut public spending, cut wages and salaries. But have those guidelines resulted in a better economy? Wages and salaries have been cut in real terms. After 10 years in the EEC productivity has gone up by 40%. In other words, we produce 140 items per working hour compared to 100 previously. In spite of this the TUC-workers' wages in real terms have fallen to 98.9% of the 1973 wages. And the official statistics do, in fact, mask an even greater fall in the real wages, because the official statistics talks about a TUC-worker who by now is almost extinct. The TUC-worker in the official statistics happens to be one who has never tried to obtain a part-time job, who has never tried work-sharing, and who has never been on the dole. Such a worker is difficult to find nowadays. Last year alone, one in three TUC-workers were unemployed for a shorter or longer period of time. The fall in real wages, which is the result of becoming a part-time worker or job-sharer, or receiving the dole, cannot be measured by the official statistics. And so one certainly cannot accuse Denmark of not having paid heed to the advice from the EEC-authorities on wage restraint.

But have these words of wisdom created more jobs? In June 1983 — which from an employment point of view is the best month of the year — Denmark had

256 712 people officially registered as unemployed and 10 207 job vacancies. So not only did we have full employment, but even a shortage of workers when we joined the EEC. From 1973 to 1982 the official unemployment rate has gone up from 0.9 to 9.9%. What is the situation in those countries with which we usually compare ourselves? Unemployment in Norway has gone up from 0.8% to 2.5%, in Sweden from 2.5% to 3.1%, in Austria from 1.6% to 3.7%, and in Switzerland from 0% to 0.4%. So we can see a clear pattern for Western Europe: Those countries also feel the economic crisis, but not in the form of mass unemployment. In the light of this we will thank the EEC to spare us further economic guidelines.

**Mr Papantoniou (S).** — *(GR)* Mr President, in contrast to the positive developments in the American and Japanese economies, the European Community remains immersed in economic stagnation, while unemployment continues to increase. There are no doubt organizational reasons for the inadequacy of European economic performance. However, the persistence in two major European countries, Germany and the United Kingdom, of conservative political forces that remain committed to the monetarist dogma is contributing a great deal to the prolongation of the economic crisis. The economies of those two countries are characterized today by small public-sector deficits, very low inflation, balance of payments surpluses and considerable margins of unused productive capacity. Thus, they embody all the prerequisites for the effective implementation of an expansionist macro-economic policy. The margins for relaxation in the monetary sector are indeed small, granted today's high interest levels in the United States. However, in the public-sector economies of those two countries the drastic restriction of organizational deficits leaves considerable margins for tax reductions designed to stimulate economic activity and to support economic development.

Despite the disquieting proportions attained by the unemployment, the governments of Germany and the United Kingdom refuse to pursue such a policy. Mr President, it is not easy to find a logical explanation for this. It seems most likely that those governments have fallen victims to the monetarist dogma and to economic circles influenced by monetarist views. Indeed, many industrialists and financiers in the large capitalist economies have adopted the view that any increase in the public-sector deficit, under any circumstances whatsoever, creates inflationary expectations that are soon manifested as higher inflation, eventually leading to a downturn in economic activity. There is no evidence to support this view. On the contrary there is recent and clear evidence that the huge deficits of the American budget have gone hand in hand with a rapid fall in inflation and a downturn in inflationary expectations, and in parallel have led to a powerful upswing in the economy.

**Papantoniou**

It is said that in its latest annual economic report the Commission seems to accept and adopt the economic choices of the conservative governments. I fully recognize the Commission's fears that an increase in the public-sector deficit would reduce available resources for investments that are essential prerequisites if we are to emerge from the economic crisis. However, these fears are totally unfounded for the following reasons.

Firstly, the financial expansion we are proposing is smaller than the one that has taken place in the United States, which is indeed risky.

Secondly, there are ways of arranging the tax cuts so as to produce investment rather than consumption. Thirdly and most importantly, Mr President, the fact that in the two countries I mentioned, the United Kingdom and Germany, the fulfilment of all the prerequisites for implementing an effective expansionist policy means an increase in the national income, and consequently increased revenue for the financing of additional productive investment. This is a basic, I would even say classical, principle of political economics, at any rate as developed after Keynes.

The Socialist Group believes that without the implementation of an expansionist macro-economic policy by countries in a position to do this, our economic stagnation will continue indefinitely. Unfortunately, neither the Commission's report nor the Bonaccini report seem to share this view.

**Mr Albers (S).** — (NL) Mr President, the Commission's annual economic report reveals that the efforts undertaken in recent years to achieve greater convergence of the economies of the various Member States have had some success. The position of the Netherlands is on the whole all the more striking as a result.

The Commission rightly states that the Dutch economy could do with rather stronger domestic demand. This statement is prompted by the rising surplus in the balance of payments and in the fact that the slow recovery of the world economy will have a favourable effect on Dutch exports.

And yet the Dutch Government's policy is to depress domestic demand even further: a reduction in public spending, public investment, investment in housing as well as a reduction in private consumption in 1984. The Dutch Finance Minister accused the Commission of using outdated figures and was supported in this by the German State Secretary for Finance, who uses more recent information to reveal better trends in his country. But the conclusion to be drawn from the figures taken as a guideline for the 1984 Dutch budget is that the Commission is right to say that domestic demand in the Netherlands is being curbed more than economic circumstances justify.

I should therefore like to ask the Commissioner two questions, Mr President. Is it true that the Commission will have to adjust the forecasts for 1984 in the light of more recent figures and, if so, will this necessarily result in a more favourable assessment of the curbs on private consumption in the Netherlands? Does the Commission's statement on the Netherlands mean that this Member State must increase its efforts to achieve greater convergence of its economy with the economies of the other Member States of the Community?

The answers to these questions are of such interest, Mr President, because further curbs on domestic demand in the Netherlands will put this country in an exceptional position as regards the trend in unemployment, which could then be expected to rise from 4.7 % in 1980 to 17.6 % in 1984.

**Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (FR) Mr President, I wish to join in the congratulations of those who have said that Mr Bonaccini and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs have done sterling work and at the same time in the regrets expressed by those who think that this economic report deserves more than a total of 46 minutes' debate in this House at the present time of vast unemployment, of constant change and of uncertainty as to whether there is a real upturn and before a European Council in Athens which is of major importance.

And I say this with even greater regret as this remark has already taken me 30 seconds.

We have drawn up a report which highlights a certain number of points which were discussed with the Committee. The first is that although there is an upswing, that upswing is moderate, slow, irregular and full of contrasts. And here I would like to say to Mr Albers that our data and recommendations remain as valid today, as they were when the report was presented in September. It is a growth which could average 1.5 % in 1984, whereas the average of 1971/1980 was almost 3 %. It is an upturn full of contrasts, as the growth is still negative in five Member States and as some of them would have a performance in 1984 of between 0 % and 1/2 % compared with the average just mentioned.

And it is an upswing which has its starting point in private consumption, the phenomenon of stock rebuilding, and partly the development of the construction business. But we have not had the traditional link of exports and we have not yet had the necessary link of investments. We hope that 1984 will bring back this support from world trade as we expect an increase in world imports of more than 35 % in volume, whereas trade was negative in 1982 and level, one could say, in 1983.



## Ortoli

Unemployment is slowing down, but as the report says, it is still not yet satisfactory. It is levelling off, but in such a way that in our economies the major problem remains that of unemployment. And so we have a slight upturn full of contrasts, but accompanied by unemployment, which is far too high.

Secondly, there is increased convergence in the Community on inflation. It is clear that in the Community we are progressively moving down from an inflation rate which was well over 10 % only a few years ago nearer to a rate lower than 6 % for 1984, with an additional element that most of the Member States will be below the 10 % level. This first element of convergence is indubitable and very welcoming.

Secondly, the considerable drop in the deficit in the balance of payments, with most of our countries enjoying a better balanced situation.

Finally, a halt in the increase in budgetary deficits — I shall come back to the question asked by some Members on the development in these countries with the best record — but there is no doubt that some countries have reached a level of deficits which involve quite simply the problem of regaining control of the increase in public spending and not of the margin of manoeuvre available for use; this point was discussed in committee and recognized, I think, by most Members present here.

There are three elements of precariousness. The first relates to the international financial and monetary situation, the interest rates, exchange rates and indebtedness. This is obviously a major factor today at a time when the upturn was partly induced by the United States and Japan.

The second element of precariousness in the upturn is the fact that we are still awaiting a new impetus in investment and that this impetus is hardly detectable in the better off economies. But investment is essential to continuous growth and continuous upturn. We cannot do without investment, firstly because what is called the potential growth rate has become weak. The potential growth rate is the possibility for the economy to grow taking into account capital stock without rekindling inflation.

This rate, which to a certain extent indicates the overall margin of manoeuvre of the economy, was 5 % per annum before 1973. It dropped to 2.4 % during the period 1973/80 and today it is around 2 %. That means that if we do not invest we shall very soon, in terms of growth, reach the limits of inflation, as has already happened unfortunately in some Member States. Upturns which could be considered weak in the light of our pre-1980 standards have become inflationist upturns. Therein lies a fundamental problem of investments, for without investment we shall not be able to tackle the problems of competitiveness or of modernization.

Thirdly, there is not enough structural change, which is linked to this insufficient investment, and I would

like to remind you that we have a long way to go yet, although we must not become disheartened. We have quoted an encouraging example in our report; some years ago it took 1 % more energy for 1 % more growth. Now we need 0.65 % more energy for 1 % more growth. This means that our attempts to reduce dependence on energy have been successful. How can we consolidate this upturn? I have no intention of dwelling overmuch on the broad outlines of economic policy, as Mr Bonaccini has touched on them sufficiently in his report, but I would like to say a couple of words on budgetary policies. What is the real margin for manoeuvre in public finance? We have suggested that we continue with the determined policies to reabsorb structural deficits but that 'automatic stabilisers' should also come into play. Indeed, in certain circumstances we would positively welcome the intervention of these 'automatic stabilisers'. But I believe that there are certain things that we must not lose sight of; firstly, the problem facing us is not only that of the size of the public deficit, it is also that of the size of the public debt. For example in such countries as the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom the public debt is over 40 % and 58 % of the GDP respectively.

This means that when the deficit grows, the increase occurs largely through the interest rates. And this is one of the points that we stressed in the report because we wanted to show that one of the margins of manoeuvre had disappeared due to the fact that each time the deficit increased it was absorbed by the interest paid. And we have quoted, I think, some very relevant statistics.

When this happens the problem no longer remains one of a budgetary deficit but becomes one of interaction between budgetary policy and monetary policy; a monetary policy accompanied by expansion which allows the interest rates to be independent of American interest rates, which means a sufficient drop in interest rates to facilitate investment without the public deficit absorbing part of the sums available and in the final analysis increasing interest rates. I should like to remind you that in such countries as the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany this balance has been sought. So while the deficit is being reduced in the Federal Republic let us not forget that interest rates have been held at a level much lower in real terms than American interest rates.

I would simply like to stress, by way of conclusion, Mr President, that we must organize this upturn. We are witnessing an upswing, let us hold on to it. We have submitted a certain number of ideas, some of which are national in character. Policies which may be pursued are partly a policy of employment, and here I should warmly welcome a debate some time on a document which we drew up on working time. This document does not present a reduction in working time or a rearrangement of working time as the absolute and sole remedy, but we show, I believe, that if

**Ortoli**

certain conditions are respected then a different organization in the planning of working time could help our economy to develop more favourably. I shall not dwell on this point, but I should welcome a proper debate on it some time, for it is a major issue which should be discussed in depth.

On the question of Community participation we must first of all appreciate the overall process of understanding problems. I mention the indispensable help received from the European Monetary System which is the most effective instrument of convergence we have; it helps our joint thinking in a way which is probably irreplaceable and generally underestimated.

We must also use the integrated financial markets, in other words create one large risk-bearing capital market in Europe; we do not have a risk-bearing capital market which could provide the means to finance investment which we ought to have with our dimension and savings. We have submitted proposals to this effect.

Finally, strengthening the single market which covers free circulation of products and services but which also concerns encouraging development through new technologies and research which Mr Moreau has just touched upon. And so in addition to purely national policies we must have common action, that is to say we must have coherent national policies which are compatible one with the other, positive and dynamic action in new technologies, a single market, financial markets, and furthermore the opportunity of having increased monetary stability which should also enable the Community to turn to the outside every time we must find a stable basis for interest rates, for exchange rates, for dialogue with the major currencies; all of which means not only adopting joint stances, but also when necessary formulating proposals for a more serene, confident, sure organization of the international economic and monetary system.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

#### 6. Tax harmonization — Turnover taxes — Taxes on tobacco

**President.** — The next time is the joint debate on — the report (Doc. 1-903/83) by Mr Rogalla, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the harmonization of taxation in the Community.

— the report (Doc. 1-777/83) by Mr Beumer, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-1299/82-COM(82) 870 fin.) for a twelfth directive on the harmonization of the laws of the

Member States relating to turnover taxes — common system of value added taxes: expenditure not eligible for deduction of value added tax.

— the report (Doc. 1-907/83) by Mr J. Moreau, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on cigarette tax harmonization.

**Mr Rogalla (S), rapporteur.** — (DE) Mr President, first of all, a point of order: perhaps I have not remembered today's agenda correctly, but I was expecting a speaking time of 10 minutes for rapporteurs. Was this perhaps changed at the last minute?

**President.** — The decision was taken by the House because of the large number of reports which have to be taken during this sitting.

**Mr Rogalla (S), rapporteur.** — (DE) Thank you for your explanation, Mr President.

The framework for this work was provided by an own-initiative report on the harmonization of taxation in the Community. I did, of course, have a personal interest in it, but I have to admit that in spite of a great deal of effort and despite some interesting work I still do not regard myself as a great authority in this field — the harmonization of taxation is such a wide and varied topic. I should therefore like to point out particularly that the Commission's experts play a very important part in this field in the Community and that I wish to express my thanks to them as well as to colleagues in this Parliament and ask that they also be included in the thanks to the rapporteur which are normally expressed on occasions such as this. My second comment concerns the importance of this report for the internal market. If the freedom of movement of persons and services in the internal market is not also completed at the fiscal level by the harmonization of taxation, then — forgive my putting it so bluntly — we can quietly bury our European Community. Fortunately I did not have to take a stance on any financial philosophies on my report. The essential aim was to support the Commission's initiatives through a programme document of some kind and to exert some control over the Commission — an extremely important point for the European Parliament.

In a wide variety of reports — and notably in a report of 14 September 1983 to the Council on the functioning of the common system of value added tax — the Commission itself has in fact pointed out that the internal market should be strengthened, and from the fiscal standpoint be established for the first time.

My third comment within the framework of the programme which I have drawn up jointly with the committee concerns the fact that, *inter alia*, a medium-term programme must be worked out. The Commission has always shied away from this and this is in fact the only point which I have to criticize. In our economic forecasts it is precisely in the financial

## Rogalla

sphere that we have to have the courage to lay down these things in stages over a longer period of 20 years. The setting of deadlines always had a very salutary effect in the early days of the European Community's activity and I should like to take this opportunity of reviving it. It is for this reason — this is an essential point in paragraph 36 — that I should like to urge the Commission to submit the relevant programme before the second direct elections. This is important because in the internal market our citizens are not only wage-dependent, they also operate undertakings and have to find their way in the Community and must have guidelines available.

There is one proposal for an amendment which I defended very strongly in committee and which I was unable to put through in the form I had imagined, namely the very important reference to the need for a link between this tax harmonization and individual revenues. I cannot conceive that in the long term with the large financial stakes and the fiscal resources which are at issue here for all the States it will be possible to put through any tax harmonization worthy of the name without the help of the Community. The committee was unwilling to accept it in this form. Therefore, in order that this idea should not be lost, I have incorporated it in Amendment No 8 and have pointed out that harmonization of taxation will undoubtedly simplify this kind of financial equalization.

The conclusions are quite clear: firstly, we must press on with the harmonization of taxation, although it would be all too easy to use the economic recession as an excuse for the fact that nothing is happening in this field any more. Something is happening here, if necessary with Community support in the field of individual revenues.

Secondly, without an internal market we are at the mercy of Japanese and American competition. Tax harmonization is part of the internal market. Thirdly a great deal more pressure must be brought to bear on the Member States and it is here that I appeal to the Commission. Ultimately the financial support of the Community is essential to harmonization.

**Mr Beumer (PPE), rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, the directive stipulates that a proposal must be made to the Council for the adoption of a list of non-deductible items of expenditure, the aim being to achieve harmonization in this respect. The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs agrees with the principle of harmonization, for instance, since competition may suffer as a result of the differences in tax systems and the effects they have. To this extent, therefore, harmonization is a good thing provided that it leads to a non-discriminatory system of taxation. Only then will competition remain unaffected, and that means that uniform basic principles must be adopted.

The problem with the elaboration of this aspect of the sixth directive is that it is not easy to tell in every case

what are business expenses and what are private expenses. My committee believes, however, that the principle should be that expenses which can reasonably be assumed to have been incurred for business purposes should continue to be deductible and that, conversely, private expenses should not as a rule be deductible.

Mr President, another important point is that double taxation must be avoided, there must be no cumulative element. We believe — and this is one aspect of the Commission's proposal that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs must criticize — that the proposal in its present form would in all probability result in business expenses which should really be deductible no longer being so and that that would in fact conflict with one of the most elementary principles of VAT. It would also produce a cumulative element in the taxes, or at least that could very easily be the case. Hence our objections. Furthermore, in the present difficult economic situation it could rapidly lead to tax increases, which are certainly not wanted at the moment and would hit small and medium-sized undertakings particularly hard.

My committee therefore believes that a different method should be chosen, and it has proposed amendments to this effect. It prefers a 'flat-rate' scheme, because without extensive administrative systems it is impossible to specify and cover everything. This flat-rate scheme would, however, include the provision that, if it can be shown that costs are incurred entirely for business purposes, they must be regarded as totally deductible in accordance with the basic principle of VAT.

This scheme formed part of a compromise reached in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. It was generally approved and is the subject of amendments tabled by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. I therefore believe that these amendments should be adopted by the House and that amendments which depart from this compromise — and there are such amendments — must be rejected.

I have another question to put to the Commission. Perhaps it can help me with some information. One of the amendments proposes that the term 'vehicle' should be replaced with the term 'means of transport'. I do not really see what the point of this is. I feel it is an amendment that might be adopted, but I should like to hear the Commission's views on this point. I believe that the statement of the general principle gives adequate support to my presentation.

**Mr J. Moreau (S), rapporteur.** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report which I have the honour to present was adopted with only one abstention in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

Admittedly, this is not the first occasion this House has had to discuss this thorny problem on which the Commission and Parliament find it difficult to agree.

**Moreau**

May I remind you that the Commission's proposal for the third step of harmonizing taxes other than turnover taxes on the consumption of manufactured tobacco has already been debated at great length in this House?

I should simply like to sketch in the background to this proposal for a directive which finally led to the motion for a resolution under discussion.

After an in-depth discussion on the floor of the House, Parliament first rejected the Commission's proposal for a directive; after this vote the Commission agreed to meet Parliament's request to study whether the present approach, namely to harmonize the ratio between the specific element and the *ad valorem* element, were the best or whether it should not be replaced by an alternative approach to harmonize the *ad valorem* part of the duty in the retail price.

The Commission forwarded this report to Parliament, while still maintaining its proposal for a third harmonization step.

Parliament studied the proposal for the third step in detail and again rejected the proposal for a directive.

Mr Tugendhat did say, however, that even though Parliament had rejected the proposal for a directive, the Commission nonetheless maintained its proposal as it believed there was no proof that the alternative approach was any more neutral in terms of competition and that the process of harmonization could not be held up any longer.

Under these circumstances our Committee considered it important to recall the main objective which it thinks ought to be pursued in this sphere, namely to avoid distortion of competition and to promote the free circulation of tobacco products within the Community.

The report in front of you takes up Parliament's position of rejecting the proposal for a directive and comes out in favour of a specific element higher than 20 % and of the alternative approach, and also calls for proposals on harmonizing methods of collection.

Since Parliament has, after due consideration, rejected the proposal, the Commission by retaining its proposal unchanged is completely ignoring the views of Parliament, which is of course quite unacceptable.

That being the case, Parliament can only urge the Council to follow the opinion of this House, and our proposal is that if necessary we should start a conciliation procedure similar to the new procedure under discussion at present.

That, Mr President, is the position adopted by a very large majority of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, and I urge the House to follow its Committee in this sphere.

I hope that the Commission will learn the necessary lessons and that the Council will then be able to deliberate in the full knowledge of all the elements.

**Mr Seeler (S).** — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to thank Mr Rogalla most sincerely for his excellent, well-defined and comprehensive report. With this report he has raised a very serious question, namely how seriously do the governments of the Member States take the European Community. An economic community which does not have a comparable tax burden on the economies of all the Member States will always remain incomplete. Equality of opportunity in competition is a prerequisite for the functioning of an economic community. We lack this equality of opportunity because the basic tax burdens in the Member States are very divergent. The consequence of this is that not only do we still have personal checks at frontiers, we also have a very complex tax burden on goods crossing frontiers within the Community.

A short while ago some friends of mine in Hamburg organized an art exhibition within the framework of a European culture week. They had to devote a full four hours to the paper war at the German/Dutch border, simply because of the differences in the taxation of works of art which were not even being exported but were simply being imported temporarily into another country of the Community. For citizens of the Community these are not signs of progress in European collaboration.

Neither is this the first time that the harmonization of tax provisions has appeared on the agenda of this House. There are numerous Commission drafts for appropriate provisions, which in some cases received the approval of Parliament more than 10 years ago and which are still waiting to be dealt with by the Council of Ministers. This shows once again how seriously the national governments take this Parliament. The Council must once again be told on the basis of this example that a reform of its decision-taking structure is more than ever urgently needed. For this reason in the resolution of 14 September the plenary, when discussing the European Political Union, rightly decided to give the Union responsibility for the harmonization of taxation in future. The harmonization of taxation in the Member States does of course require considerable adjustments and changes and therefore time. This cannot and must not be overlooked.

For this reason Mr Rogalla's admirable proposals in paragraph 36 of this motion for a resolution that an ordered programme be drawn up merit the attention of the Commission. This would result primarily in the renunciation of the Council's practice of resolving matters by letting them lie and doing nothing. My group will support the motion for a resolution in the hope that it will thereby play its part in removing a large obstacle to the continuing development of the European Economic Community and that the intra-Community barriers will be broken down at last.

**Mr Schnitker (PPE).** — (*DE*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this admirable report by our colleague Mr Beumer is a compromise. As usual this proposal will have considerable repercussions on the economy. Unfortunately, this applies particularly to the small and medium-sized undertakings and will have serious negative repercussions for them. The only proper arrangements from the fiscal point of view, and the only ones which are compatible with the economy, must be those whereby the right to deduct VAT in respect of all expenditure incurred in the course of normal business activity continues to be undisputed and free from exceptions.

Article 4 of Mr Beumer's report gives undertakings the opportunity of avoiding the restrictions on deductibility laid down in Articles 1 to 3 provided that they can prove that such expenditure is exclusively for business purposes. In principle this special provision is to be welcomed, but it does not succeed in cancelling out the disadvantages which result from the general arrangements regarding the restrictions on deductibility. Deduction of the expenditure specified in Articles 1 to 3 is in fact permitted only if the taxable person, at his own request, is subject to a strict control procedure.

The increased burden of proof will entail a substantial increase in administrative expenditure with a consequent increase in the costs burden and is certain to make disputes with tax offices more difficult. This is a time for fewer controls and less bureaucracy, not for more! I am afraid that the increased complications and other difficulties associated with the procedure will make it impossible for small and medium-sized undertakings in particular — and this in the European year for small and medium-sized businesses and craft industries — to make their own applications for implementation of a control procedure.

For this reason I have submitted an amendment which I now ask you to accept. The Commission should be expressly warned of the danger of further bureaucratization and restriction of the freedom of action of small and medium-sized businesses. It should be required to make the procedure of applying for exemption from restrictions on deduction as simple and unbureaucratic as possible.

**Mr Hopper (ED).** — Mr President, I welcome Mr Rogalla's excellent report which deals comprehensively with the problems arising from fiscal barriers to trade and to capital movements. In my group we shall particularly support his reference to the need for harmonization of the tax on alcohol. Indeed, we have moved an amendment which amplifies his own reference to this subject.

In the United Kingdom we are also particularly concerned about the problem of zero rating for VAT. In the United Kingdom something like 40 % of consumption is of goods which are zero rated,

primarily foodstuffs. It is, therefore, a very important subsidy from the better-off members of the Community to the less well-off members of the Community. I know that Mr Rogalla is aware of this problem. Indeed, there is no actual call in his report for the abolition of the zero rating for VAT. However, certain of his remarks could be interpreted as sympathetic to the abolition of zero rating. We are, therefore, moving an amendment which will make the report's position clear.

Finally, I strongly support Mr Moreau's report on cigarette tax harmonization. My group believes that 10 years ago the European Commission and the European Community set off upon the wrong road by attempting to harmonize cigarette taxation on the basis of *ad valorem* tax. At the time when the Commission set out upon this path, relatively little was known about the economic implications of *ad valorem* taxation at a very high rate, and I would draw the House's attention to the fact that the *ad valorem* taxation of tobacco is at an extremely high rate. Indeed, there is no other product in common consumption which bears *ad valorem* taxation at this high level. Parliament took a position against the Commission last year, and we are very sorry that the Commission has chosen to disregard Parliament's views.

May I conclude by saying that there is some progress being made in at least one Member State. I am very pleased to hear that in the Netherlands, a country which has up to the present time applied primarily *ad valorem* taxation to cigarettes, there has been a change of heart. The Netherlands is now moving towards specific taxation, and for the very reasons that this House has advanced.

**Mr Fernandez (COM).** — (*FR*) Mr President, I should like to make some comments on Mr Moreau's report.

Pursuant to the Rules of Procedure, I declare that I have no financial interest in the subject matter under discussion, except perhaps that I smoke Community tobacco.

I should like those of our British colleagues who take the floor to do likewise and declare their financial interests in the multinational firms they defend so passionately, such as Imperial Tobacco, Rothmans, Philip Morris, British American Tobacco, Collers and others, more commonly known as the 'Light Tobacco Brigade'.

Four times during 1981 and 1982 we have helped impede the implementation of the Commission's proposal for a directive to move to a third stage in harmonization of manufactured tobacco. The second stage of harmonization was extended and we got the status quo. That is a positive result, because if the Commission's proposals had been put into effect our country could have seen a further drop in the use of

**Fernandez**

Community tobacco and therefore in the area under plantation and the number of tobacco growers, most of whom have family businesses. It is true that the multinational tobacco firms, who have important connections in this House, do not accept the Commission's proposals either, but for totally different reasons. We thought that the Commission was already going too far. For those firms the Commission was not going far enough in harmonization. They wanted the specific element to be at least 40 % of the duties collected to the detriment of the *ad valorem* element, whereas the present minimum is only 5 %. Their stalwart defenders from the Conservative Group have launched the offensive again and inveigled a new report out of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. This report contains proposals which are still unacceptable.

The effects of this will be worse still; a further stimulus to imports and a new drop in the use of Community tobacco, when we do not even cover 50 % of our needs at present; a decrease in the number of tobacco growers which has halved in 15 years in our country, without taking into account the redundancies in our industries which are already in dire straits. For all these reasons the French Communist and Allied Members can only oppose the report from the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. We also observe that there are considerable differences between the Commission and Parliament. And let us not forget that the Council is at present examining a compromise solution from the Greek presidency which has the merit of suggesting only minimum changes to the present taxation system for tobacco in the Member States.

Under these circumstances, and in the interests of the Community growers, we think we ought to wait, which is why we propose maintaining the status quo and extending the second step of harmonization for an indefinite period. That is the ambit of the amendment we have tabled and wish the House to adopt.

**Mr Hopper (ED).** — On a point of order, Mr President, Mr Fernandez has suggested, I think humourously, that we should declare our interests in the subject. Can I assure him that I have no shares in any tobacco company? Could I also point out to him that under specific systems of taxation far more revenue is raised by the State than under *ad valorem* systems? For example, in the United Kingdom we raise three times as much revenue under our system as we would under the French system.

**President.** — Mr Hopper. I would ask you in future to make personal statements at the end of the debate, as provided for in the Rules of Procedure.

**Mr Delorozoy (L).** — (FR) Mr President, I rise to speak briefly on two of the three reports under discussion in this joint debate. I like 'blonds' which is why I

shall not speak further on the third report, Mr Moreau's, which does not call for further comment from our group. We shall vote in favour of it, in line with our previous positions.

To come back to the proposal for a twelfth directive on the common system for taxation of value added tax, we emphasize the need to make more rapid progress in harmonizing the legislations in force so that we can have a uniform basis for applying taxation.

There is tax neutrality between Member States, as between tax payers, which means that VAT on businesses' expenditure must be levied in the same way to ensure fair competition from the production stage to the consumer stage. One would indeed be undermining the very principle of the mechanism of value added tax if by refusing deductions along the line certain elements of the price were encumbered by a superimposition of taxes at the different production stages.

It is true that it is sometimes difficult to gauge accurately whether certain expenditure is linked solely to professional or to private activities; that is why we shall vote for the amendments to the motion tabled by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

The resulting text will be more suited to the realities of business life and the implementation of it will be more in line with the basic principles of the system of value added tax.

As for Mr Rogalla's splendid report on tax harmonization in the Community, we note that it took 40 pages to demonstrate how the tax system is misused to put an end to the free circulation of goods and capital and to erect protectionist barriers in the most varied and imaginative ways; the taxation of different types of drinks is a characteristic example of this. It favours the interests of national industries and it discourages others in the extreme.

The Commission has submitted numerous directives to the Council but taxation is undoubtedly one of the areas where the Council's behaviour is most inconsistent. Member States continue to adopt regulations which fly in the face of fiscal harmonization; the disorderly multiplication of these measures show an incoherence at the European level which is reflected in the report.

How can we expect to make headway in the process of European economic integration as long as the methods of collecting taxes, rates applied and the basis for assessment of VAT are not made uniform?

How can we continue to preach the organization of a unified European market as long as the excise on tobacco, alcohol and fuel is used for protectionist purposes? As long as the system for covering social security is financed by disparate levies sometimes on businesses, sometimes on employees, sometimes by

**Delorozoy**

tax methods in the state budget, sometimes by quasi-fiscal duties inequally imposed on the price of products? As long as the fiscal burdens on businesses, the taxation systems for firms and the rates applied all stem from legislations which upset conditions of competition and reduce competitiveness in the European economy?

How can we hope to return to free circulation of capital, to set up a real European monetary system and financial market in Europe, capable of meeting the needs of finance and investment renewal as long as the tax on capital revenue (dividends, securities), as long as indirect taxes on transactions are not made more convergent in the systems and rates?

The implementation of an economic policy in the Member States requires an exceptional effort in the present day. It is imperative for the Member States to show a real political determination to harmonize taxation, failing which other attempts to put our economy back on its feet and set up a strong modern European community capable of holding its own with the rest of the world will bear no fruit.

**Mr Cousté (DEP).** — *(FR)* Mr President, our group approves the three reports, especially as we have just heard Mr Ortoli tell so rightly that investments will not be given the necessary impetus in Europe if we continue to come up against certain obstacles, particularly in the free circulation of capital. That is why we particularly approve of the Rogalla report which contains an overall programme for fiscal harmonization. We think that fiscal harmonization will help to break down fiscal barriers, to equalize the tax burden of businesses and establish the interior market, as Mr Ortoli said just now.

As regards VAT we must not get lost in arguments over a zero rate or another rate. There must be a minimum rate applicable. Whether there is a zero rate plus one or two rates, there would be considerable harmonization if at least the basis for assessment were harmonized.

As for the problem of undertakings, how can we fail to wish with all our heart, what Mr Rogalla suggested as the first thing to be done immediately, the establishment of a common system of tax credits for all the undertakings of the Community? Finally, when we see that the Member States exercise their fiscal sovereignty in divergent ways contrary to the interests of Europe, how can we fail to urge the Council to adopt the proposal for a decision on the procedure for informing and consulting Member States on tax matters, the first step towards closer tax coordination as it will help to avoid divergence? I hope that in Athens they will heed the voice of this Parliament and show the political determination to introduce tax harmonization in Europe.

**Mr Paisley (NI).** — Mr President, I rise to speak briefly in this debate because of the vital importance

of the directive on tax harmonization for Northern Ireland jobs. For the benefit of one of the Members who spoke, could I declare, as a United Kingdom Member, that I have no financial interest whatsoever in tobacco and am myself a convinced non-smoker.

We have, however, in Northern Ireland hundreds of valuable jobs in the cigarette industry. The firms of Gallaghers and Carreras make a crucial contribution to employment, particularly in the towns of Ballymena and Carrickfergus and in the City of Belfast. We have heard in this House today that the average unemployment figure for the Community stands at 10.9 %, but in Northern Ireland the average is 21.5 % and the figures for the month of October are 6 100 up on last year. One example I would give is that in Strabane the unemployment rate is 40.1 % but among male labour it is 51.5 %. So this House will know how great an interest I have in jobs and in preserving jobs in Northern Ireland.

The two cigarette firms in Northern Ireland have recently poured large investments into the Northern Ireland economy and those investments are highly welcome at this time. I am convinced, however, that the Commission's proposal, if implemented, would do severe damage to those jobs in Northern Ireland, and, indeed, to jobs in the United Kingdom. I therefore welcome the opposition in today's resolution to the Commission's proposal and the stand taken by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. It is unacceptable to be told by the Commission that we should proceed to the third stage of harmonization when one Member State has not fully complied with the provisions of the second stage. In these circumstances I feel that the only realistic course is to go along the road pointed out by this report. I regret that so far the Commission has not heeded the voice of this House. I can only pray that they will have a change of heart.

**Mr Rogalla (S)** — *(DE)* Mr President, I did not ask leave to speak for a second time in order to say what I was unable to say before because of the shortage of time owing to the changes to the agenda decided by the House, rather I should like to take this opportunity of confirming with regard to our colleague, Mr Beumer's report that in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs after a very thorough discussion with all the experts we did in fact agree that with regard to Amendment No 5 which concerns Article 4 on the exclusion from the right to deduction for business matters in a particular way, this compromise is supported by all the groups in the House.

I have already heard my colleague, Mr Schnitker, refer to the need for less instead of more bureaucracy in matters of tax law. I support his view entirely. Accordingly I should like to suggest — and I shall speak to

**Rogalla**

my colleague Mr Beumer on this point once again — that we accept our colleague, Mr Schnitker's, amendment which relates to the motion for a resolution, not in fact to the directive, in which he expresses the wish that the procedure followed be as realistic and un-bureaucratic as possible, which is tantamount to supplementing the explanatory statement in the motion for a resolution. I should like, however, to reserve my group's position until I have spoken to my colleague Mr Beumer, with whom this compromise was reached.

Finally I should like to put a question concerning the agenda, or rather, to ask for confirmation that there will be no vote on this report today. If necessary I must ask for this because the translations of the amendments are not available in all the languages.

**President.** — The President decided earlier that, for that reason, a vote would not be taken today.

**Mr Van Rompuy (PPE).** — *(NL)* Mr President, I am able to say that the Rogalla report has the full support of my group. Fiscal harmonization, as has already been adequately stressed, is essential to measures to combat the crisis. If we are going to have genuine internal markets in the years to come, it is essential that all these fiscal distortions be removed. They distort competition, they obstruct cooperation between undertakings in the European Community, and they also deter external investors. How can we talk about an internal market when taxes vary from 30 % in Italy to 50 % in the Netherlands? We must consequently seek harmonization but, as has already been said, there are a number of problems in this respect.

As regards VAT, I agree that the number of rates should be reduced. It must be ensured, however, that we do not finish up with a uniform rate, because indirect taxes must, in my opinion, to some extent respect the principle of financial strength and because the basis of assessment must take account of the vital or non-vital nature of goods. A uniform rate would be socially unacceptable.

I also agree with what Mr Rogalla said about VAT. VAT is a tax, not a customs duty. Consequently, the present practice with regard to the payment of VAT on goods imported into a Member State — when it is regarded as an import duty — must stop if we are going to have better intra-Community trade. There must also be a levelling off of the tax burden on undertakings, and we therefore agree that there should be a genuine basis for settlement. The present system whereby various countries still use a classical method results in all kinds of distortions and in parent companies finding it less easy to establish subsidiaries in such countries.

To conclude, I should like to express my approval of the Beumer report. In the Committee on Economic

and Monetary Affairs we amended the Commission's proposal. We considered the difficulties it might cause industry. We considered the matter in terms of passenger cars, for example, where non-deductibility would have an inflationary effect on prices and would hit small self-employed persons particularly hard. If we look at this more closely, it will be realized that we have taken account of the interests of small and medium-sized undertakings. We did not go further because a compromise had to be reached and because we also wanted to prevent abuse and fraud in the accounting process. We agree to the present flat-rate system and to the deductibility of all genuine business expenses. I therefore believe that my group will approve the Beumer report.

**Mr Tyrrell (ED).** — Mr President, I want to expose one of the follies of the present VAT system. The folly is caused by the misleading name of the tax. It is not generally a tax on value added. In an overwhelming number of products, no revenue is raised on the value added during the time that the product passes through the stages of manufacture and distribution. Revenue is raised at the point of retail sale to a private consumer and nowhere else. This is because, although VAT is paid at every stage, the person who pays it is himself a registered trader who, in due course, receives reimbursement from the government. So, one is looking at a system where the VAT passes from the buyer to the seller, to the government and back to the buyer.

This has two immediate results, and both of them are harmful. First, valuable capital is removed from productive use. The original payer may not receive the VAT back until months after he originally paid it. Secondly, and more important, at each stage of this solemn process, records have to be kept by the buyer, the seller and the government. A typical product with a five-stage life before getting into the hands of the final consumer will have been documented 20 times. It is estimated that 90 % of VAT records are kept for the purpose of this sterile process and not one penny of extra revenue is raised as a result.

But the cost of maintaining these records is enormous and the small businessman is the one who suffers most. Many employ extra accounts clerks which they can frequently ill afford. Others do it for themselves. All over Europe, small business-men and their wives sit down on Sundays to bring their VAT records up-to-date. They do so for the benefit of no one at all.

Why was this fatuous system invented? Originally because the tax was genuinely conceived as a tax on value added, but is now only a tax on value added when the transaction is between a registered trader and an unregistered trader or a private consumer. Some try to justify the retention of the system on the grounds that it prevents fraud, but in my view it does no such thing: the more VAT transactions there are, the more opportunities there are for fraud.



**Tyrrell**

An exception could be made in the interests of preventing fraud by retaining VAT on cash transactions, but they are a small minority, and on credit transactions between registered traders it does not operate.

Those are the reasons why I urge the House to support the amendments which I put down to the Rogalla motion for a resolution.

**Mr Jürgens (L) — (DE)** Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, visitors in the galleries, the three reports which we are debating today deal with one of the most crucial questions for the future development of Europe and also for next year's election campaigns when we shall be trying to strengthen the European awareness of our citizens. They cannot understand why various taxes still have to be worked out at the frontiers of the Member States if customs duties no longer have to be paid.

Four German Liberals, including myself, once demonstrated by means of 'Aktion "Ziege"' the obstacles encountered by a normal citizen trading in goods. The 10 Member States spend about 3 billion DM on these differences. It is for this reason — and I welcome the three reports — that we should press not only for the harmonization of deductibility and not only the harmonization of the tax on tobacco — and unlike Mr Paisley I am a heavy smoker — but also for the harmonization of taxes in Europe. These reports are crucial to our future and I must vote for Mr Rogalla's stage-by-stage plan so that something at least begins to move. I should like to say to Mr Schnitke that even if in these reports there is some difference, some competition between individual levels of industry and individual sectors, the crucial thing is still to achieve uniform regulations in the European Community and to prevent the SMUs from being put at a disadvantage by comparison with larger undertakings. It is this uniformity which has decided us.

**Mr Lalor (DEP).** — Mr President, I rise to give my full support to the Moreau resolution and to join with the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs in its well-nigh unanimous resolution condemning the Commission for its utter rejection of Parliament's wishes. I want to say that, like my colleague, Mr Paisley, I have no vested interest in tobacco, but there is a considerable amount of employment in the tobacco industry in which I have a pronounced interest.

Less than 12 months ago this Parliament, by a substantial majority, approved the Beumer report, which, in essence, seriously faulted and rejected the Commission's proposal for a directive to amend the existing directive on taxes as they affect tobacco consumption. This Parliament's decision was not taken lightly. It had been preceded by a pretty exhaustive discussion in a number of meetings of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. It was followed by

quite a comprehensive debate in the plenary sitting itself. Not only that, but the members of the Economic and Social Committee had reached similar conclusions.

It is quite impossible to understand, therefore, why Commissioner Tugendhat, acting for the Commission, should have refused to accept the considered decisions of the representatives of the people of Europe and come back within four months with such a slap in the teeth to Parliament and a refusal to accept the people's view. I join with the committee in appealing to the Council to accept Parliament's advice and to seek from the Commission a proposal on tax harmonization on the lines already outlined by Parliament.

**Mr Welsh (ED).** — Mr President, I would like to start by declaring an interest in that I am a director of a public company. Were the Commission's proposals in the 12th VAT Directive to be implemented, it would increase our tax bill by around £ 200 000. Honourable Members might care to reflect on what the effect would be if such a measure were imposed across the whole of European industry.

The Commission's proposal basically acts as a penalty on our export salesmen. Can you imagine, Mr President, the Japanese deciding to tax their salesmen's travelling expenses? Absolutely not! They probably give them an incentive, because that is the way they get out and sell their goods. It seems very curious that on the very day we talk about a fragile economic recovery we should then be turning round and trying to make it that much more difficult for our industry to deliver the recovery in question. There seems to be within the Commission an obsession with the idea of perks. Well, most people do not use their company cars for amazing long trips to all sorts of exotic places, they use them to work. Salesmen, architects, surveyors, site engineers — to these people a company car is a tool of the trade and it is ridiculous that they should be discriminated against in this way.

Now Mr Beumer's analysis of the problem is, as always, impeccable, but I am sorry to tell him that his solution simply will not work. He must realize that it is absolutely impossible to find incontrovertible proof that every single jot and tittle of one's expense account was used for a business purpose — it simply is not practical and what is even worse the bureaucracy that his draft amendment calls for from the Member States, which they would have to set up to administer this system, would merely add to the burdens which small business and, indeed, large businesses suffer already, as so eloquently described by my colleague, Mr Tyrrell.

We believe that the suggestion that 50 % of private cars should be deductible is not enough. If you think of the average working week, you will realize that most people only use their cars for private mileage at weekends, and we therefore consider that 10 % deduc-

**Welsh**

tion is a much more accurate reflection of reality. We are not involved with protecting perks. We disapprove of perks just as much as our Socialist friends opposite, and that is why we are not seeking to change the Commission's proposals in respect of entertainment. But I would say to my Christian-Democratic and Liberal friends in particular, let us have the courage of our convictions. None of us likes this particular directive so I would invite them to join with us in voting it down so that our good friend, Vice-President Tugendhat, can think again.

**Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission.** — Mr President, I am glad to have the opportunity to answer this debate immediately after it was made. Let me make two preliminary remarks.

First of all, I must say that I found myself very much in agreement with Mr Jürgens when he talked about the relevance of this subject in the run-up to the European elections and the importance of not losing sight of the subjects inherent in this debate when we talk about the elections and, indeed, when we talk about the construction of Europe itself. Technical it may be, difficult to understand it may, but what we are talking about does lie at the heart of some of the most important things which we are all of us trying to do.

My second remark of a preliminary nature must be to Mr Rogalla, whom, of course, I remember well from his own days in the Commission, to say to him that he must not be too modest when he talks about his lack of expertise. I do not think that anybody who read the report or who heard what he had to say would be struck by a lack of expertise — quite the reverse. I should like to congratulate him on his mastery of the subject.

The Rogalla report which is before us is a very complete document and omits none of the numerous tax problems which must be resolved if we are to attain the objectives which we all desire. Furthermore, the considerations set out in the report coincide exactly with the preoccupations which the Commission expressed in its 1980 report on the scope for convergence of tax systems in the Community. Finally, it is a realistic document which draws a distinction between what is possible and what would be desirable in the short and long-term and which clearly sets out the priorities. Among the priority subjects which I am particularly pleased to find are three subjects to which the Commission drew the attention of the Council in its recent communications on financial integration and on tax and financial measures in favour of investment. I refer here in the first place to the exhortation to the Council to adopt as a matter of urgency the Commission's proposal of 31 March 1976 for a directive on indirect taxes and transaction in securities. It also endorses our proposal to study the question of ending registration duty and our call for coordination at European level of incentives adopted by certain Member States to encourage

venture capital investment. I can therefore give the general agreement of the Commission to the text which is now before you.

I must, however, record the Commission's disagreement on one particular point and draw your attention to another. The point of disagreement relates to manufactured tobacco, something which has cropped up from time to time in the debate and on which Mr Lalor had some very strong things to say. As I made clear to Parliament in my letter of 28 March 1983 and reiterated in my address to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on 29 September 1983, there is no evidence that the alternative approach favoured by Parliament is more likely to bring about neutral conditions of competition than is the Commission approach. Nor was any evidence produced of agreement on a common multiplier which the alternative method presupposes. The Commission firmly believes that the only way forward is to continue along the path set by Council in its directives of 1972 and 1977, defining the first and second stages of harmonization.

Secondly, the point to which I should like to draw your attention is the 1975 proposal for a directive on the harmonization of systems of company taxation and of withholding taxes on dividends. Mr Rogalla's report stresses the importance which Parliament attaches to finding a solution to this problem for a variety of reasons, relating in particular to financial integration. I would urge you to resume consideration of this proposal and to give your opinion as it is a matter of urgency. I would remind you that the Commission is willing for its part to amend the proposal as appropriate.

Having made these two points, Mr President, I would like to conclude on this report by confirming the Commission's very positive response to Mr Rogalla's initiative. I think the initiative which has been taken here should contribute to progress in the harmonization of taxes and I trust that it will receive the general approbation of the House.

Mr President, in the remaining minutes available to me I would also like to say something on the other subject of this joint debate. The Commission has submitted to the Council a proposal for a 12th VAT directive — about which Mr Welsh had some harsh words, I thought — the objective of which is to establish at Community level a list of expenditure incurred by businesses on which VAT is not to be deductible. According to one of the principles of the common system of VAT, all businesses should be able to deduct from the tax due on their turnover the tax charged on expenditure necessary for the operation of their business. However, another principle of the system requires that any expenditure which is in the nature of final consumption should be charged to tax. The difficulty arises where the expenditure in question has the apparent characteristics of final consump-

**Tugendhat**

tion but has been incurred in connection with the operation of the business.

The second directive of 11 April 1967, which merely sketched the board outlines of the common system of VAT, evaded the issue by limiting itself to the observation in Article 11 (4) that, and I quote: 'certain goods and services may be excluded from the deduction system, in particular those capable of being exclusively or partially used for the private needs of the taxable person or his staff.'

Nor is the question further clarified by the sixth directive of 17 May 1977 concerning the uniform basis of assessment for VAT, Article 17(6) of which states: 'Before a period of 4 years at the latest has elapsed from the date of entry into force of the directive, the Council, acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission, shall decide what expenditure shall not be eligible for a deduction of value-added tax. Value-added tax shall in no circumstances be deductible on expenditure which is not strictly business expenditure, such as that on luxuries, amusements or entertainments.'

In accordance with the mandate thus given to the Commission, the proposal for a 12th directive sets out to put an end to the current situation of widely differing national rules. The situation is becoming more and more intolerable to businesses which operate on a European level and which find it difficult to understand why they are confronted with a range of exclusions which vary from one Member State to another when the eighth directive of 6 December 1979 gives them the right to claim the refund of the VAT charged on their operating expenses in those States of the Community where they are not established.

The proposal for a 12th directive is aimed at reaching a compromise between the two principles previously mentioned, so as to avoid difficult discussions between businesses and the tax authorities. It should be stressed that the proposed list of exclusions is exhaustive. The Commission proposes that value-added tax shall not be deductible on expenditure relating to passenger vehicles, travel accommodation, luxuries and amusements. The amount of VAT charged on such expenditure in relation to the turnover of the business can only be small. Small businesses which are eligible for an exemption in most Member States cannot claim any deduction of imput tax anyway, and so they will not be affected by the proposal for a 12th directive.

In its opinion your Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs suggests a plan of action comprising, on the one hand, a flat-rate limit of 50 % deduction of VAT in respect of passenger cars, motor cycles and travel expenses and, on the other hand, the possibility of maintaining deduction of the tax in full in respect

of such expenditure, and that relating to private aircraft and pleasure boats, where the trader can produce irrefutable evidence that the expenditure is wholly for business purposes. However, value-added tax would in no circumstances be deductible on expenditure on accommodation, food, luxuries, amusements and entertainments.

The Commission is still of the opinion that the solution which it has suggested is the one which best suits the requirements of harmonization and administrative simplicity without involving increases in charges for businesses which might endanger their ability to compete. The Commission recognizes, however, that the amendments proposed by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs are likely to produce a larger consensus of opinion, in that they satisfy to a great extent the concern expressed by the trade. Our essential concern is to ensure that the provisions relating to the possibility of deducting certain expenses in full be applied as uniformly as possible by the authorities of the various Member States. It is on this basis that the Commission finds itself in a position to accept the proposed amendments.

Mr President, I could delay the House a little bit further by going through the lists of amendments and those which we accept and reject. I think that, as I have already kept the House 5 minutes over time, it might be better if I did not. I am, of course, ready to do so if at any time the House wishes me to do so.

**Mr Beazeley (ED).** — I would put two very short questions to the Commissioner.

The first question is whether, in view of today's date and the fact that the prolongation of the present stage of harmonization runs out at the end of the year, the Commissioner is considering continuing prolongation?

The second question is: If the Commissioner intends to enforce *vis-à-vis* the Council the third stage of harmonization, does he have any confidence that the two Member States who had difficulty in complying with the second stage and the one which has not yet complied will comply on time?

**Mr Tugendhat, Vice-President of the Commission.** — The answer to the first question is yes.

The answer to the second question is that I think — and this is confirmed by my advisers — that there is one country not two, on which the Court has ruled, and the Court's judgments are always accepted by the Member States.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.<sup>1</sup>

(The sitting was closed at 8.05 p.m.)

<sup>1</sup> Agenda for next sitting: See Minutes.

*ANNEX***Commission action on European Parliament opinions on Commission proposals delivered at the September and the first October 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 September and the first October 1983 part-sessions in the framework of parliamentary consultation, and of disaster aid granted.

Too little time was available to be able to cover in this account the action taken on opinions adopted at the second October part-session, which will appear in the Commission's next monthly communication.

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

1. Report by Mr Sälzer closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the EC Commission communication to the Council (COM(83)143 final) on the :

- (i) draft decision on structures and procedures for decision-making in the field of science and technology,
- (ii) draft decision on management structures and procedures and the coordination of Community research, development and demonstration activities

Following up Parliament's resolution, the Commission has prepared an amended version of its proposal for a Council decision which will be sent to the Council shortly. The amendments relate to Articles 3 and 5, and to the Annex to the proposed Council decision concerning structures and procedures and the coordination of Community research, development and demonstration activities.

The amendments to Article 3 and the Annex were voted on and approved by the European Parliament.

The amendment relating to Article 5 was withdrawn before the vote. Part of this amendment, put forward by the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, was completely acceptable to the Commission ; in its amended proposal it has replaced the words 'if appropriate' by 'systematically'.

Concerning the requests made by Parliament in the resolution itself, Commission departments have already responded to the request in paragraph 5 and on 7 November 1983 sent copies of the publication EUR 6545 EN-Advisory Committee for the Common Science and Technology Policy to Parliament's Secretariat.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 13 October 1983, pp. 286-7.

Text of proposal adopted by Parliament : Minutes of 14 October 1983, p. 28.

2. Report by Mr Linkohr closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the EC Commission proposal to the Council (COM(83)327 final) for a decision establishing a research programme to be carried out by the Joint Research Centre for the European Atomic Energy Community and the European Economic Community (1984-87).

On 26 October 1983 the Commission sent the Council and the European Parliament an amended proposal for a Council decision establishing a research programme (1984-87) to be carried out by the Joint Research Centre for the European Atomic Energy Community and the European Economic Community (COM(83)640 final).

The Research Council's sessions on 26 October and 5 November did not reach unanimous agreement. The proposal for the JRC programme is on the agenda again for the Research Council session scheduled for 13 December 1983.

This amended proposal incorporated the amendment to Article 7 requested by the European Parliament. Also, the budget procedures for JRC research not included in the programme, requested in paragraph 13 of the parliamentary resolution, have been included and spelt out in Annex B to the amended proposal.

With regard to requests made by Parliament in the resolution itself, it will not be possible to consider them until the Council has taken a decision on the new programme. As the European Parliament itself stated in paragraph 24 of the resolution, it is not expecting immediate action, but that the matters in question should be taken into consideration in the next four years.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 13/14 October 1983, pp. 305-7.

Text of proposal adopted by Parliament : Minutes of 14 October 1983, p. 37.

3. Report by Mrs Squarcialupi closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the EC Commission proposal to the Council (COM(80)917 final) for a directive amending for the third time Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.

On 26 October 1983 the Internal Market Council session adopted a Council directive amending for the third time Directive 76/768/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to cosmetic products.

This directive takes account of the substance of the amendment to the proposal for a directive proposed by the European Parliament.

Commission's position at the debate : Verbatim report of proceeding, 13 October 1983, pp. 277-8.

Text of proposal adopted by Parliament : Minutes of 14 October 1983, pp. 15-17.

4. Report by Mrs Krouwel-Vlam closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the EC Commission proposal to the Council (COM(81)811 final) for a directive concerning airborne noise emitted by household appliances.

A new version of the proposal for a directive, amended under the second paragraph of Article 149 of the Treaty, will be sent to the Council and Parliament by the end of November.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 15/16 September 1983, pp. 325-6.

Text of proposal adopted by Parliament : Minutes of 16 September 1983, pp. 55-80.

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

5. Report by Mr Turner closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the EC Commission proposals to the Council (COM(80)635 final) for :

- (i) a first directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to trademarks,
- (ii) a regulation on the Community trademark.

At the debate the Commission informed Parliament that it :

- (a) was going to take over 63 of the 70 amendments proposed, with certain alterations ;
- (b) would put proposals amended under the second paragraph of Article 149 of the EEC Treaty before the Council.

The Commission departments concerned are preparing the amended proposals. In view of the volume of parliamentary amendments accepted by the Commission, more than two months will be needed to prepare the texts.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 12 October 1983, pp. 140-141.

Text of proposal adopted by Parliament : Minutes of 12 October 1983, pp. 55-63.

6. Report by Mr Moreland closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the EC Commission proposal to the Council (COM(82)816 final) for a directive on the conditions under which non-resident carriers may operate certain national transport services within a Member State.

A proposal for an amendment (Article 149 of the Treaty) has been prepared by the Commission. This text corresponds to Parliament's Amendment No 6. The amended proposal will be sent to the Council and Parliament as soon as possible.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 13/14 October 1983, pp. 334-335.

Text of proposal adopted by parliament : Minutes of 14 October 1983, pp. 71-72.

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

Report by Mr Schmid closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the EC Commission proposal to the Council (COM(83)356 final) for a decision concerning the adoption of the second phase (January 1984 — March 1986) of the multiannual research and training programme for the European Economic Community in the field of biomolecular engineering.

- (a) Parliament adopted an amendment to paragraph 1.2 in the Annex to the proposal for a Council decision. At the plenary debate the Commission rejected this amendment, which concerns medical matters.
- (b) On 26 October 1983 the Research Council session adopted the decision on the second phase (1984-86) of the multiannual research and training programme for the EEC in the field of biomolecular engineering.
- (c) The request made in paragraph 2 of the resolution (plants with higher energy yields) may be followed up in carrying out the programme, provided the Commission receives suitable proposals.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 13/14 October 1983, pp. 297-298.

Text of proposal adopted by Parliament : Minutes of 14 October 1983, p. 33.

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

1. Report by Mr Veronesi closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the EC Commission proposal to the Council (COM(83)258 final) for a decision adopting a first European strategic programme for information-technology research and development (ESPRIT).

With regard to the October 1983 resolution the following should be noted.

- (a) The Commission has always followed technological and economic developments in this sector very closely. The Information Technology Task Force is trying to work out strategy in this field in order, among other things, to stimulate demand here. An extremely important part of this work will concern a set of telecommunications schemes. Two communications on the subject have already been sent out, the first explaining the need for action, the second (which is on the agenda for Athens at the end of the year) proposing six lines of action, one of these being the establishment of standards, the others :
- (i) the setting of medium and long-term goals at Community level,
  - (ii) joint R & D,
  - (iii) joint development of the transnational part of the future infrastructure,
  - (iv) the use of modern telecommunications techniques for the least-favoured regions of the Community,
  - (v) the opening-up of the part of the common market dominated by public buyers.
- (b) As for the problem of integrating national projects in a programme coordinated at Community level, the national bodies on the ACM are keeping up close enough links with the ITTF staff to ensure proper coordination. In addition, the personnel and services of the information exchange system (IES) will be shared to some extent.
- (c) The Commission is studying how the results of this research can be made known effectively to the Community's best advantage while at the same time protecting persons' and companies' ownership of inventions and research made in the framework of the coordinated Community programmes. It is considering using not only the IES but also scientific and technical publications, and conferences and seminars, in collaboration, naturally, with those taking part in the programme.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 13/14 October 1983, pp. 327-328.

Text of proposal adopted by Parliament : Minutes of 14 October 1983, p. 56.

2. Report by Mr Brok on the Commission Memorandum on employee participation in asset formation.

To follow up the resolution, but also to meet the request made at the joint (Eco/Fin-Soc) Council session on 16 November 1982 that the Commission's working paper on 'ways and means of promoting worker participation in the formation of company capital' be up-dated, the Commission is proposing as a first stage to prepare an Addendum up-dating its 1979 Memorandum accompanied by a draft Council recommendation concerning capital formation by persons with relatively modest incomes and wage-earners.

Commission's position at debate : Verbatim report of proceedings, 12 October 1983, pp. 147-8.

D. *Disaster aid supplied since the last part-session  
Emergency aid for third countries*

1. *Financial aid*

<i>Country</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Reason</i>	<i>Distributed by</i>	<i>Date of decision</i>
Santa Lucia	200 000 ECU	tropical storm	gvt.	21. 10. 83
Western Samoa	200 000 ECU	fires	gvt.	27. 10. 83
Turkey	500 000 ECU	earthquake	LICCROSS	3. 11. 83

2. *Food aid*

<i>Country</i>	<i>Quantity/ Product</i>	<i>Reason</i>	<i>Distributed by</i>	<i>Date of decision</i>
Ethiopia	100 t cereals 100 t butteroil	drought	LICCROSS	13. 10. 83
Paraguay	2 700 t beans	floods	NGO	20. 10. 83
Lesotho	3 600 t cereals		World	
Nicaragua	7 200 t cereals		Food	
Senegal	2 700 t rice		Programme's	6. 10. 83
Somalia	10 000 t cereals		International	
Gambia	1 800 t rice		Emergency	
Syria	1 200 t cereals		Reserve	



## SITTING OF TUESDAY, 15 NOVEMBER 1983

## Contents

1. <i>Approval of the Minutes</i> <i>Mr Forth; Mr Bournias . . . . .</i>	34	<i>poulos; Mr Arndt; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr R. Jackson; Mr Enright; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Enright . . . . .</i>	61
2. <i>Decisions on urgency</i> <i>Lord Douro; Mr De Pasquale; Mr Provan</i>	35	5. <i>Deadline for tabling amendments</i> <i>Mr Chanterie . . . . .</i>	68
3. <i>Deployment of Pershing and Cruise missiles — INF negotiations in Geneva — Oral questions with debate to the Foreign Ministers (Doc. 1-956/83) by Mr Gontikas and others and (Doc. 1-957/83) by Mrs Focke and others</i> <i>Mr Gontikas; Mrs Focke; Mr Charalambopoulos (Foreign Ministers); Mr Hänsch; Mr Barbi; Mr Fergusson; Mr Segre; Mr Haagerup; Mr de la Malène; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Bangemann; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Hänsch; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Klepsch; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mrs Focke; Mr Charalambopoulos; Lady Elles; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Wurtz; Mr Bangemann; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Gendebien; Mr De Goede; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr Mommersteeg; Mr Möller; Mr Alavanos; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mrs Spaak; Mr Jacquet; Mr Habsburg; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Alexiadis; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul; Mrs Boserup; Ms Cluyd; Mr Cariglia; Mrs Gredal; Mr Gontikas; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul; Mr Chanterie . . .</i>	35	6. <i>Council statement — European Union — Decisions to be taken on all four aspects of the negotiations — Enlargement of the Community (continuation)</i> <i>Ms Cluyd; Mr Rumor; Mr Prag; Mr Fanti; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Lalor; Mr Blaney, Lord Douro; Mrs Weber; Mrs Ewing; Mr Charalambopoulos . . . . .</i>	68
4. <i>Council statement — European Union — Decisions to be taken on all four aspects of the negotiations — Enlargement of the Community — Statement by the President-in-Office of the Council and oral questions with debate to the Council, (Doc. 1-958/83) by Mr Rumor, (Doc. 1-961/83) by Mr Fanti and Mr Piquet, (Doc. 1-951/83) by Ms Cluyd and others and (Doc. 1-953/83) by Mr Galuzzi and others</i> <i>Mr Charalambopoulos (Council); Mrs Elaine Kellett-Bowman; Mr Charalambo-</i>		7. <i>CAP — Report (Doc. 1-987/83) by Mr Curry and oral questions with debate (Doc. 1-950/83) by Mr Papaefstratiou, to the Council, (Doc. 1-955/83) by Mr Sutra, to the Commission and (Doc. 1-959/83) by Mr Antoniozzi, to the Commission</i> <i>Mr Curry; Mr Louwes; Mr Collins; Mr Woltjer; Mr Ligios, Mr Provan; Mr Pranchère; Mr Jürgens; Mr Kaspereit; Mr Skovmand; Mrs Spaak; Mr Gautier . . .</i>	74
		8. <i>Deadline for tabling amendments</i> <i>Mr Van Minnen . . . . .</i>	88
		9. <i>Topical and urgent debate (announcement)</i> <i>Mr Davern . . . . .</i>	89
		10. <i>Question Time</i> — <i>Questions to the Council</i> — <i>Question No 1, by Mr Papaefstratiou: Immediate implementation of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes:</i> <i>Mr Charalambopoulos (Council); Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Battersby; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Kallias; Mr Charalambopoulos . . . . .</i>	89

- |  |    |   |    |
|--|----|---|----|
| — Question No 2, by Mr Moreland: Mediterranean Monk Seal:<br>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Moreland;<br>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Muntingh; Mr Charalambopoulos . . . . .  | 90 | Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Seeler; Mr Charalambopoulos . . . . .   | 94 |
| — Question No 3, by Mrs Ewing: Meeting of the Council of Fisheries Ministers:<br>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mrs Ewing;<br>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mrs Ewing;<br>Mrs Le Roux; Mr Charalambopoulos;<br>Mr Seligman; Mr Charalambopoulos;<br>Mr Calvez; Mr Charalambopoulos;<br>Mr Clinton; Mr Charalambopoulos;<br>Miss Quin; Mr Charalambopoulos . . . . . | 90 | — Question No 10, by Mr Eisma: Trans-frontier effects of power stations<br>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Eisma;<br>Mr Charalambopoulos . . . . .  | 94 |
| — Question No 4, by Mr Kaloyannis: The combating of terrorism in Greece<br>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Kaloyannis; Mr Charalambopoulos . . . . .   | 92 | — Question No 11, by Mr Marck: Community rules on agricultural products<br>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Marck;<br>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mrs Ewing;<br>Mr Charalambopoulos . . . . .   | 95 |
| — Question No 5, by Mr Rogalla: Checks at internal frontiers<br>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Rogalla;<br>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Charalambopoulos . . . . .  | 92 | — Questions to the Foreign Ministers<br>— Question No 25, by Mrs De March: Extradition requests addressed by the Turkish Military Junta to the Governments of the Ten:<br>Mr Charalambopoulos (Minister for Foreign Affairs); Mr Chambeiron; Mr Charalambopoulos; Ms Cluyd; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Adamou; Mr Charalambopoulos . . . . . | 95 |
| — Question No 6, by Mr Gerokostopoulos: Compensation for victims of decolonization in line with the resolution adopted by the European Confederation of Victims of Decolonization:<br>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Gerokostopoulos; Mr Charalambopoulos . . . . .   | 93 | — Question No 26, by Mrs Ewing: Release of five Cuban citizens, together with their lawyers:<br>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mrs Ewing;<br>Mr Alavanos . . . . .  | 96 |
| — Question No 8, by Mr Seeler: Extension of EEC sanctions against the Soviet Union   |    | — Question No 27, by Mr Lomas: European companies in South Africa:<br>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Lomas;<br>Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Hord; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Jakobsen; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Enright; Mr Charalambopoulos . . . . .  | 97 |

#### IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

*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 Forth (ED).** — In fairness, Mr President, to yourself and to the House, I would draw attention to the English version of the minutes, page 14, where it

says that I asked that the Viehoff report not be placed on the agenda and that Parliament accepted this request. Regrettably, Mr President, Parliament did not see fit to accept this request, and I do suggest that the minutes be changed because they give entirely the wrong sense at the moment. Unfortunately, but they do.

**President.** — Thank you very much, Mr Forth. In fact the conclusion is upside down; Parliament did not accept your request.

*(Parliament approved the Minutes)*

**Mr Bournias (PPE).** — *(GR)* I am sorry, Mr President, but I am forced to complain and enter a plea on

**Bournias**

behalf of the New Democracy Members because, on a subject of tremendous importance for peace and for Greece, you have cut the speaking time of our colleague, Mr Gontikas, to five minutes, whereas in the agenda he was allotted ten minutes. Unfortunately, with the build-up of business, this happens very frequently, and it is a transgression of the Rules of Procedure. Today at least, for this subject, Mr President, you should make an exception.

**President.** — Mr Bournias, yesterday we accepted or rather decided that rapporteurs would be given only five minutes speaking time, except in the case of those reports that related directly to the preparations for the Athens Summit. There were no comments whatsoever on this at the time, so that I must take it that this decision was agreed to.<sup>1</sup>

### 2. Decisions on urgency

Proposals from the Commission to the Council for a Regulation instituting integrated Mediterranean programmes (Doc. 1-661/83 — COM(83) 495 Final)

**Lord Douro (ED).** — Mr President, I was asked by the Committee on Budgets to deliver an opinion on this matter. We have not had a chance to consider it, and therefore I believe the Committee on Budgets would also be against urgency for this matter.

**Mr De Pasquale (COM), chairman of the committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning.** — (IT) Mr President, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning I regret to say that I must ask for the request for urgent procedure to be refused. We are extremely sorry, but I see no other solution, since our committee, which is the one responsible, has not for a number of reasons, including time and the well-known problems of the translation services, been able to complete its report. Therefore in view of the importance of this matter I do not think that we can proceed to urgency. Moreover, the committees which have been called upon to give their opinion — the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Budgets — have also not been able to give their opinion. Therefore, I ask that urgent procedure should be rejected.

**Mr Provan (ED).** — Mr President, I think it is actually quite intolerable for the Commission to come forward this morning and ask for urgency on this matter. It is a \$ billion ECU programme, which is approximately 25 % of the total European budget. To bounce it through on a motion of urgency is

intolerable, and I suggest that this Parliament vote against it most strongly.

*(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure)*

Arndt report (Doc. 856/83) on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the

Proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-375/83 — COM(83) 270 final) for a decision on own resources in relation to the future financing of the Community.

**President.** — I should now like to make an announcement with regard to the procedure to be followed in dealing with the Arndt report.

The Committee on Budgets has informed me that it has decided to maintain the original text of the report by Mr Arndt — and therefore also of the motion for a resolution — but that it has decided at the same time to table certain compromise amendments to it.

This being the case, it is not longer necessary to vote on it on Friday. However, as I already announced yesterday, the vote could be put on Wednesday's agenda on the understanding that the debate would not be reopened and that only the rapporteur and possibly the chairman of the committee could be given the floor to explain these amendments.

With regard to the amendments in general, those tabled by the Committee on Budgets are now ready and will be distributed as soon as possible. I would ask the authors of other amendments to let me know by 1 p.m. whether they are withdrawing amendments already tabled or whether they would wish to table new amendments.

As announced yesterday, the deadline for all amendments has been fixed for 1 p.m. today.

*(Parliament decided on urgent procedure)*<sup>1</sup>

### 3. Deployment of Pershing and Cruise missiles — INF negotiations in Geneva

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on : — the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-956/83) by Mr Gontikas and others to the Foreign Ministers of the European Communities meeting in political cooperation

Subject: Steps taken by the Greek Foreign Minister to postpone deployment of American missiles in Europe

On 19 August 1983 the Greek newspapers published a letter from the Greek Foreign Minister to his EEC counterparts asking for a six-month postponement of the implementation of the decision to deploy Pershing and Cruise missiles in Europe.

<sup>1</sup> *Topical and urgent debate (announcement):* see Minutes.

<sup>1</sup> *For the vote on the other requests for urgent procedure, see Minutes.*

## President

Since European public opinion in its entirety considers this measure essential as a means of defending the Western world against the aggressive and expansionist plans of the communists, can the President of the Council explain what prompted him to take such an action, which makes Greece look like a defender of Soviet policy?

Does the President of the Council also consider that this comes within the Council's terms of reference and that this was the most appropriate time — during the Greek Presidency — for the taking of such a step?

- the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-957/83) by Mrs Focke and others to the Foreign Ministers of the 10 Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation

Subject: Action taken by the Foreign Ministers meeting in EPC on the Greek proposal concerning the extension of the Geneva INF negotiations

On 12 August 1983, the Greek Prime Minister, Mr Charalambopoulos, proposed that the Foreign Ministers of the Community meeting in EPC should press for a six-month extension of the Geneva negotiations on medium range weapons in Europe.

1. Can the President of the Council state whether the Greek Government's proposal was discussed at the Conference of Foreign Ministers meeting in EPC on 12 September 1983, and, if so, with what results? If not, why not?
2. Is the President of the Council of the opinion that the question of the length of the negotiations is a 'political aspect' of an issue which concerns the security of all the Member States of the Community?
3. Does the President of the Council take the view that the adoption by the Community Member States of a joint position on an issue of vital importance to all Europeans could have a positive effect on the progress and outcome of the Geneva INF negotiations?
4. Does the President of the Council believe that all 10 Member States within EPC should be prepared to compromise to reach a united position and that the Presidency has a particular responsibility in this respect?

**Mr Gontikas (PPE).** — *(GR)* Mr President, my question to the President of the Council reflects the bewilderment of that large section of European public opinion on behalf of which I speak today. Ordinary Europeans are pondering why the Greek Presidency has launched such a one-sided initiative, one which

leaves it wide open to every sort of criticism. European public opinion, which is preponderantly peace-loving, concurs wholeheartedly with the statement issued by the French bishops on 8 November this year, a statement marked by realism and deep political wisdom. I take one sentence from it which we should carry in our minds: 'Every man should espouse peace'. However, living as we do in this world of injustice, responsible statesmen have a duty to defend the things which our countries value in common, and which the people have entrusted them to protect. Apart from peace these include justice, security, independence and freedom. But to succeed in defending these things they need to take all necessary measures to prevent any attack on them.

That is how we envisaged the Greek Presidency. We felt sure that it would follow a truly European path, despite its petty political expediences — such as refusing to allow the Greek Socialists to visit the Berlin Wall of Shame. We believed, Mr President-in-Office, that you would wish to appear as a responsible statesman who, without disregarding the peace message conveyed to us by the marches — only by people in the West, unfortunately — would have the courage to say publicly that it is immoral for those in government to leave the citizens of the Community undefended.

We had hoped to hear you say what we have read in the bishops' statement, that, 'living in a world where man is still a wolf to his fellows, for us to turn man into a lamb is an incitement to the wolf'. We did not imagine that the French President would beat you to it in saying that the tragedy lies in the fact that the missiles are in the East and the peace movements in the West.

*(Applause from the centre)*

This is important for the free world because peace can only exist within the framework of a balance of forces. Instead of telling us this truth you have spoken for a one-sided postponement of weapons systems deployment, and so, Mr President-in-Office, this beautiful initiative of yours, which we could have accepted if it had included all of the States involved, has been wrecked unwittingly by you off your own bat. You have been the star performer in a theatre of the absurd, have participated in a modern Greek tragedy and have suffocated peace and truth single-handed.

One act in this theatre of the absurd was the response of the Greek Presidency to the shooting down of the South Korean airliner. Nowhere have we read, Mr President, of any protest by the Presidency of the Council about the recent deployment of Russian missiles in Czechoslovakia and Hungary. The saddest thing of all is that we have not seen peace marches in those countries.

**Gontikas**

Has this no relevance for you, Mr President-in-Office of the Council? Is it only the American missiles that disturb you? I think you have chosen a bad moment and the wrong forum in which to put forward the Soviet call for a postponement of the deployment of the American missiles. Your proposal is out of tune with reality because it comes at a time when Europe is bowed down by innumerable economic problems and is in no position by itself, without American assistance, to guarantee the security it needs in order to lay the foundations for reflation and growth. It should not escape our attention — perhaps you are unaware of the fact — that the time when the Community really blossomed was between 1960-1975 when America shouldered the main burden of defence expenditure in Europe. I think that the best answer to my question today is given in the book by Jean-François Revel, the social democrat, in his book 'The Death of the Democracies'. He says that the so-called peace campaigners are targeting on the present Euro-missiles because it is these which give Europe strategic autonomy.

Mr President, European public opinion holds the Greek Presidency accountable. Firstly, for using its powers to mislead it through the service of non-European interests.

*(Applause)*

Secondly, it feels that the Presidency's quixotic preference for a missile-free zone would render Europe easy prey to the numerically superior Soviet conventional forces. It feels anxious about such a circumstance, because should a missile land in its near vicinity, Europe would suffer the effects of nuclear fall-out without being able to defend itself. It believes that you have deliberately concealed the fact that Russia has a nuclear superiority of 3 to 1 and a superiority in conventional forces of 5 to 1.

For those of us who believe in Europe, Mr President, the deployment of the American missiles is so vital for our security as to disallow any hesitancy which could possibly lead again to the Munich spirit of appeasement. Regrettably, Mr President and colleagues, ultimate peace is to be found only in the grave, and I can assure you that Europe is not thinking of dying.

Mr President, I want today's debate to sound out a message to Europe and therefore I paraphrase a familiar expression. 'We do not anticipate peace through a Russian initiative, we are not afraid, we are free'.

*(Loud applause from the centre)*

**Mrs Focke (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the oral question to the Foreign Ministers, to which I am speaking on behalf of my colleagues too, was tabled against the background of the Geneva

negotiations on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. The question was prompted by the proposal from the Greek Presidency in August this year to the Foreign Ministers of the Ten that they should press for a six-month extension of the negotiations. Rather late, although not too late, this oral question is the subject of a debate today with the President-in-Office of the Council, at a time when millions of citizens of this Community are looking to the negotiations between the two superpowers in Geneva with fear and hope, although with rather more doubt than confidence, and asking whether their voice, the voice of the Europeans, of those concerned, will be heard at that negotiating table.

*(Applause from the left)*

What is the issue? Quite simply the question is when we Europeans can persuade the big powers to listen to us at their talks, since it is a matter of our — European — security, and how we can achieve the widest possible consensus among ourselves. That is why I ask the Foreign Ministers: How do you actually implement your declarations in the cold light of day? For the Stuttgart declaration did say that the aim was to achieve closer coordination between the positions of the Member States on the economic and political aspects of security.

When Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council, proposed the six-month extension of the Geneva negotiations, his colleague Mr Genscher, and others too, immediately rejected it on behalf of his nation. No-one knew whether he meant the proposal was not a subject for European Political Cooperation or whether he meant that we considered this proposal politically wrong. Whatever the meaning, it was not revealed to the public. That is why the interested observer is surprised to read that only a few weeks later Mr Genscher reported to his Foreign Minister colleagues on his meeting in Vienna with Mr Gromyko, the Soviet Foreign Minister, and Mr Andreotti reported on the meeting between the head of his government and President Reagan in Washington. According to newspaper reports, the matter certainly was discussed on those occasions, i.e., the possibility that the Soviets might withdraw from the Geneva negotiations, the need to prevent a break in the East-West dialogue and observance of the timetable fixed for the deployment of the new medium-range weapons.

Mr President, there is a certain lack of clarity here. Such contradictory behaviour generates confusion, not just among us Members of Parliament but also among the citizens of our countries. So I ask you, according to what criteria do the Member States' governments apply the instrument of European Political Cooperation?

*(Applause from the left)*

Focke

Have you already sacrificed your solemn declarations in Stuttgart on strengthening and developing European Political Cooperation on the altar of political opportunism a mere four months later? I also refer you to paragraph 4 of our question. What has the Presidency, which always bears a special responsibility in this respect, done to reach and promote compromises to ensure that the Ten adopt a united position? I get the impression that the Foreign Ministers go to the European Political Cooperation meetings with two different yardsticks — a long one when it is a question of defending their own political interests and intentions, a short one when it is a question of the interests and opinions of other governments.

*(Applause from the left)*

That is not the way to reach a common concept of European security that can protect the European people's independent way of life. In the question of security, which is so vital to all Europeans, the point is to establish the credibility of our Community in the eyes of our citizens, to give the general public the confidence and certain knowledge that this Community does have a meaning. It is not just an economic Moloch. It is the expression of a peaceful order in Western Europe, of organized co-existence instead of destructive nationalism: instead of distrust we have cooperation, instead of war peaceful ways of settling conflicts, and this directly elected European Parliament has taken the right road. I am saying this on behalf of the large majority of the Socialist Group. From the outset it has committed itself to the policy of peace set out in the Helsinki Final Act. It has made it clear that it wants to continue the CSCE process, i.e., a policy of détente and disarmament. It has called for a disarmament conference in Europe, an idea adopted in Madrid against the original opposition of the USSR and the USA. It has opened the door to a fresh interpretation of European security interests. However, and this is also the view of my Group, it was the Christian Democratic/Conservative majority in this House that thought last month that by adopting the Fergusson report it might also be possible to choose a different road, to achieve a European security policy via a European policy on armaments. To this we say no. We do not want to follow that road, for it is the wrong one.

*(The President requested the speaker to conclude)*

I will conclude then, Mr President. Disarmament, not rearmament, is the order of the day. That is why I say to the Foreign Ministers: fulfil your duty and formulate common political solutions to respond to Europe's major problems!

*(Applause from the left)*

I must say to Mr Gontikas and Mr Habsburg: in what time do you think you are living? How can you assert publicly that European public opinion as a whole is convinced of the need to deploy these weapons? Did

you see ghosts on the streets of Europe? Did the opinion polls invent the figures showing that in Germany alone 70% of all citizens are against their deployment?

*(Loud applause from the left)*

So make use of the instrument of political cooperation! Make sure that Geneva does not become the signal for a European arms spiral but the prelude for scrapping the Soviet SS 20s! Do not follow a rigid timetable! Help ensure the destruction of the self-imposed straitjacket of automatic deployment! Call for further negotiations instead of further weapons!

*(Applause)*

Put the whole weight of your 10 European governments in the scale to ensure that the negotiations cover both medium and long-range missiles.

Honourable Members, as European Members we bear a special responsibility for peace. Let that emerge clearly from this debate.

*(Loud applause from the left)*

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — *(GR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I must remind you that I am here today in the capacity of President of the Council and as nothing else. It was essential for me to clear that up, because from what I can see both the questions refer to the foreign policies of Member States and, as you know, matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the Member States are not discussed in this House. Only the national parliaments have competence in such matters.

The Council's reply to both questions is the same, so I will not reply to Mr Gontikas and Mrs Focke separately. The honourable Members' questions refer to an initiative of the Foreign Minister of Greece acting in that capacity and not as President of European political cooperation. As a consequence, the substance of this initiative has not been discussed in the context of political cooperation.

*(Shouts of disapproval)*

**Mr Hänsch (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group finds it most welcome that the European Parliament is the first Community institution to deal at last with an issue that concerns millions of people on our continent. What can and must be done by Europe to help the Geneva negotiations to a happy outcome in spite of everything? In August this year the Greek Presidency proposed an extension of the Geneva negotiations, to be discussed in the framework of EPC. Mr Foreign Minister, if you say something different today and allege that you made that proposal as Greek Foreign Minister, then I say to you: do stop this masquerade behind your two functions!

*(Applause)*

**Hänsch**

We German Social Democrats and the majority of the Socialist Group would have supported that proposal and still support it now. The Foreign Ministers themselves refused to consider your proposal in the framework of EPC and we regard that as very misguided, in fact as a mistake.

*(Applause)*

What are the citizens of the Community supposed to think of their representatives and leaders who — starting with the German Chancellor — solemnly undertook in Stuttgart in July to deliberate on the political aspects of the Community's security too and then, two months later, in August, refused to discuss a proposal on precisely that matter?

What are the citizens supposed to think of us and their representatives in the Council of Ministers, who are about to debate 30 pages of a directive on intra-Community trade in the sperm of domestic cattle but cannot find three hours to consider the question of European security?

*(Applause)*

We Social Democrats, we Socialists, take the threat of the SS 20 missiles very seriously. Nor do we want any applause from those who, here in this House too, regard American weapons purely as murder weapons and want to persuade us that the SS 20s are successful descendants of the dove of peace. We want these missiles to be scrapped. But, unfortunately, you will not achieve this by the deployment of new medium-range weapons in Western Europe. You can only abolish them by way of negotiation. And anyone who hopes to negotiate them out of existence ...

*(Applause)*

will have to continue negotiating after 22 November. There is no other way! And merging the INF and START negotiations could be one way to do this.

We are acting here as spokesmen for the millions and millions of people in Europe who want this Parliament to reflect their concern at the nuclear arms race in Europe. We appeal to the superpowers, the USA and the Soviet Union, to those among us who believe they can live safely under the mantle of one or the other, to stop the mad arms race. Do not delude yourselves that more weapons will mean more security. Do not be pressurized by time-tables. Give the Geneva negotiations, which were delayed for so long by both sides, a new chance, and give a new chance to the Community, which is a European Community, which is becoming more and more aware of itself, which is committed to freedom and to guaranteeing peace.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Barbi (PPE).** — *(IT)* Mr President, we have not really been surprised by the question from Mrs Focke and our German Socialist colleagues since they are at present in opposition in their country.

We have been surprised by the attitude of the Greek Socialists, who are in government. We have been surprised, Mr Greek Foreign Minister — and I am calling you this because you do not want to be seen wearing your hat of President of the Council for this discussion ...

*(Applause)*

... we have been surprised by the proposal for a six-month moratorium, which seems to take no account of the four years which have been spent in vain.

And it is precisely for this reason that Mr Gontikas moved his question on behalf of our Group. When they have had to cope with the responsibilities of office, all the Socialists in Europe have supported NATO's so-called twin-track decision: from Chancellor Schmidt, who with the backing of the whole German Socialist Party was one of its originators and most convinced supporters; President Mitterand, who maintains the autonomy of the French *force de frappe*; the Italian Prime Minister, Mr Craxi, and Mr Soares and Mr Gonzales of Spain and Portugal; and the Belgian and Dutch Socialists when they were in government. And this seems very noteworthy and, I might say, logical to us: those in power must ensure the security of their country. Once in opposition, they can allow themselves a few demagogic flourishes ...

*(Applause from the centre)*

We of the European People's Party have clear ideas and a coherent position on this vital problem, which we have maintained even where we are in opposition, as in France and Greece, and which we have expressed on a number of occasions in this Parliament and recently put into concrete form in the Haagerup report which we supported and from which in our view we should not now deviate.

We believe that the surest way to achieve what is best for all our people lies in cooperation rather than dialectical opposition, solidarity rather than the class struggle, tolerance rather than violence, ideological and political pluralism rather than a one-party dictatorship and freedom rather than totalitarianism.

*(Applause from the centre)*

So our desire for peace is natural and held with deep conviction. It is, therefore, with great reluctance and extreme caution that we undertake the difficult task of providing for the defence of our people when recourse to arms is needed. And we only do this if and when we are threatened directly and immediately by weapons brandished by those who, in accordance with ideological principles which they have never repudiated, during the long exercise of their political power — as has been shown recently in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Afghanistan, Cambodia, Angola and Ethiopia — have no hesitation at all in using them.

*(Applause from the centre and right)*

**Barbi**

We Christian Democrats, who in the countries where we hold power have reduced expenditure on armaments to the basic minimum and would like to stop this expenditure completely, we Christian Democrats approved the NATO twin-track decision in 1979 when we were confronted by the deployment of the SS-20s which were pointing at our cities, especially as we preferred to believe that the negotiations which were immediately offered would reach a successful outcome within four years.

We were the ones who through our governments in Europe inspired the zero option and the intermediate solution for the installation in Eastern and Western Europe of an equal, and the lowest possible, number of nuclear warheads.

All of these proposals have been rejected.

And not only that: the Soviets have been able to take advantage of this long period not indeed to negotiate but to increase their number of warheads from 135 in 1979 to 1 050 this year, so demonstrating clearly their wish to ensure their monopoly of short-range missiles in order to blackmail Europe through the nuclear threat and divide it from its American partners.

Should we, therefore, give way to despair? Should we resign ourselves to the nightmare of nuclear destruction? Certainly not. But we are more convinced than ever that the negotiations can lead to positive results only if they are not subjected to the dictates of fear which others seek to impose on us, only if the other side is convinced that we are not about to give in and only if they are obliged to seek a realistic balance of power.

I say to the Greek Foreign Minister that accepting the proposal for a moratorium would mean hindering the search for agreement and so for peace. How can we avoid the fact that such a step would be seen as proof of the weakening of the West's resolve? It would be interpreted as a demonstration of the fragility of the European governments in the face of the pressures and threats — which are not even particularly veiled — of Soviet diplomacy, and as a sign of the vulnerability of the Atlantic Alliance which would seem disunited and incapable of honouring the undertakings it gave unanimously four years ago.

How can we avoid seeing that as long as the Soviet Union thinks that it can prevent NATO from deploying missiles without giving up its own, it will obviously have no need to take the negotiations seriously. You do not negotiate, Mr Hänsch, with those who have nothing to negotiate.

On the contrary: it is likely that the Geneva talks will begin to lead somewhere when the West has shown some evidence of its determination. I know there are those who are afraid that the Soviet Union will carry out its threat to break off the talks as soon as the

Cruise and Pershing missiles arrive in Europe. Perhaps they will. But what name should we give to those who behaved like that towards us after watching us work patiently, honestly and tenaciously for talks throughout four long years during which they had coolly built up their nuclear arsenal in Europe to a massive extent?

No, ladies and gentlemen, it is not by yielding to threats, or by weakness and fear, or by doubts and divisions that the Europeans will maintain peace alongside freedom, as true peace could certainly not be acquired at the price of freedom!

We must be firm, courageous and united. Therefore we take this opportunity to state once more our long-term conviction that we need an integrated defence for Europe.

If, 30 years ago, we had brought about the European Defence Community we should very probably be in a better position to meet these dangers and cope with these threats more effectively. We Christian Democrats want peace. We believe in peace. But we also want to find the best means and to choose the right ways of achieving it; and the main and essential one of these is through European unity.

We are proud of having made a direct contribution to the longest period of peace between us in this old and bloodstained continent of ours when the first germ of the idea of European unity was discussed by Schuman, Adenauer, De Gasperi and Monnet just after the war. We must resolve quite firmly to do all that we can to help this idea to grow and flourish.

And so I say to all my colleagues from all parties, but in particular to the Socialists on this occasion, that it is my deeply-held conviction that we must not be split on this vital matter and must not quarrel about these conditions which are essential to our very existence as free peoples.

*Primum vivere, deinde philosophare*, as our forefathers said. Let us unite to defend our basic right to freedom; then and only then shall we be able freely to discuss our different social and political proposals: only then shall we be able to differ and disagree among ourselves in a helpful and intelligent way.

I hope that the 1 050 SS-20s which are being cold-bloodedly aimed towards our countries will at least have one positive effect: that of making us see more clearly than any political argument that this is the moment for unity, for the greatest, most determined and firmest unity in Europe.

*(Loud applause from the centre and from the right)*

**Mr Fergusson (ED).** — Mr President, it is a very important debate, and it has been fascinating to watch how those who have most noisily maintained in the past that this Parliament has no right to debate European defence strategy have taken the lead in pressing



## Fergusson

on this Chamber and on the Community the most momentous strategic issue of all — nuclear weapons.

*(Applause from the right and from the centre)*

In certain minds — and I cannot exclude the mind of the President-in-Office of the Council, with his egregious ideas about political cooperation — this debate is not intended to be about defence. For them it is expressly about no defence, about defencelessness. It is about consciously contriving the comparative weakness of the free world, about wilfully permitting the enemies of freedom to achieve a calculated and unsailable advantage over those who would defend it. In so obscuring the global scale of Soviet militarism since the Helsinki Agreement of 1975, those who feel this way are not only endangering the peace that they say they want, not only preparing to trade peace with freedom for peace at any price, they are making less likely the more immediate aim of the rest of us — the mutual, balanced and guaranteed reduction of all arms right across the board. Why should the Soviets pay for what ...

*(Interruption from Mr Enright)*

... If people like that have their way, they can have for nothing.

The proposition has been put that the deployment of Cruise missiles should be postponed for six months. Now that policy would be worth considering if it offered the slightest prospect of eliminating from the European theatre the SS 20s which have so fundamentally upset the balance of nuclear power here. But what evidence have we that the Soviets would so use another six months' grace? This evidence: that since NATO's twin track decision was taken in 1979, whereby the reversal of its missile policy has always been on the cards given a sign of good faith from Moscow, the Soviet Union has put in position four times as many SS 20s as she had before. Does the President-in-Office of the Council wish that ratio to be increased to five times before the first counter-measure is in place? Or is it his hope that after another six months delay free world opinion would be so persuaded that appeasement is the only argument it has left that the reinforcement of our own deterrent becomes impracticable? Moscow would like that.

As the British CND movement and its officials have just reminded us, of course Cruise is an awesome weapon, but its purpose is not to destroy mankind. Its purpose is that mankind shall not be destroyed; to make it more possible for real disarmament to take place. America's European allies, including the Socialist parties of Germany and Britain, have asked for it, not so that Europe might become a battleground but so that we should not be abandoned. To stop or postpone that deployment without a comparable move from Moscow would be an act not of peace and wisdom, but of appeasement, of unilateral disarmament. We would never get rid of the SS 20s.

Mr Hänsch is wrong. To those who support such a gesture I would say this. One could quote many, many instances from history where unpreparedness, where a lack of arms, where pacifism, where refusal to face a threat, where weakness and cowardice and surrender itself have invited aggression and made war or slavery inevitable. But I would challenge the appeasers to quote one instance from European or world history, past or present, modern or ancient, or even from the realm of fiction, in which they so contentedly move, where one-sided disarmament has prevented war and preserved any nation's independence.

Has anyone here perhaps taken part in those demonstrations where people lie on the ground in a public place or paint their faces like skulls to simulate the horror of war? Let them go into the Place Kléber any day of the week and see the people of Strasbourg — MEPs often among them — going about their daily business calm, unfrightened, prosperous and free. That is the deterrent at work, working as it has worked for 30 years. That is not the peace of the psychiatric ward, that is the peace of the free, the peace that will last — but only if we are determined and able to defend it to the end.

My group welcomes this debate and will support the joint resolution now tabled wholeheartedly. We will do so because moderate, realistic, hopeful, determined Europeans can distinguish between the behaviour and aspirations of the super-powers just as they can distinguish between light and darkness, between the benign and the malignant, because the multilateral disarmament that we seek must be real, must be mutual, must be trustable and because we are not prepared to sell freedom — our freedom — for the base and craven and illusory peace offered by the tyranny in the East. We are here in this Parliament to give expression to the public opinion of the Community and to assert that it can keep its nerve. Let the governments of the Member States then listen to us and take notice of us and take notice of what we are telling them; let them be aware of the support that we are now giving them!

*(Applause from the right and from the centre)*

**Mr Segre (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, today is November 15 and there is a month and a half to go before the end of 1983. And yet the missiles are already arriving in Europe at an increasing pace which gives cause for great concern.

Why has the pace been speeded up? Why is this stubborn attempt being made to present the public with a kind of *fait accompli*? Probably in order to force people into acceptance. Acceptance of the failure of the Geneva negotiations, of the fresh increase in the arms race and of the increasingly dangerous and precarious state of international relations.

**Segre**

But this, Mr President, is an attempt which is both cynical and mistaken.

If there is a positive aspect to what is happening in the world today this lies in the increasing anxiety shown by all shades of public opinion, in the nagging doubts about the future of the world and the human race and in the desire to call a halt to this race towards oblivion and to bring about a definitive change of course.

This is what lies behind all the great peace demonstrations. This is what led to the appeal made by the 14 000 physicists. This gave rise to the clear and powerful warning delivered on Saturday by Pope John Paul II in his speech to the Papal Academy of Science in which he drew attention to the fact that just seven per cent of the world's military expenditure would be enough to save hundreds of millions of people from death by starvation.

No, this is not the moment for acceptance! But it seems to us that there is too much acceptance here; and too much support for weapons at the expense of the dictates of reason. I hope that Mr Barbi and Mr Fergusson will allow me to say in reply to their speeches that there is still time not only to avert another step towards a Europe transformed into a potential 'Euroshima' but also to prevent Europe from moving backwards politically and culturally by at least 30 years. Unfortunately the time is now very short. We must not simply throw this time away but must use it to rise above all national or party disputes and show a real sense of European responsibility!

In order to achieve this we Italian Communists, who are aware of the gravity of the situation, wish now to propose that the European Parliament should adopt a position based on just two points. First, since we are convinced that the adoption of a common position by the Member States of the EEC would have had and would still have a positive effect on the progress of the Geneva negotiations, we wish to invite the governments of the Member States to decide on a common position aiming, as the Greek Government has proposed, at suspending the installation and preparation for operation of the new missiles and on the furthering of the Geneva negotiations and integrating them eventually with the START talks. Secondly we would ask the Soviet Government at the same time to begin to make concrete provision for dismantling and destroying a reasonable number of the SS-20 missiles which have already been installed and to ensure that work is suspended on the construction of missile bases in Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic.

We are deeply convinced that the pause for reflection and the new margins for negotiation which would therefore be opened up could, together with a clear initiative from Europe, lead to understandings which

would guarantee stability, peace and security through balanced and controlled disarmament.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Haagerup (L).** — *(DA)* Mr President, several members have wished for a debate in this Parliament on the much discussed matter of the American medium-range missiles and NATO's twin-track decision. The Liberal Group has not shared the wish that we definitely must have a missile debate in this Parliament, even if we, of course, accept the decision now taken. My group is not of the opinion that taboo items should exist in the Parliament at all. And if we have had certain doubts about bringing up the missile debate here in Strasbourg, this is not due to the fact that we have hardly any possibilities to add decisively new viewpoints to the debate, because we quite simply have no basis for changing a decision taken outside the Community, namely by the foreign and defence ministers of NATO.

Allow me to elaborate a little on this point of view: we in the Liberal Group are in no way against this subject or other security policy subjects being brought up. What we are against is the fact that an attempt has been made to exploit European political cooperation to change a policy and a decision which most of our countries have made in cooperation with countries outside the Community, including the USA. To put it plainly, this is an attempt to change, through the back door, the security policy of the Member States.

Mr President, when I negotiated with the political groups prior to the adoption of my report on political cooperation and European security, many people pointed out to me that it should be said explicitly that the Community institutions have no competence in military areas, as Mr Fergusson reminded us a short time ago. Not only have I accepted this viewpoint, I have included it in the report, which was adopted by a large majority consisting of members from all six political groups. Who was so eager to have this explicit statement and this restriction included in my report? Well, it was the very same members and parties who now are of the opinion that the Parliament, after all, ought to debate military questions and missiles in Europe.

*(Applause from the centre and from the right)*

So, so much for those principles. A year ago we received a clear no from Socialists and Communists to discussing military subjects in Parliament — now this has become a yes to debating these questions. Why this sudden change? Well, it is due to the fact that several, but far from all, socialist and social democratic parties in Western Europe have now changed their viewpoints as regards NATO's twin-track decision of 1979. And they wish to use the European Parliament as a forum for their agitation against the American nuclear weapons which they themselves, and others,

**Haagerup**

have asked the USA to bring to Europe; weapons which they too have accepted four years ago, should no results be reached from the negotiations in Geneva on the so-called INF weapons.

No results have materialized, and since 1979 the Russians have multiplied the number of their SS-20 missiles. But that is not the reason for today's debate. The reason is that socialists and social democrats from a number of our Member States — and regrettably including the German SPD — want to create as much publicity as possible for their campaign, a campaign which is not primarily directed against the Soviet missiles, but against those American missiles, which have not even yet been deployed in Europe.

Mr President, we are presented with a not very attractive tactical game. Allow me to ask: In what way do the initiators of this debate think it will help to achieve a prompt positive result from the Geneva negotiations? For that is supposedly their aim — or do they just want to create further demonstrations, more ado, more confusion in connection with the missile issue. Can't they see that they make it even far more difficult for the Soviet Union to reach an agreement with the Americans on a minimum of missiles on either side of Europe, when the German, Dutch and Danish social democrats, plus Communists, demand that no American missiles at all be allowed in Europe, whilst allowing Russian missiles in Europe? These Russian missiles have been here for several years. In the course of the years they have been steadily augmented. How and when has this Parliament heard the Socialists protest against this Soviet missile threat against Western Europe? When have we heard them protest against it outside of this Parliament? Unfortunately, everything points to the fact that socialists and social democrats — with honourable exceptions from Italy and France, and I do hope, with honourable exceptions also within the SPD — have been scared by the peace movement's propaganda, and they have now finally joined the campaign against the American missiles, whereby they are trying to undermine the basis of the NATO decision which was adopted exactly four years ago. This is irresponsible conduct, which must be deeply regretted. Only a clear statement from Parliament in support of our Member States' policy to safeguard the necessary balance of power in western Europe can be the correct answer to this provocation.

Who do Members at the other side of this House think they are, when they dare monopolize peace and pronounce the word 'peace' in such a way that more than suggests that the rest of us are less peace-loving than they themselves? Let it be stated clearly: my group and the Parliament's majority simply do not accept that certain individuals and parties may achieve a monopoly on peace and the peace movement by

behaving in a loud-mouthed, provocative, and irresponsible manner towards our allies. I repeat: this is not solidarity towards our allies. Peace is too serious a matter to be left to troublemakers. This should be pondered on by that group of Members who are so convinced of the purity of their own motives that they stop at nothing in order to convince others of the justification of their viewpoints. Maybe the very thing they stand for is contributing to weaken our security, and thereby constitute a danger for peace and freedom in western Europe. Mr President, I at any rate am convinced that this is so. And because of this there are some of us who through a communal decision have taken steps to safeguard that the message which emerges from Parliament will be quite different from what some of the initiators of this debate had in mind.

*(Applause from the centre and from the right)*

**IN THE CHAIR: MR BRUNO FRIEDRICH***Vice-President*

**Mr de la Malène (DEP).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall comment first on the procedure and then on the substance.

As regards the procedure, we all have the feeling that the crisis of which we are speaking today is of critical importance for the survival of free Europe. But that is not a reason for anybody and everybody to be meddling in it or to be talking of it. Just the opposite. It is no business of the European Economic Community, nor of our Assembly, nor even of the Ten in cooperation; it is the business of the members of the military organization of the Atlantic Alliance.

I note, by the way, that the decision which brings us together here today was in fact taken many months ago, and at the time nothing was said. Now, however, there is a new element — the surprising initiative of the President-in-Office of the Council. An initiative all the more surprising in that, when he was in opposition, he had the strongest reservations as to the Community, and even stronger ones as to the cooperation of the Ten. But now, as President-in-Office, the same man who had harsh words for the Community and for this cooperation wants, wrongly, to use this cooperation for the ends of what he considers the right policy. There is something intolerable about that, an aura of misdirection of the European construction, and it is for this procedural reason that we have organized today's debate, that we are participating in it, and that we have signed the resolution which has been tabled to signify, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, that we denounce your attempt to misdirect Europe.

*(Applause from the right and centre)*

## de la Malène

As to the substance, my group is convinced of three things. The first is that an overall balance of forces must be achieved; the second, that the free-world alliance is a defensive one; and the third, that pacifism, as it is being served to us, is anything but the answer to the problem of peace.

First, the overall balance of forces. We all know that it is this balance which has maintained peace, such as it was, throughout the world nearly 40 years now. We also know that only a global equilibrium is likely in the future to, first, continue to preserve the peace, and — secondly — perhaps lead to disarmament, genuine disarmament, I mean.

We also know very well that a balance of conventional arms cannot be achieved in Europe, that that balance must be re-established by means of nuclear arms, and that the siting on the other side of the Iron Curtain of 400 SS-20 missiles has destroyed that equilibrium, which must now be urgently restored for the sake of maintaining peace.

We are, secondly, convinced that the alliance, our free world alliance, is an alliance for defence. This is not just two blocs sitting face-to-face. What we have is, on one side, an alliance of free democracies which mean to defend themselves, and — on the other — there is an aggressive bloc. One can join our alliance, and one can leave it, if one does not like it. On the other side, is the threatening bloc, there is no way of getting out. Just ask Poland what she thinks of the alliance in that bloc!

*(Applause from the right and centre)*

We are an alliance of free democracies and we only ask for one right, but that right we do demand: the right to our own defence and the right to our security.

The third thing we believe concerns pacifism. Pacifism as such, manipulated pacifism, and, lastly, one-way pacifism. For there are three aspects to pacifism. First, pacifism as such. Unfortunately, we know from past experience that pacifism means enslavement first, followed by war: not either serfdom or war, but *first serfdom then war*.

The pacifism we are witnessing now is manipulated pacifism. Yes, we all know that there is a variety of personalities, convictions and ideologies within the pacifist movements, but it is no accident that, at a time when the Soviet Union and its satellites are threatening us, all the USSR's tools throughout the world, the various peace movements, should be coming forward to organize large-scale pacifist demonstrations. This kind of pacifism is of no interest to us, it is manipulated pacifism.

Lastly, there is a third characteristic of this pacifism: it is a one-way business. We have seen no such movement on the other side. At a time when the SS-20s, which threaten us, were being installed on the other

side of the border not a single pacifist or Communist was seen marching through the streets of Rome, Bonn or Brussels.

*(Applause from the right and centre)*

Only now, when we want to defend ourselves, when we want to safeguard our own security against these arms which have been installed across the border, are these pacifist, or Communist, movements manifesting themselves everywhere in the West. This kind of pacifism, this manipulated, one-way pacifism, we cannot take seriously.

*(Applause from the right and centre)*

Mr President, I am coming to the end of my speech. Contrary to my custom, it has been an impassioned one. It's not my style. But I am so firmly convinced that our Europe, our free Europe, will, in the coming weeks and months, be facing such threats to its survival and its freedom that I could not help the emotion which you must have noticed. The French, thanks to General de Gaulle, find themselves in a rather special position in this matter. It is not one that entitles them to preach to anyone, nor do they intend to.

But, in ending, I should like to say how much I admire and how grateful I feel to those statesmen throughout Europe who are able to resist the pressures that are being exerted on them. On their shoulders rest the responsibility for our own and our children's freedom. For this, I should like solemnly to pay them homage.

*(Loud applause from the right and centre)*

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — *(GR)* I have listened very attentively to those who have spoken up till now, but I was particularly struck by something Mr de la Malène said concerning the President of the Council since at present that honour falls to me. Mr de la Malène said that I have distorted the meaning of political cooperation. But the case is exactly the opposite. It is the Member himself who has made the distortion. I made it clear at the outset that I am present here today and following this very interesting debate in the capacity of President of the Council of Ministers. And I always keep it in mind that when this debate is over, my obligation is to convey the views expressed to my colleagues in the Council.

I said at the beginning that on foreign policy matters it is the national parliaments which have competence, and this practice has been adhered to systematically in recent years.

*(Strenuous protests)*

To prove this, even though the facts speak for themselves, I need do no other than refer you to what previous Presidents of the Council of Ministers have said on the matter.

**Charalambopoulos**

In the past the presidency has repeatedly drawn the attention of the European Parliament to the need for adherence to certain principles which make for unobstructed provision of replies to honourable Members' questions. By way of demonstration I could point to the letter of 10 May 1976 from the then President-in-Office, Mr Thorn, to the President of the European Parliament, Mr Spenale, concerning the matter of questions, where it said that the operational guidelines of political cooperation generally preclude the giving of answers to questions touching on the national policy of one or more member countries. Moreover, a memorandum by the Irish Presidency, dated 13 November 1979, on the problems created by honourable Members' questions, states, after pointing out that many of the questions raised have to do with the national positions of Member States and could thus more fittingly be tabled in the national parliaments, that in conformity with the guidelines the presidency is obliged to declare that such questions are outside its competence. Mr President and honourable Members, I do not think there is any distortion on my part, nor, more generally, by the Presidency. This is clearly manifested not only by the documents I have mentioned, and which attest to the practice followed since as far back as 1976, but also by the recent solemn declaration on European Union adopted in Stuttgart in connection with which some countries reserved the right not to be bound in any way as regards the exercise of their foreign policies, a reservation which the other partners ratified.

Accordingly, as was its duty, the Presidency has conformed with the guidelines which govern political cooperation, and, if you remember, I said in my reply that the proposal of the Greek Foreign Minister was made in his national capacity and that only the procedural aspect of the matter has been discussed in the context of political cooperation, and not its substance. Furthermore, you are very well aware that the Member States have taken certain positions on the crucial issue under debate today, and that there is general anxiety amongst the peoples of Europe concerning the deployment of the Euro-missiles and the dangers inherent in arms escalation of this kind. This anxiety has expressed itself clearly and impressively in all the countries of Europe. Consequently, I think I did right in stating at the outset that I am present in this Chamber to listen to your views, which I shall convey to my Council colleagues, solely in the capacity of President of the Council of Ministers.

*(Protests)*

**Mr Bangemann (L).** — *(DE)* Mr President, may I ask you to reject this statement by the President-in-Office of the Council, pursuant to our Rules of Procedure.

*(Applause)*

It prejudices rights Parliament has already acquired. In the framework of European Political Cooperation,

this Parliament has discussed external policy questions on several occasions — and the President of the Council has joined in himself, as I remember.

*(Applause)*

I would ask you, Mr President, to reject it. It curtails the rights of Parliament. The President of the Council himself once answered a question, during Question Time, which the President did not want to allow, and on exactly this subject! He must admit that the European Parliament can not only debate such a question in the framework of European Political Cooperation but also has the right to hear the views of the President of the Council.

*(Loud applause)*

**President.** — Mr Bangemann, the Chair does not apply the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament just to suit the wishes of individual Members but in accordance with the provisions of the Rules themselves. Rule 66 (5) provides that 'Members of the Commission and Council shall be heard at their request'. The Council has a genuine right therefore to intervene in a debate whenever it wishes to do so.

The President-in-Office of the Council has just made use of this right. Such an intervention does not amount to any change in our agenda, and I must point out to you therefore that your request runs contrary to our Rules of Procedure. I shall therefore proceed with the agenda, as an intervention from the President-in-Office of the Council in no way affects the agenda decided on by Parliament.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mrs Hammerich (CDI).** — *(DA)* Mr President, in this threatening time any sign of detente and sensible attitudes are welcome, and such signs do exist. I have in mind the decision taken by the Danish Parliament against the weapons race in East and West and the deployment of the 572 missiles, and I find it appropriate to speak of this, especially after Mr Haagerup's speech which does not reflect the attitude of the Danish Parliament.

On 26 May the Danish Parliament decided to instruct the Danish government to tell NATO that the Western countries should prolong negotiations on the new missiles, and that no development or preparation for new missiles may take place while the negotiations continue. And on 3 November the Danish Parliament decided to urge the government to promptly initiate that the NATO countries make a new political assessment of the procedure before the commencement of the installation of the missiles. Unfortunately, it seems as if the installation commenced before the time-limit expired without an extraordinary NATO meeting being held, and without waiting for the ordinary December meeting.

**Hammerich**

This premature installation is a shockingly undemocratic action which goes against the wishes of the large majority. Because it is not correct when the Christian Democratic question claims that the people of Europe look upon the missiles as a necessary means of defence for the western world. On the contrary, most people are against the missiles, and presumably would have preferred sensible attitudes such as those prescribed in both decisions from the Danish Parliament. We also note with astonishment that the Christian Democratic question doubts that the EEC has the competence to debate a deferral of the deployment. The Christian Democrats never doubt the EEC's competence when it concerns rearmament, Dilligent's war-navy, Fergusson's weapons production, etc. It seems like the application of double morals. The attitude of the People's Movement is clear: we were and are against the EEC debating military subjects; partly it is unlawful and partly it does not further détente. We are not of the opinion that the European Parliament should debate military subjects, because what inevitably happens is that the majority will change sympathetic disarmament proposals to cold war proposals, which are not in the interest of the peoples. Détente and disarmament can be achieved by, amongst other things, peace movements working together across frontiers, and by the application of pressure on their respective parliaments and governments, in such a way as has happened in Denmark, for instance. The Danish parliamentary decision of 10 November instructs the government to work actively towards Denmark's remaining a nuclear-weapons-free zone through the establishment of a Nordic nuclear-weapons-free zone. Thus we know very well the Danish interests in this issue, and we know that they are identical with the wishes of the large majority of the peoples of Europe.

**Mr Hänsch (S).** — (DE) Mr President, on a point of order, I would like to put a question to the Foreign Minister. Mr Foreign Minister, or Mr President of the Council — whichever hat you think you are wearing — you said that foreign policy questions did not belong in this Parliament. Has it escaped your notice during your five months in office that the Foreign Ministers and the 10 Member States have undertaken to harmonize and coordinate their national foreign policies in the framework of EPC, that they have undertaken to hold a quarterly colloquy on European Political Cooperation with this Parliament's Political Affairs Committee and that they have undertaken to discuss all the questions which were considered in the framework of EPC at those colloquies?

(Loud applause)

**President.** — Mr Hänsch, you asked to be given the floor to speak on a point of order. This only confirms the fears I expressed earlier that the right to intervene

on a point of order is being abused in order to make contributions to the debate.

**Mrs Van den Heuvel (S).** — (NL) Mr President, it would perhaps be a good thing, in view of the present confusion in this debate, for it to be made very clear once again that the negotiations in Geneva on the deployment of intermediate-range missiles do not involve our Member States: they are negotiations between two superpowers. And they have all the features of negotiations between two superpowers. But although we are not sitting at the negotiating table, we are nevertheless the subject of the negotiations. The deployment of the new American nuclear missiles in Europe is a real threat to us citizens of Europe, and the massive demonstrations that have taken place in the capitals of Europe in the last few weeks are proof that our citizens are very well aware of this. Those who are not aware of this are people like Mr de la Malène and all those who have warmly supported him, and to my very great sorrow, I note that they include many people with the same religious convictions as all those demonstrators who have taken to the streets in the Netherlands, for example.

Personally, I — like my party, even when it was in power — have always opposed the NATO twin-track decision on the deployment of the new American nuclear missiles in response to the Soviet Union's deployment of SS-20s. It was, after all, a decision that tried to reconcile the irreconcilable, a decision of principle to deploy the missiles together with a decision to negotiate. And I must say — and I take no pleasure in doing so — that the absurdity of the decision was amply revealed by later developments. Initially, it was said that the twin-track decision was necessary to force the Soviet Union to make concessions and so to prevent deployment. Now it is said that the Soviet Union will be prepared to make concessions after deployment. The twin-track decision has major political implications. The differences between Europe and the United States have grown, partly as a result of what I consider to be irresponsible statements by the Reagan Administration on the possibility of a limited nuclear war. These statements have seriously alarmed the European public, as we are now all able to see.

But, Mr President, those who regret developments also have a duty, as politicians, to react to them. What else can we do? There is only one course left open to us: we must do everything in our power to prevent the battle for prestige being waged by the superpowers from leading to a further increase in the role played by nuclear weapons. There is still room for the Ten to take the initiative and call a stop to the present disastrous trend. If the Community countries together take initiatives to achieve a postponement of deployment and the merging of the INF and START negotiations, there is a chance that new life will be breathed into

**Van den Heuvel**

the process of détente, which seemed to be gaining fresh impetus through SALT. And that would serve two ends. On the one hand, it could help to slow down the nuclear arms race, on the other, it could reconcile Europe and the United States. To Members on this side of the House I would say that an effective answer could then be given to the deployment of SS-20s, which we Socialists regret and condemn and against which we protest just as you do.

*(Applause from the left)*

The deployment of the SS-20 has after all created problems for the Soviet Union too. The Soviet leaders are also beginning to realize that the deployment of these missiles will not bring them any military advantages, because they too must appreciate that a limited nuclear war is not possible. Perhaps my colleagues could listen to what I am saying rather than talking among themselves, Mr President. A politician sometimes finds that very useful.

Mr President, there is no magic formula for changing a world with 60 000 nuclear warheads into a world with no nuclear weapons. All we can do is negotiate. Negotiations must prevent the introduction of new systems and the reduction of existing nuclear arsenals, including the Soviet Union's. On behalf of my group I therefore make a final appeal to the governments of the Member States. It is five minutes to midnight, but it is not yet too late.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Klepsch (EPP).** — *(DE)* Mr President, honourable Members, today we the legitimate and elected representatives of 260 million citizens are discussing a vital issue of our times: our security! So we are naturally surprised to find the President-in-Office of the Council trying to give the impression that we, the elected representatives of those citizens, have nothing to contribute to this question.

*(Applause)*

We are all the more surprised because we all know that foreign policy cooperation, the common representation of our interests, is the key issue with which we will have to deal in future. That is why we cannot accept your statement, Mr President of the Council.

*(Applause)*

We are speaking here from within a secure and voluntary peaceful order, based on the common principles of a free constitutional democracy which neither threatens nor blackmails anyone with the use of force. We are living together in a peaceful community which has done away with century-old conflicts and stands as an island of peace in the world. We threaten no-one, and anyway, how could we threaten them? Perhaps because we are the beacon of a peaceful order, in a society guaranteeing dignity and peace, which serves as a model and a sign of hope for those

citizens of Europe who unfortunately do not have total freedom and dignity because of the Communist dictatorship imposed on them.

*(Applause)*

In the many generations of the history of the European Community, we have proved that we can create and preserve freedom. We, who believe in the same principles, assured our external freedom by resolving to form an alliance with the United States of North America, which has a peaceful democratic order like our own, and this gave us the certainty that we need bow to no blackmail or threats — blackmail Mr President, such as we saw during the Berlin blockade. We still remember that well.

*(Applause)*

But we also know what it has been like outside the borders of this European Community, where peace is guaranteed, during all this time, if we think of 17 June 1953, the uprising of the German workers, the Hungarian uprising, the repeated defeats of the Czechs and Poles. We are well aware what it is like for those who can be blackmailed and who are helpless in face of the use of force.

*(Applause)*

The alliance we have joined threatens no-one. It does not seek superiority, and our resolve to defend ourselves merely means we want to create a balance of forces and prevent the use of violence. Let us be honest: during the sunny days of détente — Mrs Focke rightly referred to Helsinki earlier on — in 1977 the Soviet Union began to deploy its land-based medium-range missiles and to threaten us, yes us! These missiles are aimed not at the towns of America but threaten the towns of the European Community, and we must protect ourselves against them.

*(Applause)*

Why was the NATO dual decision taken? In order to give the Soviet Union an opportunity to remove this threat against us, in order to ensure by negotiations with it that we need not build up our armaments in order to maintain the balance of forces. We decided this and undertook to do this jointly.

The protection of our peace was, and still is, based on three things. Firstly, the free, democratic constitutional system we have created, which precludes conflicts arising between us ever again. Secondly, the security we have through membership of the North Atlantic defence community and thirdly — and I put a great value on this — the common consensus to defend ourselves jointly against any threat facing the political forces in this European Community. It is precisely that consensus which seems under threat today. Our worst fear is that we might quarrel about the way to protect our vital interest, namely the guarantee of lasting peace and security.

**Klepsch**

I am sure that as before a large majority will be in favour of this consensus. From Kohl to Mitterand, from Mrs Thatcher to Mr Craxi and Mr Martens, to name but a few important personalities, the bond of common consensus, of refusal to yield to any threat or blackmail, holds firm.

*(Applause)*

We ask ourselves today in this House what can have distorted the clarity of view the German Social Democrats still had two years ago under Chancellor Helmut Schmidt and destroyed this consensus.

What we risk losing now is something I have always regarded as very precious, which explains why we are asking you why it is precisely the Social Democrats who have made an about-turn within the Socialist Group and are now calling for a security policy quite different from the one we have followed together so successfully for a generation.

*(Applause)*

During the vote tomorrow, when a convincing majority will be in favour of our consensus, we will therefore be sad to find — as the vote will show — that Mrs Focke's Social Democratic Group and Mr Denis' Communist Group no longer want to adhere to this consensus.

*(Applause)*

I also include Mr Chambeiron. Our objective is clear: we want to maintain a guaranteed peace, here in Europe, for us Europeans. Lech Walesa, the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, and Manès Sperber, winner of the German book trade's peace prize, have made it quite clear that we must not, will not and cannot give up Europe, because we are a beacon of peace in the world. Our aim remains to ensure by dogged negotiation that we maintain a balance between each side's ability to defend itself, and protect our peace and our freedom.

*(Interjection by Mr Fellermaier: Why not the Greeks?)*

**Mr Klepsch (EPP).** — *(DE)* Mr Fellermaier, all I can say to the Greek proposal to which you referred, and which has in any case been put in a very shaky form, as your colleagues themselves made clear, is that NATO has given the Soviet Union too long a deadline already, with which the latter did not comply. Not a single SS-20 missile has been withdrawn, instead more and more are being deployed against us; and what are we being threatened with now?

The deployment against us of more and even more sinister weapons. What a strange way to show love of peace! We can only shake our heads in surprise that anyone should want to build on those foundations. That is why we can only negotiate on a basis which

will enable us to defend ourselves and maintain the balance. We Europeans will, as I hope, remain fully committed to maintaining freedom.

*(Sustained loud applause)*

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — *(GR)* Mr President, a brief reply to something said by Mr Klepsch. I am certain that what I said has been misunderstood or misinterpreted. I have never denied that Members of the European Parliament are entitled to debate general foreign policy matters. What is more, that is what my presence here today is all about, and also my obligation to answer questions for an hour and a half this afternoon. What I did say, and I reiterate it now, is that this Chamber cannot be used as a forum for criticizing or debating the national policy of one Member State.

*(Strenuous protests)*

Of one Member State, I said. Hence, I am here now to listen to the Members' views, and this afternoon I shall reply to their questions, as provided for, on purely Community matters. After this clarification I do not think Mr Klepsch will disagree that what I have said is both objective and in accordance with the guidelines on political cooperation.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Rule 42 (3) of our Rules of Procedure provides that 'questions may be put to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation under the same conditions as laid down in this Rule for questions to the Council'. It is with a question of this kind that we are now dealing. I think that that is quite clear.

**Mrs Focke (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, as Members we have a right to know with whom we are dealing on the Council bench. We are told that Mr Charalambopoulos is listening to us in his capacity as President of the Council. I am not sure in what capacity he is speaking.

*(Applause)*

On a point of order, I would like to know whether he was speaking personally as Greek Foreign Minister or on behalf of all the Foreign Ministers of the European Community when he stated that foreign policy is a purely national affair, whether he was therefore speaking on behalf of all the Foreign Ministers when he rejected the Stuttgart declaration that European Political Cooperation must be strengthened and developed by the formulation and establishment of common positions and a common approach on the basis of closer consultation in the field of foreign policy, including the coordination of Member States' positions on the political and economic aspects of security.

*(Applause)*



**President.** — Mrs Focke, I must ask you at least to give the President-in-Office of the Council a chance to hear the translation of what the President is saying. The Chair, as in duty bound, gave the floor to the President-in-Office of the Council, who, given the place in which he is sitting, can ask for the floor only in his capacity as Council President. I assume that the President-in-Office would have no interest in taking part in this debate if he could not speak in his capacity as Council President.

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs.** — (GR) Mr President, as I said at the beginning I am taking part in this debate solely in the capacity of President of the Council. This is very clear, but because, during the debate, some Members have raised certain matters I have been obliged to reply in the context of political cooperation, with strict adherence to its guidelines and as President of the Council. That is to say, my interventions are made in the context of my duties as President of the Council of Ministers.

**Lady Elles (ED).** — Mr Charalambopoulos will know that all democratic institutions respect the person who comes to address them. As a human being, of course, I, with my colleagues, fully respect Mr Charalambopoulos. However, he will be aware that he has not fulfilled the role of Foreign Minister acting in political cooperation, because, regrettably, according to his explanation, he has not read anything about it since 1979. Now I would like to inform the Foreign Minister acting in political cooperation, to whom indeed the two questions were addressed — and therefore Mr Charalambopoulos comes in that capacity, whatever he says — that this House has adopted reports — including, I may say, one in my own name and I would be very happy to send him a copy — and that the major resolution was incorporated in the London report of October 1981 agreed by all the Member States of the European Community, not with guidelines, but with rules laid down for the pursuance of European political cooperation, including the discussion of security matters within EPC. That is clear.

I therefore have six questions to put to the Foreign Minister acting in political cooperation, and I would be grateful if he would reply. First, has he read or been aware of the London report? Secondly, what is happening this year to the United Nations where, daily, in the mission which has responsibility for presiding over the Foreign Ministers acting in political cooperation, every representative at every committee meeting in the United Nations discusses General Assembly resolutions? What is happening to that? Are we not having a common position — for the first time in at least eight years — on resolutions coming

before the United Nations at a time which is critical for Europe and for the world as a whole? What indeed does the Foreign Minister do during the half-hour of Question Time following the questions put to him as President-in-Office of the Council? Could he kindly tell us on whose behalf he is replying when he replies as Foreign Minister acting on behalf of the other Foreign Ministers acting in political cooperation? Is it Greek national policy? We are not the Athens Parliament. We are the European Community Parliament. We want European answers to European questions.

(Applause)

Further, what happens to all those resolutions — admittedly, perhaps too many — which the President of our Parliament is requested and urged to transmit to the Foreign Ministers acting in political cooperation? Do they end up in the waste paper basket of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Athens or do they get a proper answer? And further, are the political directors of the other nine Member States on holiday?

Finally, Mr Foreign Minister acting on behalf of the other foreign ministers in political cooperation, is this Community to be without any foreign policy whatsoever for the next six weeks until your country stops holding the Presidency or do we have to wait for the new President-in-Office to come in on 1 January? Does foreign policy cease because you refuse to act, as you have the duty to act, as a foreign minister acting in political cooperation on behalf of the whole Community in matters of foreign affairs — including of course, security?

These are questions to which this House is entitled to an answer. He may not be able to give them immediately, but I demand categorical answers to all those questions. Indeed, I think it is my duty to ask the Vice-President of Parliament to pass the summary of this debate to the President of Parliament and to inform all the Foreign Ministers acting in political cooperation of the attitude that has been taken by the Greek presidency today in this House. It is a shameful condition of the constitution which we have been building up for the benefit of the Community and the benefit of its citizens.

(Applause)

I had hoped to say a few words about the question of the missiles. All I will say now is that, regarding the proposal of the Greek Foreign Minister, whether acting in a national or European capacity, he has put the wrong question to the wrong people at the wrong time. Let the Greek Government ask the Soviet Union if it will negotiate meaningfully now. That is the question that should be put, whatever hat the Foreign Minister chooses to sit under!

(Applause)

## IN THE CHAIR : MR KLEPSCH

*Vice-President*

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs.** — (GR) Mr President, I am not annoyed, simply saddened by the distortion of certain facts, and I would not have expected certain colleagues to put another connotation on what we know as European political cooperation.

I stated at the outset that as the President of the Council of Ministers my answers would be on behalf of the Council of Ministers and I sincerely regret the way in which Lady Elles has raised these matters. As has been said many times, and as you are all aware, political cooperation does not mean common foreign policy. This should be understood by everyone once and for all. In the context of political cooperation there is consultation, discussion and exchange of view, and wherever possible the Ten agree on a common position. When they do not agree there is no common position. That is the meaning and the content of political cooperation.

With this reply I accommodate all Lady Elles' questions, and I repeat that I am here today to honour the European Parliament and to listen to all the views expressed so that I can inform my colleagues in the Council of Ministers of what is said in this House.

**Mr Wurtz (COM).** — (FR) Mr President, at this moment we are being told that new nuclear missiles are about to be installed on European soil, with all the threats that such an eventuality implies for the future of our continent and of peace in the world.

It is a situation which lays upon each of us a grave responsibility before our respective peoples and before history. The present debate is therefore not only more than justified, but overdue! The Communist and allied members are glad that our Assembly should be given the opportunity to discuss how peace and détente can be preserved on our continent, instead of debating, Mr Haagerup, how to increase its armaments. This is an entirely different matter. This is a realistic and wise move, consonant with what our peoples have the right to expect of Europe.

At the same time, the fact that we are holding this debate is in itself a reflection of the scope and strength of a movement which, transcending divisions of political conviction or religious belief, differences of perception and national frontiers, has grown unceasingly throughout these months and has registered a new and impressive growth following the United Nations appeal.

Today, the voice of the peoples on this issue can be heard in this House. It is a fact that will not escape the notice of observers and it is the reason for the frustrated reactions of certain inveterate protagonists of escalation. Isn't that so, Mr de la Malène? Isn't that true, Mr Klepsch?

At this critical period we believe, as we have always done, that the right attitude is the one which refuses to let the fate of Europe be decided either by the United States or the Soviet Union. The current stalemate in the Geneva negotiations demonstrates the dangers of such a situation. This is why the French Communist Party has put forward the idea that all European countries should be associated with the negotiations.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in these circumstances the Greek proposal to extend the Geneva negotiations by another six months is, in our opinion, a counsel of reason which we approve and support. This proposal takes account as much of the imminent danger of the siting of new missiles, of the anxiety expressed by international public opinion, as of the positive contribution that European countries can make to the cause of détente and of disarmament.

The proposal has the great merit of offering a chance of averting the irreparable, by putting negotiation before any arms installation. Let all the forces for peace in this Assembly unite to respond, over and above our differences and occasional conflicts, to the joint call from all over Europe from millions of feeling men and women, Communists, Socialists, Christian Social Democrats, ecologists and from all those young people who have never known war and do not want to know it! That is what we most fervently hope for.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Bangemann (L)** — (DE) Mr President, may I once again refer the President of the Council to the document that he too has signed, the Stuttgart declaration. Paragraph 223 of that document states: '... to advance towards a Europe that will speak with one voice and take common action in the field of foreign policy'. That is the common foreign policy we are calling for. And paragraph 232, which the President-in-Office of the Council has also signed, states: 'The European Parliament shall discuss all the questions of European Union, including European Political Cooperation'.

You made your proposal not in Greece but before the assembled Foreign Ministers meeting in the framework of EPC, and that is that we want to discuss here!

*(Applause)*

Even if you had not done so, I could still refer you to paragraph 233 of the Stuttgart declaration:

'Resolutions on questions of great importance and having general implications, on which Parliament requests explanations from the Council, shall be considered in the European Parliament.' Surely you will not dispute the fact that this resolution has wide implications.

**Bangemann**

If we had accepted your proposal, if the Foreign Ministers had agreed to your proposal, if the negotiations had been extended for a further six months after an unsuccessful conclusion of the Geneva negotiations, then you would have done the most dangerous thing one can do faced with a dictatorship: you would have been giving in to these people. You would have given the impression that provided sufficient pressure is exerted...

*(Applause)*

all peace-loving peoples will be prepared to back down. I am addressing these words to Mr Wurtz too. He said that we Liberals, Christian Democrats and Conservatives wanted to build up our armaments. We do not want to build up our armaments. It would have been all right with us if the 'zero option' proposal for no medium-range missiles in Europe, which came from us, which was a proposal from the West, had been accepted by the Soviet Union. Then we would not have had any missiles now. Then we would not have needed any missiles in our countries, nor would there have been any missiles on the other side.

We should not confuse the issue. For is it not altogether quixotic that the people here in the West who have been waiting four years for the Soviet Union to give in have had to watch new SS 20 missiles being produced and deployed week after week for four years? In the six month extension for which you call, new SS 20 missiles would again be produced and deployed week after week. That is the reality of dictatorships. There are no two ways about it!

*(Applause)*

Mr President-in-Office of the Council, we must not close our eyes to the reality of that kind of dictatorship, as some Members of the European Parliament unfortunately did in Berlin. A dictatorship of that kind cannot be fought by showing forbearance or closing our eyes, but only by having the courage to defend our own freedoms resolutely. That is the issue, not weapons! We are prepared to disarm. But if the Soviet Union is not prepared to do so, we must let it know that we are prepared and resolved to defend our freedom. That is our political aim.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I have received five motions for resolutions with request for an early vote to wind up the debate on the oral questions.

— by Mr Barbi and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), Sir Henry Plumb and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Bangemann and Mr Haagerup on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats (Doc. 1-1014/83/corr.);

— by Mrs Focke and others on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-1030/83);

— by Mr Jaquet and others (Doc. 1-1034/83);

— by Mr Fanti and others (Doc. 1-1035/83);

— by Mr Boyes and others (Doc. 1-1045/83).

I should like to propose to the House that the vote on the request for an early vote be taken today at the end of the debate. The vote itself would then be taken tomorrow afternoon at the beginning of the voting time, i.e. at 4.30 p.m.

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs.** — (GR) A very brief comment on what Mr Bangemann has said. He mentioned the solemn declaration adopted in Stuttgart but omitted something very important, namely that certain countries reserved their positions with statements which were annexed to the text of the declaration and signed by the Heads of Government and Foreign Ministers of the Member States. In one such statement referring to foreign policy one of the Member States stresses clearly and categorically that in no circumstance will it be bound by the solemn declaration in the exercise of its foreign policy.

**President.** — I think it is pointless to keep going over the same ground. The President-in-Office of the Council has made his position quite clear.

**Mr Gendebien (CDI).** — (FR) Mr President, I wish the Right would stop harrassing the President of the Council, because I have a feeling that it has to do with the fact that he happens to be a Socialist and a Greek.

*(Applause)*

I also wish we could get back to the debate, even if I don't share all the views of the President of the Council.

As far as I am concerned, ladies and gentlemen, I am neither a pacifist, nor a militarist, nor a demagogue. And I am not hysterical. I am for peace, for freedom and for a free Europe.

And this is why I signed the resolution of the French Socialists, because their attitude is, if not the best, at least the least bad. It represents common sense, wisdom, firmness and moderation. It calls for peace, disarmament and continued negotiations to establish balance at the lowest possible level, as President Mitterrand put it so clearly during his visit to Belgium.

So, while deploring the demagogy on both sides, I have subscribed to this position. Not that it isn't obvious that all those thousands of millions, of francs, dollars or roubles spent on the arms could be better used to feed the human race.

We also think that it is rather hypocritical to talk only of nuclear missiles and to ignore conventional arms, or chemical weapons, for instance.

## Gendebien

All in all, I think you will all agree that this debate is humiliating: it is about negotiations in which the Europeans have no part. We do not hold the key to our own security. The name for such a situation is dependence, and it is accepted by many, both on Right and Left, but it is an illusion to believe that military dependence does not entail political and economic dependence.

To end now, Mr President, I must say again: to safeguard the identity, independence and freedom of our peoples we must urgently make substantial progress in the matter of political cooperation as well as in creating an instrument of European collective security that the Europeans themselves can control.

**Mr De Goede (NI).** — *(NL)* Mr President, I have only a few minutes and therefore no time for emotions. I will confine myself to three factual comments. This debate is really about these three aspects.

Firstly, we must ask ourselves whether it should be possible for problems connected with disarmament and European security to be discussed within the framework of EPC and therefore in this Parliament. We believe this should be possible. We have long felt that it must be possible for aspects of European security to be discussed within the framework of political cooperation in view of the special nature of European security interests. It also seems to me there is no disputing that the INF negotiations concern European security interests very specifically. Of course, the negotiating position in Geneva at the moment is primarily a matter for the superpowers. But NATO also has a say. Influence might be exerted during the preliminary European consultations in the context of EPC. A joint European contribution would, contrary to what is claimed in this Parliament, benefit the Atlantic Alliance since it would force the United States to pay greater attention to these specifically European interests.

Secondly, there is, of course, some doubt about the way in which the Greek Presidency put forward its proposals. We are not happy about this. But this does not alter the fact that the contents of these proposals are important.

Thirdly, we attach considerable importance to the negotiations in Geneva, and we believe that there are still prospects for achieving a reduction in intermediate-range weapons in Eastern and Western Europe through these negotiations. These prospects must not be jeopardized by pressure of time. We therefore call for a six-month postponement of deployment in Western Europe provided that the Soviet Union is prepared to begin dismantling SS 20 missiles in return.

The negotiating parties must take advantage of this postponement to give careful consideration to the

proposals the two sides put forward. The West must also show that it is prepared at any moment to include the French and British nuclear weapons in INF, in START or in a combination of these two fora, thus removing a major obstacle to agreement in Geneva.

**Mr Plaskovitis (S).** — *(GR)* Mr President, the initiating questions and the ensuing resolutions at the end of the debate on them illustrate the great concern felt by the European Parliament over the catastrophic implications for détente and peace wrought by the increase of nuclear weapons in Europe. This concern tallies with the sentiment of our peoples as a whole, with their anger and dissent at the goings on and the schemes hatched behind their backs in the closed circles of the technocrats and the offices of the high-ranking military advisers of our present day leaders.

It matters little, Mr President, that one side of the House sees the problem in one way and the other side in another way, Ineluctably, tragically, the problem resides in all our consciences. Where are we heading, where shall we end up after turning Europe into a forest of nuclear missiles? Who can assure us that after deploying Pershing and Cruise now, ostensibly to restore the balance of forces as some are maintaining, we shall not have to add new and different missiles to balance off some new devilish invention, some new additional counter weapon deployed by the other side? And then what, where will it end, this giddy spiral, this insanity, this road to ruin? Who can speak of balance when it is a known fact that each super power is capable of blowing the planet to bits with only one-tenth of its nuclear stockpile, when no one, except in jest, can venture to suppose that a local nuclear war would not develop automatically into a worldwide nuclear conflict? It was thoughts like these, this depth of anxiety, which motivated Greece, small country that it is, to propose that the Geneva negotiations be continued for a period of six months and that deployment of the new missiles be postponed in a last ditch attempt to avert a new situation. It is manifestly obvious from the nature of the proposal that it addresses a plea to both sides to show good faith and a spirit of compromise, and, in my opinion, it springs from the conviction that ultimately a solution will be found in no other way. I am glad to see that the resolution of the Socialist group effectively concurs with this proposal, albeit with a different formulation, though initially it met with such strange and inexplicable opposition from various quarters.

The fact is that world opinion sees the proposal for postponement of the deployment of the new missiles in Europe, and for continuation of the super power negotiations as a last hope. Whoever reads the relevant letter sent by the Greek Foreign Minister to his colleagues from the other nine countries on 13 August will see that it took the form of a suggestion

## Plaskovitis

that the matter be discussed in the context of political cooperation. In my view, the letter and the publicity given to it were for no other purpose than to provide the ministers of the Ten with a powerful incentive for thinking about and deciding on an urgent debate. And the people were with them as regards such an initiative. It creates a sad impression in me to see my Greek colleagues in the New Democracy party endeavouring yet again to introduce their oppositional fervour into the European Parliament when they have every opportunity to give vent to this in the Greek Parliament, and likewise to see them striving in this way to bring the socialist government of their country to heel with the help and support of Members who have no connection with Greek political affairs. Of course the New Democracy people are entitled to express their view as to whether or not the Greek Government's proposal was right and proper, and as to whether or not it would be likely to forestall a further escalation of tension between the two super powers. However, it is inadmissible for them to put down oral questions with the transparent intent of putting their country and its government in the dock for pursuing a foreign policy opposite to their own, and to try to embarrass their country's government by casting its intentions in a bad light. Mr President, let them finally learn that when criticizing Greeks they should address themselves to Greeks.

It is essential, in my view, that there should be understanding of the spirit which motivated the Greek initiative for the defence of peace and the prevention of catastrophe on this planet.

(Applause)

**Mr Mommersteeg (PPE).** — (NL) Mr President, I fully endorse the resolution on the deployment of Cruise missiles because I completely agree with the main points it raises. I will confine myself to two of these points.

Pacifism and appeasement, it is said, are not the solution to the problem of European security. Quite the contrary. I insist on adding that neutralism is not the solution either, because neutralism — and I can detect signs of it here too — is emerging in various forms here and there, in my country, for example, and in the Federal Republic of Germany. In this connection, the tendency to lump the two superpowers together and call for 'equidistance' must be firmly rejected. Despite all the differences of interests — and there are genuine differences — despite all the criticism that may be levelled at American policy — and that must be done — the link with the United States, interdependence is still vitally important for Western Europe's security and for its economic development. This interdependence and in particular the values we have in common mean that there can also be a genuine dialogue and influence can be exerted, in the special consultative group that has been set up to monitor the negotiations in Geneva, for example.

This influence will be all the more effective if we in Western Europe are of one mind, and this debate unfortunately makes it only too clear that this solidarity is lacking. An independent security concept must, of course, be developed, but it cannot be seen in isolation from the Atlantic context. The contrast between pure Europeans and pure Atlanticists is outdated.

Mr President, what would happen if governments and parliamentary majorities in the countries concerned, and this primarily means the Federal Republic at present, recoiled from the consequences of a decision taken in the past within the Atlantic Alliance, while the Soviet Government remained adamant about retaining the nuclear advantage that threatens Western Europe, as it has done so far? Postponement? Of what?

Mr President, that is a question which must be answered, by Mrs Van den Heuvel and others. Even leaving aside the original arguments underlying the twin-track decision, the dual nature of the twin-track decision, my answer is that it would be politically disastrous. Internally — in Europe and internationally — it would have a destabilizing effect. Relations within the Alliance would approach breaking point if the mutual political confidence that is needed was unsettled. The Soviet Union would come close to achieving a major objective, alienation of Europe from the United States and, internally, European discord. It would also acquire a virtual right of veto, a *droit de regard*.

Mr President, European influence on American policy — the initiative for a closed-door policy came from Europe after all — would be drastically reduced. Every American Government would feel free to act as it saw fit towards partners whose political credibility had been sullied. And what would the effect be on the Franco-German relationship, the cornerstone of European integration? To ask the question — and I take no pleasure in doing so — is to wrench open a door behind which lurks distrust that has apparently not yet been completely overcome. And what effect would this recoiling have on efforts to achieve arms control, on arms control negotiations, if one of the parties could take without giving? Again the answer is that it would have a disastrous, destructive effect on future arms control negotiations.

**Mr Møller.** — (DA) Mr President, I shall follow Mr Gendebien's advice about not harassing the President-in-Office. I am only doing it out of pity; he will have a hard day today. He will have a difficult day, and soon his term as President-in-Office shall come to an end. Then we can say good-bye to him. Some day we may meet him again as an ordinary Member of this House, as he was previously.

Møller

But at any rate it seems to me that this discussion really belongs in a NATO- context and not here in the European Parliament. It seems to me that the left wing has failed by insisting on having this debate today. I also find it strange to see this about-face which many European social democrats have shown. Is this due to the fact that one is about to have one's aim fulfilled? Is it due to the fact that the Soviet Union has started to scrap its SS 20s? Is it due to the fact that negotiation results are reported every day, giving good news. No, that is not the case. It is not due to the fact that the end is in sight. Therefore I would like to say to those who insist that all we need is a six month prolongation for further negotiations: what then, when these six months have expired? Will those ladies and gentlemen who plead for these six months then accept that we get the Pershing missiles? I am convinced that a further reprieve will be asked for for one reason or another.

Doesn't anyone realize that what one is actually doing is to weaken the negotiating position day by day of that super-power which is our NATO ally? The USA is weakened every time, we, by a demonstration or by other means, reveal our disagreement and unrest in Europe with regard to that decision which was taken in 1979, the so-called twin-track decision: If a negotiation result could not be achieved within five or six years, then we were to have these Pershing missiles. Every time doubt is created about whether or not the western world is in agreement about this, then it is a trick which the Soviet Union can take, put in its pocket, and use at the negotiations. How come that all those demonstrations which take place in Europe, and which undoubtedly are idealistically motivated, cannot take place in the Soviet Union, which already has deployed her rockets? Everyone knows the answer, it is very simple: it can't be done, because it is prohibited in the Soviet Union. In our freedom to demonstrate one finds genuine freedom.

Let us not create doubt as to the attitude of the West. Let us create no doubt as to the fact that we stand firm on that twin-track decision which was taken in 1979, and which was agreed upon by all the NATO countries. Let us not — despite what the President-in-Office says; that is his own affair — create any doubt, because that doubt can only benefit the other side. We too want peace, but we want both peace and freedom. We want to safeguard our freedom, and that can only happen if our weapons for deterrence are sufficiently forceful to constitute a deterrent against those who will use the SS 20s already deployed.

IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN

*Vice-President*

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) Mr President, along with the attack on detente and disarmament a coordi-

nated attack is being waged here today against the government of my country. An attack which we cannot fail to link with other events such as destabilization attempts in Greece and the declaration just now of an independent Turkish Cypriot state. The saddest thing of all is that the New Democracy party is playing an active part in this attack as once again it places the interests of the powerful European countries and the United States above peace and aligns itself with that group in the European Parliament which a few days ago invited here the leader of the Turkish Cypriot state, Mr Denktash. Of course, I do not think that in taking this initiative the Greek Government is in any way out on a limb, bearing in mind the Palme and Brandt initiatives and the wish of all the European peoples. Whereas the opposing views represent no one, and it is not by chance that you have tried to move the debate into the context of political cooperation. As for what Lady Elles said about this debate smacking more of the Greek Parliament than the European Parliament, I fear that the views supported by her faction and the Christian Democrats make this assembly seem more like an American parliament.

I also want to mention the French and British missiles which are the cause of the deadlock in the Geneva negotiations. Are these not missiles? What will the missiles of Mrs Thatcher and Mr Mitterand shower upon us? Confetti, tulips, carnations? Why do you not ask for them to be included in the negotiations so that a way can be found of breaking the deadlock? The non-deployment of Pershing and Cruise, the counting in of the French and British missiles, achievement of balance on the basis of equal security, these are the three principles which will lead to a solution in the disarmament talks.

**Mr Vandemeulebroucke (CDI).** — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I find it regrettable that only a few months after the solemn declaration in Stuttgart the Council should feel it must practise self-denial by stating that security policy and the missile question are not subjects for discussion within the framework of political cooperation.

There are enough nuclear weapons in the world today to destroy it eighteen times over. How much further must this overkill be increased? Is it not therefore understandable that we are doing everything possible to bring this hellish spiral to a halt? There is absolutely no evidence that growing numbers of weapons increase the likelihood of a successful outcome to negotiations and so make for greater security.

We all know that new nuclear weapons in Western Europe will lead to new weapons behind the Iron Curtain and that Europe is in danger of digging its own grave by continuing to take risks in this way. The idea that a limited nuclear war in Europe is strategically possible is gaining increasing currency. We must

## Vandemeulebroucke

therefore seize every opportunity to take a small step towards stopping the arms build-up. Resolute rejection of the deployment of nuclear missiles in Western Europe does not mean taking a unilateral step towards disarmament. We would in fact be taking a small step towards preventing a further arms build-up, giving the Soviet Union a clear sign and hoping that a reduction in its nuclear arsenal will follow.

Why is the Community not making a clear move towards establishing a positive peace policy? Peace is, after all, not simply the absence of war: it also means the elimination of all forms of violence. The European peace policy is not a fight against hunger in the world, a fight against the violation of human rights. The European peace policy is the development of a new triptych: peace through disarmament, peace through development, peace through justice and self-administration. This broad vision is surely one of the unique tasks that Europe can perform.

**Mrs Spaak (NI).** — *(FR)* I think out of respect for the Greek Presidency it would be unpolitic to extend the debate in hand to a discussion of political cooperation.

I should also like to stress emphatically that the defence of peace is not the sole prerogative of any one political group. We must never forget that the division of Europe is the result of Soviet will alone. A will that found armed expression in Prague, Budapest and Berlin and is exerting such unrelenting and cruel pressure on Warsaw today.

When we remember that Moscow still refuses to recognize the European Communities because she considers them a divisive factor in Europe, we can be sure that the Soviet Union has not given up its determination to dominate.

To be credible, dissuasion — which is indispensable — must be a combination of political will to resist pressure and of military capability to dissuade the adversary from being the first to undertake the risk of war.

It is in this military and political context that one must view the Soviet decision to deploy the SS-20 missiles. In military terms, it poses a new heavy threat — exclusively to Europe. Politically, it is calculated to awe Europe and to create a split between the Europeans and the Americans.

The Russians knew very well that their calculated move would provoke a reaction. The scale of this move made such a reaction inevitable, for failure to react could only mean, first, that Europe was giving up and, second, that the United States was giving up Europe.

Within Europe itself, the increased threat to the FRG could only result, in the absence of a reaction, in the outcome that the whole of European policy since 1945 has sought to avert: that country's neutralism or re-armament.

The siting of the SS-20s, which did not stop during the Geneva negotiations, thus poses a fundamental political issue — much more political than military, contrary to what we are being told. Of course, the proponents of unilateral disarmament hope that by their good example they will arouse benign sentiments on the other side. But we are all, in this House, political men and women. And politics teaches us that it is a mistake to count on the adversary's kind feelings. He will exploit our weaknesses and act on them.

There is more substance in the argument which points to the cost of unleashing an inevitable armaments race. This must be avoided. However it is viewed, it is a scandalous thing. We need therefore to pursue, steadily and in parallel, policies which lead to credible and balanced control of armaments and which avert the unacceptable dilemma: either renunciation or the arms race.

The main negotiations are being held in the absence of the Europeans. This is largely their own fault. Budgetary considerations have always induced the European states to opt for the American systems in preference to joint ones. In this sphere, as in so many others, Europe will have one day to match its deeds to its words. You cannot want security and refuse to shoulder its consequences all at the same time.

There is another point: the Europeans today are not prepared to state what they would regard as an acceptable solution. This is very different from the situation of some years ago, when under the inspiration of statesmen like Helmut Schmidt, President Giscard d'Estaing or James Callaghan, a consensus existed on this issue in Europe.

Our course should therefore be guided by three considerations: first, the negotiations must continue; secondly, the cause of peace will not be served by an uncommitted Europe; and, thirdly, Europe should assert itself by refuting the Soviet threat and by demanding from its American partner recognition of its own identity.

I should like to finish, very quickly, Mr President, with a quotation. In 1966 my father, who had been Secretary-General of NATO and one of the instigators of the European concept, wrote: 'In these last twenty years many Western statesmen have been called 'the Fathers of Europe' or 'the Fathers of the Atlantic Alliance'. None deserves the honour. It belongs to Stalin. Without Stalin, without his aggressive policies, without the threat he posed to the free world, the Atlantic Alliance would never have seen the light of day and the movement for a united Europe, embracing Germany, would never have become the astounding success that it is. In both cases, it was the instinct of self-defence which provided the basis for these great achievements.'

Spaak

Mr President, what was true then is even more true today.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Jaquet (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, it is obvious that on the occasion of this debate we should in fact be examining the whole problem of the Geneva negotiations and their implications. There is anxiety throughout the world and all the peoples live in fear of war.

Not that we have given up the idea of constructing peace. But it is not enough to vociferously abhor war, in order to have peace. The conditions for peace must also be created.

The way to peace is through the establishment of a system of collective security at world level which will ultimately make the present military blocs redundant.

This collective security, evidently, presupposes agreement on a number of basic principles: renunciation of the use of force, the right of the peoples to self-determination, and in the last account, gradual controlled disarmament.

When these principles have been asserted, or rather reaffirmed, how is the aim to be achieved?

It is on this point that the French Socialists differ from the majority of their group, and so it is on this point that I should like to ask for your attention for a few moments.

Obviously, the objective of peace which I have just defined can only be attained through negotiation which can lead us, stage by stage, to lasting détente.

But I am firmly convinced that, at each stage of this negotiation, success and progress to the next stage can only be achieved through genuine balance of forces.

This is a general principle, applicable in every case, in every negotiation and with every partner.

If we apply this principle to the Geneva Euromissile negotiations, I think we can all agree that an imbalance exists, because the SS 20s are already deployed, which is not the case for the Pershings.

May I at this point refer to the problem of the French and British nuclear forces?

The Soviet leadership has repeatedly demanded that these two forces be counted in the negotiations. I shall limit myself to the French force, as I do not know enough about the British.

The French nuclear force does not consist of Euromissiles. With the possible exception of the 18 devices sited on the Plateau d'Albion which, at a stretch, could be compared to the SS 20s — but let me point out that there are 240 of the latter and that they have three warheads each — the rest, that is the bulk, of the French force consists of submarine-based missiles, comparable to those of the USSR or the USA. The French nuclear force is, in fact, a strategic deterrent

force, comparable in nature to the American or Soviet strategic forces, though, of course, much smaller.

We must therefore be clear what the negotiations are about. For the time being the Geneva negotiations are only concerned with Euromissiles. So it is only of these that we can talk here.

We had hoped fervently that an agreement could be reached. But many, long months later, the two sides seem to be talking at cross purposes. If, as I understand, it is the imbalance in Euromissiles which has led to this stalemate, how can anyone imagine — given that the imbalance is still there — that an agreement can be reached late or soon? In these circumstances, the moratorium proposed by our Greek friends would in no way increase the chances of success in the negotiations. But we do not despair. We should like to hope that, in a new situation, when the partners negotiate from a more equal footing, the talks can resume in a better atmosphere.

In Geneva, then, the Euromissile negotiations must unrelentingly continue, so that agreement can be reached on the lowest level possible.

In the START negotiations we must also try to achieve a substantial reduction of strategic nuclear devices. At the level of conventional arms there must also be negotiations for a reduction of forces. Negotiations must continue, or be initiated in every sphere with a determination to succeed, with the resolute will to create at last, after all the vicissitudes, a world at peace. That is the purport of the resolution tabled by my French Socialist friends and myself.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Habsburg (EPP).** — *(DE)* Mr President, to achieve a policy of peace and security is the most important task of the states and political communities. Such a policy must be planned and pursued in realistic terms. History has taught us that peace can never be secured by faith-healing, manifestos, marches, demonstrations or the constant repetition of magic formulas but only if those who want peace are strong enough to prevent the warmongers from daring to attack them. Our people have realised that, which is why they have constantly committed themselves to the military solidarity of the free. Mrs Focke spoke of a majority view emerging from the peace demonstrations and alleged opinion surveys. She forgets that on 6 March this year a large majority of the German nation elected those candidates who had declared themselves unreservedly in favour of implementing the NATO decision.

*(Applause)*

Our citizens are much more intelligent than those people who clearly do not want to learn from the experiences of the years before the Second World War. No-one in this House does not want peace. But there are realists and there are those who believe in illu-



**Habsburg**

sions. The latter are blindly following the road to disaster, for we will only preserve freedom if we are prepared to defend it. Once that has been made clear, the Soviets will be prepared to negotiate just as Hitler would never have dared to invade Austria or Poland if the West had had the courage to face him resolutely in 1936.

*(Applause)*

Without the appeasement policy, which the self-appointed apostles of peace remind us of today, millions of people would still be alive and more than a hundred million Europeans would still be enjoying freedom today. We do not want to relive what we lived through from 1939 to 1945. That is why we want the NATO dual decision to be implemented clearly and at the right time, and that is why we say yes to the joint resolution tabled by the four groups.

*(Applause)*

**Mr de Courcy Ling (ED).** — Mr President, Europe is one vital link in the chain of international security. We have spoken of the United States, let us not be too Atlantically orientated nor too Eurocentric. Let us remember that 117 SS 20 missiles are also targeted on China and Japan. Let us remember that the security of Europe is extremely important to the security of Asia.

Secondly, I would like to say to Mrs Focke, whose speech I listened to as always with rapt attention, that whereas 70 % of German Federal Republic opinion may be opposed to the deployment of Cruise and Pershing missiles in northwestern Europe, I can assure her that 100 % of British public opinion dislikes the deployment of landbased, intermediate nuclear missiles. We dislike it, but we accept it as necessary. To do what is right is not always easy. Certain countries in Europe have found that out repeatedly in their history.

This is not a situation in which politicians should encourage public opinion to pursue illusions, and I should particularly like to say how much I regret the remarks on Sunday of Mgr Bruce Kent, General Secretary of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, who abused his position in the Catholic priesthood to add illusion to confusion, to claim that he was a partner in peace with the British Communist Party, whereas in fact the truth is that after 4 years of patient waiting for a Russian response to our overtures, we still face the threat of a Russian walkout in Geneva. Let us hope, let us say as a parliament to the Soviet Union, that whatever happens, the intermediate nuclear forces talks in Geneva must continue, not just for 6 months, as the Foreign Minister of Greece has suggested, but indefinitely until we achieve agreement.

**Mr Kyrkos (COM).** — *(GR)* We are in a constantly worsening international situation. This morning the

news came that an independent Turkish state has been declared in Cyprus and it is obvious that this will lead to a whole host of new complications. The matter we are discussing is familiar enough, this incessantly escalating tension. I want to say to Mr Gontikas that before he read the Greek Government's proposal he tore it up, like you colleagues on the conservative side, and you have portrayed it together here as an expression of Soviet policy, whereas in fact it was a simple and wise idea because, regardless of the differing interpretations placed upon it, it offered the opportunity for a tranquil continuation of the Geneva dialogue. One would need to be an idiot to think that the deployment of the missiles will not provoke the deployment of new missiles, and that the new missiles will not in turn provoke the deployment of even newer ones. So the peoples' only hope lies in the negotiations and their prolongation. The conservative side is attempting to destroy every hope of negotiations and to bring the European Parliament to a position diagrammatically opposed to that of the peoples of Europe. Mr Gontikas, who gave you the right to speak for the peoples of Europe? Millions of people, communists, socialists, religious, and non-religious people, ordinary human beings who do not wish to fill coffins, who want to live for their children and for their children's children, who wish to preserve what the centuries of civilization have built, are at this time calling for the SS 20s, the Pershing, Cruise, and the French and British missiles to be withdrawn, so that no missiles are left. Peace and cooperation, that is the message Parliament should be sounding out today, but instead we are snared up in a web of recrimination and impasse. Look back at your own faction, because that is where the Chamberlains have come from, the men of Munich, and when all the peoples were calling for us to arm against fascism certain of them blocked that demand.

Today in the name of peace, we call on all of you, conservatives and non-conservatives, communists and socialists and democrats of all persuasions, to fall in with the common demand for a solution to be found through the Geneva negotiations, for the nuclear arms race to be halted and for all the missiles deployed in Europe to be destroyed.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Alexiadis (NI).** — *(GR)* It is not agreeable for one to have to berate the government of one's own country in front of a foreign audience, but as a human being and a European it is a duty I cannot avoid. Faced with Soviet expansionism Europe has decided to defend itself and is ranging allied Cruise and Pershing missiles against the Soviet SS 20s.

The Greek Government opposes the deployment of Cruise and Pershing and is calling for a six-month postponement so that new discussions can take place,

## Alexiadis

as if the four years of talks up till now have not been enough. It considers this to be a service in the cause of peace, something it never ceases to eulogize while sparing no words about the horrors of nuclear war. There are no pacifists and non-pacifists as far as nuclear mass destruction is concerned. Everyone is against it, just as, in general, everyone is against any form of war. What the Greek Government does not understand, or does not want to understand, is that one-sided disarmament is more likely to bring about war rather than prevent it because it serves to embolden the side left with superior military power.

The struggle for peace becomes suspect when it is confined to calls for the non-deployment of the American missiles while blithely disregarding Soviet missiles. When Moscow rants about the deployment of Cruise and Pershing in Europe it does not do so because these missiles will disturb the balance of power, but because they will deprive it of the first-strike initiative, of the opportunity to inflict the first and last blow. If, at a given moment, the Soviet leadership, having the SS 20s, decided to relieve Europe of its freedoms it could easily do so. The last word would rest with its huge infantry and armoured power which is crushingly superior to that of the West. Within a short time Europe would be transformed into a Community of termites, into an insect democracy with freedom and hope banished forever.

*(Applause)*

The deployment of Cruise and Pershing averts this possibility because these missiles will be able to reach their targets in the Soviet Union before the SS 20s strike theirs. Moscow's objection would be warranted if the SS 20s were defensive rather than offensive weapons and if the Soviet Union had not instituted violence and repression as the supreme guiding principles of the whole militaristic structure of its state organization. When a regime is founded on violence the totalitarianism and police state apparatus which are its hallmarks can do no other than lead to concentration camps and gulags within its borders and to military confrontations abroad. When dialogue is not tolerable at home why should it be any more tolerable in the foreign arena?

Real peace-lovers must know that the cause of peace is not advanced by mawkish homilies about starving peoples, about the disappearance...

President. — Forgive me, Mr Alexiadis, but I must now give the floor to Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul. You have exceeded your speaking time.

Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, Honourable Members, Mr Klepsch levelled the serious reproach at the Socialists and Social Democrats that they had discarded certain major elements and founda-

tions of security policy, on which there used to be a common position. Now I ask him: is it not in fact those who are making use of work and planning manoeuvres which would involve regional nuclear war in Europe who are destroying the foundations of security policy?

*(Interruptions from the centre)*

Anyone who carries out manoeuvres with the idea that a nuclear war could be waged on a regional basis is ensuring that nuclear weapons are no longer political weapons and that the principle of nuclear deterrence will not work for long. That is why we are now in a new situation, although some people are still talking as they did twenty years ago.

*(Applause from the left)*

We Europeans — and that is the difference between us and the two superpowers — cannot afford a nuclear war, because the superpowers would stage it on our territory. At worst, more than 200 million people in Europe would be killed on the spot and millions of others would suffer irreversible harm if 1 000 nuclear weapons each weighing a megatonne exploded over our heads. That would destroy all that we are trying to defend together. That is the new situation. Anyone who can conceive of a regional nuclear war is also planning and calculating in terms of the mass destruction of the people and — speaking quite seriously — has different security interests from ours; even if he is an ally, he would become a threat to the Europeans.

*(Interjections from the centre)*

This has helped the emergence of the European peace movement, and some Members who cannot criticise the Americans strongly enough when economic disputes arise should finally recognise that it is true of security policy too.

We Europeans have torn each other apart in two world wars. During these days we are commemorating the millions of dead. Is the period of 38 years since the end of the Second World War to have been all the peace we can guarantee for the generations to come?

May I quote: 'The USA is only waiting for the medium-range weapons to be stationed in Europe before engaging in military intervention in Nicaragua and the Middle East'. Before you react, I can tell you that this was said not by a Russian, nor by the European peace movement but by an American analyst of Reagan's government policy from the Institute for Policy Studies. Can we tolerate the fact that as a part of US American imperialist policy, whose expression in Western Europe has been the planned deployment of medium-range weapons, a people such as the Nicaragua people should be robbed of its right to self-determination and independence? Can we tolerate intervention in the Middle East on the model of the US gunboat policy towards Grenada? The result would be

**Wieczorek-Zeul**

that thanks to Mutlangen, thanks to Comiso, thanks to Greenham Common, we become the victims of a US policy which attacks outside in order to win elections at home.

In objective, if not subjective terms, those — including some Member States — who do not oppose the deployment of medium-range weapons now are acting against the interests of their countries and of the people they represent.

This could be the hour of truth for the European Parliament. Let us prove ourselves bold and fearless and pay no heed to diplomatic considerations, as we were in the proposal for European Union. By calling for a moratorium on the deployment of the planned medium-range weapons in Western Europe, let us point a European path of reason, and oppose the deployment of the new nuclear weapons in Europe. There are already 50 000 nuclear weapons in the world. Enough for us to murder one another a million times over. Let us call for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Europe, which will reduce the threat of conflict for the small and medium-sized states in Western and Eastern Europe and give them independence vis à vis the two superpowers, the USSR and the USA. Let us achieve a worldwide freeze on nuclear weapons, which threaten the survival of us all.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mrs Boserup.** — *(DA)* Mr President, it is a difficult task to say something after such a well formulated speech as Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul's. At this stage I would like to say that I agree with my Conservative fellow-countryman and colleague, Mr Poul Møller: this discussion ought never to have taken place at all in this House. But I do admire the Greek Government for its courage in creating an occasion for it. There is nothing in the Greek Government's policy which could be contrary to that of the Danish Government, in so far as the Danish Parliament has decided that the Danish Government must work along lines which overlap those proposed by the Greek Government.

I have always been opposed to attempts to include military and security policy in the European cooperation. Three years ago a former — and rather weak — social democratic Foreign Minister agreed that one should only debate the economic aspects of security policy. This is something which by interpretation can be stretched as far as can be imagined. There are, in fact, always economic aspects when one talks about weapons and rearmament. The waste of resources, of human wisdom; the very thought of rearmament is shattering. And it is understandable that this is stressed on the part of the Greeks, as the Greek Government is doing its utmost to further the difficult task of winning over the Greek people to EEC cooperation. We need resources for things other than weapons, and we have a need to talk about problems

in this House other than just weapons. I have been elected by a party which for 25 years has worked for disarmament, and I feel a representative of those Mr Haagerup so jokingly calls troublemakers, and I am proud of it.

**Ms Clwyd (S).** — Mr President, I now live in a country where the government says it is ready to shoot non-violent, unarmed women peace demonstrators. We now have Cruise missiles in Britain despite the fact that 94% of the British people are against the deployment of Cruise without dual key. It makes no difference to those of us who believe passionately in peace whose finger is on the key, Reagan's or Thatcher's. The very existence of these weapons, Mr President, is an obscenity. Cruise is not only an awesome weapon, Mr Fergusson, it is a war-fighting weapon. Not a deterrent. It is therefore dangerous and provocative. There have been 107 computer malfunctions in the last ten years in the United States, yet they are the No 1 computer country in the world. If they have had these malfunctions, what happens if there is a Soviet malfunction? A third-rate computer nation compared with the United States. The argument Reagan and Thatcher use that we have got to deploy these missiles as the only way to get the Soviets to the bargaining table is quite wrong. It is a case of playing nuclear chicken. The last time the game was played was in Cuba where the Soviets backed off and Khrushchev was shamed. The Soviets will not do it again, and two great nations and their allies, with such a capacity to destroy life, cannot afford this kind of macho behaviour.

Last night, the members of the Executive of the Turkish Peace Association who have been on trial for the last year were sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. Mr Dikerdem, the President, aged 68, was sentenced to 8 years in prison and two years internal exile. Eighteen others were sentenced to 8 years in prison and two years exile. Five others were sentenced to 5 years. The charges against them amounted to nothing more than that they opposed nuclear weapons. I call on the President-in-Office of the Council and Parliament to condemn these unjust sentences and to continue to withhold economic aid to that country.

*(Applause from the left)*

Mr President, all that is necessary for the forces of evil to win the world is for enough good men and women to do nothing. I am proud to be a demonstrator in the cause of peace.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Cariglia (S).** — *(IT)* Mr President, my intention in speaking is to confirm here the position which the two Italian Socialist Parties have already adopted elsewhere.

## Cariglia

As our colleagues know, this problem arose at the moment when the Soviet Union moved hundreds of SS 20s in order to threaten a number of towns and sites in Western Europe.

The Anglo-French reply is different as it is strategic, as Mr Jaquet said just now, and the other Western European countries, at the insistence of others, do not have nuclear weapons, and therefore the reply could only come from the Americans within the context of NATO.

The other possible replies are: no reply at all — but in this case we must not forget the spirit of Munich — or the destruction of all existing medium-range nuclear weapons, that is, the zero option. The second of these is rejected by the Soviets but also, surprisingly, by the pacifists.

We must also recognize — and this is where some of our problem lies — that this situation carries within it the menace of the germs of a nuclear escalation. Therefore, it is our duty to try every option which might facilitate an agreement on the balanced and gradual reduction of the medium-range nuclear weapons installed in Europe.

However, the way forward does not lie in a six-month moratorium, which is a possibility on which we need not make a decision as it is a diplomatic tactic and so is not one of the options open to Parliament.

The right way to proceed is by alerting the consciences of all men in order to bring about a peace which is not imposed through fear but is in the interest of all humanity.

This undertaking is easier in countries under democratic rule and is far less easy, if not impossible, in countries where the people have no say.

The episode of the South Korean aeroplane shows yet again the behaviour of those who are not accountable to public opinion. Europe today is a community of peaceful nations which threatens no-one and which, beginning a new chapter after a long and turbulent history, aims now to maintain good relations with all countries not in order to demonstrate its supremacy but to help to resolve the problems of the world, of all the world.

This, Mr President, was the spirit which gave rise to the Ostpolitik; and so I ask myself: why are there more than 300 SS 20s pointing at the Western European democracies? Perhaps the USSR does not so much want a nuclear war as a split in our ranks: it is aiming to split Europe and today, unfortunately, this Parliament has given further proof of this split so showing that a new and gloomy future lies in store for us.

*(Applause)*

Mrs Gredal (S). — *(DA)* Mr President, in the Danish Parliament the President would have called to order a member who referred to other members as trouble-

makers. This ought also to have happened here. I would like to tell Mr Haagerup that we are not trouble-makers. We are people who think just as seriously and are just as responsible as everyone else in this house. When my colleagues from SPD and the Socialist Group put forward this question and propose motions for resolutions, then I have no doubt that they do this because they, like us, are deeply worried and afraid of the existing development. The Danish social democratic policy — a policy which has also been carried through in the Danish Parliament, and which the Danish government must follow — is that the negotiations in Geneva must be prolonged, and that preparations for deployment of new missiles must not take place during the negotiations. The ulterior aim is to cut down the number of nuclear weapons both in east and west, and not as Mr Haagerup said, solely directed at the USA. This being said, I must however, say that the Danish social democrats find that these problems do not belong to European political cooperation. We have other institutions to take care of these defence issues. This issue rightly belongs to a NATO context. The Community is not competent in the military field. Even if our claims and wishes for the parties in Geneva are exactly the same as those mentioned in the resolution put forward by my group, we are not able to vote for it for the reasons I have just mentioned.

President. — The debate is closed.

Mr Gontikas (PPE). — *(GR)* Mr President, the speech by our dear colleague, Mr Plaskovitis, has raised a personal issue which I want to clear up here and now.

We are not dealing with the Greek Government, and certainly it was not my intention today to question the Greek Government. When the President of the Council made his statement in Athens on 19 August it was reported in the Greek press that he had said that he was going to push the initiative forward on a Community basis. It was on account of this statement of his, Mr President, and in accordance with Rule 42, that I tabled my question. However, and this is a point of order, I did expect the President-in-Office to give me a reply today on the following point. As he has said, Mr President, he believes that the matter is not specifically one of Greek foreign policy, but what do the other nine Foreign Ministers, who have discussed it in the context of political cooperation, think, because that is what counts as far as today's debate is concerned? My second point of order, which does not weigh against you, Mr President, but against the previous occupant of the Chair, is that although, according to Rule 66, paragraph 5, the Council has the right to be heard in this House at its request, it must surely have something to say when it does appear. When it has nothing to say what purpose is there in its coming?

## IN THE CHAIR : MR NIKOLAOU

*Vice-President*

**President.** — (GR) Mr Gontikas, that is something every Member here must judge for himself.

**Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul (S).** — (DE) Mr President, I think it is in the interest of all the Members to know when the translations of the proposed resolutions winding up the debate will be available, for it was arranged that amendments to them could be tabled until 1 p.m.

**Mr Chanterie (PPE).** — (NL) Mr President, my point of order concerns the question that has just been put. The deadline for tabling amendments has been set at 1 p.m., but the Dutch version at least is not yet available. I would therefore suggest that the deadline for tabling amendments should be later than 1 p.m.

**President.** — Mr Chanterie, what you say is very sensible, as is also the remark made by Mrs Wiczorek Zeul.

At 3 p.m. the President will announce a new deadline for tabling amendments<sup>1</sup>.

4. *Council statement — European Union — Decisions to be taken on all four aspects of the negotiations — Enlargement of the Community*

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on :

— the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council on preparations for the meeting of the European Council in Athens on 5, 6 and 7 December 1983 ;

— the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-958/83) by Mr Rumor, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, to the Council ;

Subject: Solemn declaration on European Union

Point 2.3.6 of the solemn declaration on European Union, adopted by the European Council at its meeting in Stuttgart from 17 to 19 June 1983, states that :

'The Council will enter into talks with the European Parliament and the Commission with the aim, within the framework of a new agreement, of improving and extending the scope of the conciliation procedure provided for in the Joint Declaration of 4 March 1975'.

Furthermore, at a meeting between the Council and a delegation from the European Parliament in Brussels on 24 January 1983, the Foreign Ministers undertook to begin tripartite talks with the Commission and the European Parliament on the implementation of the institutional resolutions adopted by the European Parliament.<sup>1</sup>

What measures has the Council taken to honour its own commitments and carry out the tasks entrusted to it by the European Council ?

— the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-961/83) by Mr Fanti and Mr Piquet, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, to the Council :

Subject : Decisions to be taken on four subjects of the negotiation taken as a whole

whereas the Stuttgart European Council has declared itself in favour of a genuine overall compromise with regard to the decisions to be taken on four subjects of negotiation taken as a whole (CAP, structural funds, financing of the Community and correction of imbalances, EMS and new policies),

whereas the European Parliament has stated clearly that any proposal for the correction of financial imbalances in isolation from the other aspects is unacceptable,

having regard to the undertakings repeatedly made by the Council that it will take into account the opinions expressed by the European Parliament on the above-mentioned topics and that it will involve Parliament itself ;

1. What stage has the negotiation reached ?

2. Have the above-mentioned criteria and undertakings been observed ?

3. What guarantee can the Council give so as to avoid biased or unsatisfactory results, as occurred in the case of the mandate of 30 May 1980 ?

<sup>1</sup> — Relations between the EP and the Council, OJ C 234 of 14. 9. 81, p. 52, rapporteur Mr K. Hänsch

— Right of legislative initiative and the role of the EP in the legislative process of the Community, OJ C 234 of 14. 9. 81, p. 64, rapporteur Mr K. Van Miert

— Role of the EP in the negotiation and ratification of treaties of accession and of other treaties and agreements between the European Community and third countries, OJ C 66 of 15. 3. 82, p. 68, rapporteur Mr E. B. Blumenfeld

— European political cooperation and the role of the EP, OJ C 234 of 14. 9. 81, p. 67, rapporteur Lady Elles

— Role of the EP in its relations with the European Council, OJ C 11 of 18. 11. 82, p. 192, rapporteur Mr D. Antonozzi

— Relations between the EP and the Commission with a view to the forthcoming appointment of a new Commission, OJ C 117 of 12. 5. 80, p. 53, rapporteur Mr J. Rey

— Draft European Act submitted by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Italian Republic, OJ C 128 of 16. 5. 82, p. 28, rapporteur Mr Croux

<sup>1</sup> Decision on the requests for an early vote: see minutes

## President

- the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-951/83 by Ms Clwyd and others to the Council :

Subject : Enlargement of the Community

In its resolution on the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and *Portugal* adopted by a large majority on 17 November 1982 the European Parliament reaffirmed 'the political will, which it has expressed on many occasions, that Spain and Portugal should join the Community by 1 January 1984 at the latest',

It further urged the Commission and the Council 'to use every possible means to ensure that the negotiations for its accession are completed by 30 March 1983 so that the ratification procedures can be completed in 1983'.

Can the Council inform the Parliament as to the state of progress of the negotiations with the two applicant countries, notably in the light of the recent European Council meeting in Brussels? Can the Council also indicate what problems are holding up the speedy conclusion of negotiations and can it indicate at what date accession could take place?

- the oral question with debate (Doc. 1-953/83) by Mr Galluzzi and others to the Council :

Subject : Enlargement of the Community

In its resolution on the enlargement of the Community to include *Spain* and Portugal adopted by a large majority on 17 November 1982 the European Parliament reaffirmed 'the political will, which it has expressed on many occasions, that Spain and Portugal should join the Community by 1 January 1984 at the latest',

It further urged the Commission and the Council 'to use every possible means to ensure that the negotiations for its accession are completed by 30 March 1983 so that the ratification procedures can be completed in 1983'.

Can the Council inform the Parliament as to the state of progress of the negotiations with the two applicant countries, notably in the light of the recent European Council meeting in Brussels? Can the Council also indicate what problems are holding up the speedy conclusion of negotiations and can it indicate at what date accession could take place?

**Mr Charalambopoulos, *President-in-Office of the Council.*** — (GR) Ladies and gentlemen, the European Council in Stuttgart decided to tackle the pressing problems which exist at this crucial time for the future of the Community by setting up a special negotiation process so that an urgent review could be made of the following four matters :

- A. The common agricultural policy.
- B. The structural funds.

C. The new policies.

D. The future financing of the Community.

The Greek Presidency has had the difficult task of preparing proposals on these matters in readiness for the Athens Summit. Since Stuttgart a lot of serious work has been put in at all levels in order to make these negotiations a success, and today I want to inform you about how they are proceeding. It is still too early to assess the final outcome because there is still a little time to go before the Athens Summit when we shall have to take specific decisions. All the parties involved must therefore realize just how critical the situation is and be prepared to do everything possible to achieve the necessary compromise. Failure in Athens will have serious repercussions for the Community's future, but success will give it a shot in the arm and ensure its resurgence. I know that the European Parliament supports our endeavours. In conformity with the mandate it was given at Stuttgart the Greek Presidency has aimed at a solution which will leave the existing policies, and particularly the common agricultural policy, intact, make for greater convergence of the economies, help to pave the way for enlargement and boost efforts to improve the competitiveness of European industry. The attainment of these objectives demands a more disciplined approach to Community spending and access to additional resources through the raising of the VAT contribution ceiling. Within this framework a series of special Councils and conferences have been held at which the various sides have exchanged views and advanced specific proposals. On some points there is agreement, but on others differences still remain. At the most recent special Council, held in Athens between 9 and 11 November, the Greek Presidency, acting in conjunction with the Commission, put forward an overall proposal in an attempt to find common ground between the differing views, and most of the time was taken up with discussion of this proposal. I will refer now to the main points of the negotiations and outline the views of the Presidency for you.

A. The common agricultural policy.

The Presidency holds to the view that the decisions of the European Council in Athens must embrace the following points :

1. The reassertion of certain principles relating to the implementation of the agricultural policy in general.
2. Specific measures in sectors where the most serious problems exist with regard to surpluses and the burden these place on the budget.
3. The unity of the market.

As regards the overall policy on prices and production thresholds we propose that the Community should combine caution on prices with the lowering of

## Charalambopoulos

production quotas where this is made necessary by surpluses or by significant rises in expenditure due to marketing bottlenecks.

### 4. The policy on exports and imports.

The Community's export policy must be developed on a sound economic footing, and efforts must be made at Community level to find long-term contractual outlets for farm products.

On import policy the regimes currently in force for particular products must be re-examined and adjusted to accommodate the market situation, bearing in mind the need for balance between the Community's international obligations and the satisfactory retention of the principle of Community preference.

### 5. The milk sector.

Given the serious and intractable imbalance between production and market requirements in this sector effective action must be taken for as long as necessary to curtail increases in production and to reduce the burden on the budget. The Presidency has therefore proposed that the following measures be implemented for 1984-85 for a four-year period with reappraisal after three years.

- a. The fixing of a Community guarantee base level and of production quotas for individual producers.
- b. The imposition of a supplementary levy on individual producers equal to 75 % of the indicated price for their collected surplus milk production. The most important point concerns which reference period to choose for the establishment of production quotas. The Presidency has proposed that these be based on mean individual production levels over the period 1981-1983 less 2 %, but obviously this does not exclude other possible arrangements capable of bringing about the desired result. Production cutbacks of this sort would, of course, create special problems for Ireland, given the importance of the dairy sector in that country's economy, and we are therefore looking for realistic solutions in this particular respect.

### 6. The cereals sector.

The Presidency has proposed that in future it should be Community policy to bring prices paid to all producers into line with those paid to farmers in the main producing countries. Action must be taken in concert with this to ensure a genuine levelling-off in imports of cereal substitutes, and to this end the Community must explore all the avenues open to it, both bilaterally and within the framework of GATT.

### 7. The monetary compensatory amounts.

This is the most crucial aspect of negotiations on the agricultural sector. To us it is obvious that a solution must include a date for the gradual dismantling of the existing MCAs. As regards future MCAs we are looking at an arrangement whereby exchange rate fluctuations which adversely affect any one country would

be offset by a system of negative MCAs in the other countries so as to enable prices in the national currency of the country affected to remain unchanged. The arrangement would obviate the need for new positive MCAs.

### B. The structural funds.

In essence the three funds have been downgraded nowadays into mere channels for the redistribution of resources, while inequalities between the regions are growing rather than diminishing. There is general agreement that these funds must be shaped into the effective instruments of a real Community regional development and structural readjustment policy, and I feel sure that Parliament will concur with this new attitude. In the Council's view the purpose of this development plan must be to tackle the development problems of the less developed countries, to speed up the process of restructuring in those industrial and agricultural regions which are in decline, and to spearhead the fight against unemployment and against youth unemployment in particular. The Presidency has proposed that by 1990 the resources allotted to these funds should be doubled in real terms and that, in the overall context of fiscal discipline, Parliament should be consulted over a model long-term financing plan designed to ensure a controlled pattern of expenditure over a period of years. It is also calling for a greater concentration of the fund's financial mechanisms, and this will involve raising the intervention rates, for improvements in the way the funds are managed, and for the activities of the funds in particular countries to be planned on a basis of genuine dialogue between the Commission and the recipient Member State. The interventions of the funds must be coordinated as much as possible so as to give a coherent pattern to their activities. The Council recognizes that the integrated programmes constitute the most suitable and efficient means of tackling the special problems of certain regions. The integrated Mediterranean programmes are forerunners in this respect and the Council should therefore give them its blessing and issue the necessary regulation as quickly as possible.

### C. The new policies.

We are all agreed that these policies must be given special priority. By coordinating research and innovation in the new technologies their purpose is to ensure that undertakings within the Community remain competitive. These policies will be implemented in such a way as to allow all the member countries to participate in them and to benefit from them on a fair basis. The Community will have to take specific steps to bolster the economic and monetary aspects of the internal market. It must also encourage cooperation between undertakings in the furtherance of new policies in the energy, transport, environmental and research and technology sectors.

## Charalambopoulos

In this sphere the Community must be mindful of the special problems of industrial restructuring and modernization facing the less developed member countries.

### D. Future financing.

#### 1. Own resources.

The Presidency has proposed that the VAT contribution ceiling be raised to 1.8 % with effect for every Member State as from 1 January 1986. We believe that the measures adopted must be adequate to cover the needs of the next ten years, and an increase smaller than the one we have proposed will in no way suffice.

#### 2. Financial and fiscal projections.

Developments in the pattern of the main expenditure headings will be effected via a long-term plan which the Council and the Commission will draw up in consultation with Parliament. The guiding principles of this plan will be roughly as follows.

For the agricultural sector the Presidency agrees with the proposal made by the Commission in its Communication of 4 November. The new policies will receive substantially greater support than in the past with a rate of increase considerably higher than for the other policies. As far as the structural funds are concerned, the intention is to double their endowments in real terms by the year 1990. The Council of Foreign and Finance Ministers will meet yearly to establish spending guidelines, in accordance with the long-term plan, for inclusion in the preliminary draft budget. In cases where the fiscal projections are significantly at variance with the original plan the Council will examine the situation and, after taking the opinion of the Commission, make the necessary modifications to the Community's policies in order to change the pattern of spending in adequate time.

I now come to the final point in this sector, the question of the budgetary balances. Four solutions have been proposed.

As you know these are the proposals which have come from the Commission, Denmark, the United Kingdom and Germany. I will not go into detail about these proposals now because I prefer to give you the views of the Presidency regarding the most useful basis for continuing the discussions. Any such basis must be relevant to the problem, it must be simple, and, most important of all, it must form part of the overall context of negotiation to which I referred at the beginning of my speech.

Given this approach, the Greek Presidency submitted a compromise solution to the most recent special Council in Athens, and this paved the way for an exchange of views. We hope that final decisions will be taken soon. I want to remind you that the special negotiating team has to meet for one more time and that one more special Council still has to take place.

The compromises which are essential if the European Council in Athens is to produce satisfactory results will have to be forthcoming at these meetings.

In winding up, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to stress yet again how important it is that the negotiations going on in Athens for an overall settlement should succeed, and to emphasize the difficulties which the Community will face if we fail in our appointed task. We are at the stage when it is imperative for the Member States to act as one in manifesting the political will to accept the sort of compromises which can lead the Community on to a new course where it will be characterized by greater cohesion and a new dynamism, and be capable of further evenly-balanced economic growth.

**President.** — (GR) Colleagues, I am making a special request of the interpreters and the other staff to continue with the sitting until all of the speakers down to speak have spoken. Each political group will have 5 minutes, and I shall be very strict about this because we are pressed for time. When a speaker's time is up I shall stop him. Of course, there will be a two-hour suspension, and business will be resumed after this.

I have received two motions for resolutions with request for an early vote on winding up the debate on these oral questions. These are the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1033/83) by the Liberal and Democratic Group and the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1064/83) by Mr Fanti and others. The vote on the requests for an early vote will be held at the end of the debate.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) Mr President, I would like to answer the oral questions before we carry on with the debate.

**President.** — (GR) All right, Mr President, you have the floor.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I answer these questions in accordance with Rule 44 of the Rules of Procedure. First of all the question by Mr Fanti and Mr Piquet.

In view of the seriousness, complexity and inter-related nature of the problems the European Council in Stuttgart decided to set up a special urgent negotiating procedure. In fact the special Council has met six times up till now. All four of the subjects to which the honourable gentlemen refer were discussed at the most recent of these meetings in Athens between 9 and 12 November, given that work on each of them was at the same level of preparation. The groundwork that has been done on the four subjects has been governed by the paramountcy of the principles of globality and inter-relatedness, and the special Coun-



**Charalambopoulos**

cils have also attached full heed to these principles. The same principles will also apply as regards the recommendations which the special Council will make to the meeting of the European Council in Athens. Joint decisions will be arrived at when negotiations on the topics involved are completed.

Concerning the other question, by Mr Rumor, I want to say this. It has always been the wish of the Council and of the Member States to ensure a significant role for the European Parliament. Furthermore, this is provided for in paragraph 231 of the solemn declaration on European Union which states that 'the Assembly of the European Communities has a substantial role to play in the development of European Union'. In the past this conception of the role of the European Parliament has found its main expression in the ratification of the treaties of 22 April 1970 and 22 July 1975 which strengthened Parliament's powers over the budget, in the ratification of the Act of 20 September 1976 which provided for the election of Members on the basis of direct universal suffrage, and likewise through the adoption of many procedures which allow the European Parliament to function more effectively in its role as defined by the treaties.

From amongst these procedures the Declaration of 4 March 1975 which established the conciliation procedure and the resolution of 30 June 1982 designed to improve the procedure for drawing up the budget are worth special mention. The Council is looking at its relations with the European Parliament in a positive spirit, mindful of Parliament's own resolutions on the subject.

The Council's first reply to many of the points raised by the European Parliament was contained in its letter of 6 April 1982. This reply clarified certain issues and led to certain improvements in its relations with Parliament. Regarding the conciliation procedure the Stuttgart Declaration makes provision for the Council to enter into talks with Parliament and the Commission. Before embarking on these talks the Council intends, as does Parliament, to clarify its position as regards the proposals made by the Commission on 17 December 1981 and with a mind to the position a delegation has taken on paragraph 236 of the solemn declaration.

The Council is continuing with its appraisal, on the basis of paragraph 237 of the solemn declaration, of the Commission's communication concerning the role of Parliament in the establishment of international agreements and treaties of accession. At the meeting of 24 January 1983 between the Foreign Ministers of the Ten and the enlarged Bureau of the European Parliament the Chairman of your Political Affairs Committee proposed that a form of dialogue be set up between Parliament and the Council and

that the Presidents of the two institutions should decide on which of the institutional resolutions adopted by Parliament should be accorded priority.

The two Presidents met to arrange a procedure for giving effect to this proposal in order to allow the Council...

**Mrs Elaine Kellett-Bowman (ED).** — Point of order Mr President.

**President.** — Mrs Kellett-Bowman, you simply cannot interrupt when the speaker is the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers. That is unheard-of!

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) .... At the Council meeting of 26 April 1983 the Presidency raised the question of establishing informal contacts between delegations from the European Parliament and the permanent representations in connection with certain institutional matters. However, at that time the Council was unable to find agreement on this and informed Parliament accordingly in its reply to Question H-132/83 during the June part-session.

Mr President, I will now give a joint reply to the oral question tabled by Miss Clwyd and others and that tabled by Mr Galluzzi and others.

**President.** — (GR) Mr President of the Council, a question. Because, as you can see, the Chamber is beginning to empty, and because it would be difficult, of course, for us to keep the debate going for another hour, would you be prepared to be here at 3 p.m. so that the debate can continue then?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) Mr President, the timetable I was sent in Athens said that this debate would last from 12 p.m. to 1 p.m.

**President.** — (GR) Yes, from 12-1 p.m., but with 35 minutes set aside for the political groups.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) Parliament should have allowed more time then.

**President.** — (GR) I beg your pardon, but you were informed that your speaking time during this hour would be 15 minutes so as to allow time for others to speak as well.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I answer the questions.

**President.** — (GR) Yes, but from what I am told you were informed that you should speak for 15 minutes.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I have a duty to answer the questions. If these answers are longer than is customary in this Chamber that is due to the fact that the Council of Ministers studied them in depth.

### Charalambopoulos

Moreover, the length of the answers is an indication of the respect in which the Council holds Parliament.

**President.** — (GR) Yes, Mr President, you are right, but the Rules of Procedure do make certain provisions. The political groups must have their say on what you have said.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) All I have done, Mr President, is to give Parliament a first acquaintance with things. This is not the end. There still remain one more special Council and the Athens Summit. This is just a first acquaintance.

**President.** — (GR) What the Bureau specifically wants to know is whether you can be here at 3 p.m.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) Our political will to press forward as rapidly as possible with negotiations on the accession of Spain and Portugal has been repeatedly reaffirmed in recent months at the highest political level and also within the forum of the European Council itself.

In keeping with this work has been going on intensively, and this is still the case. At the present juncture it can be said that in both sets of negotiations solutions have been found to problems in a whole series of sectors although certain problems do still remain in some of these sectors and, of course, there will have to be agreement on the overall packages. Significant progress has been achieved in other sectors and work is continuing.

The main sectors where agreement has to be found are agriculture, fisheries, social affairs, institutional matters and own resources. Henceforth negotiations must focus on the first three of these, given that institutional matters and own resources are usually discussed in the final stage of negotiation.

Concerning the agriculture sector the Community informed its Spanish negotiating partners at the last ministerial conference with Spain on 18 October that the outcome of the Council meeting of the same day with regard to the Community's existing Mediterranean regime provides it with a firm basis for continuing with the internal adjustments which are essential in order for the Community to be able to work out its own final position in this important area of the negotiations. The Community will make this position known to the conference before the end of the year if possible.

The Council is working strenuously at the present time to prepare the Community's view on the substance of these problems for presentation to both Spain and Portugal.

In both sets of negotiations positions as regards the fisheries sector have already been put on the table, and this should enable the respective conferences to

set about finding solutions to the problems which exist in this important sector very shortly.

Views have also been exchanged on social affairs. Important differences exist and the two conferences will have to succeed in narrowing these differences down. The negotiations on accession are at a stage where every effort must be made to bring them to a conclusion as quickly as possible, something which both Parliament and the European Council are concerned to see happen.

This concern is the dominant factor in the work currently being undertaken by the Council in collaboration with the Commission, work which the Presidency is anxious should have a happy outcome.

I come now to the oral question put by Mr Papaefstratiou and others. The Council took great account of the anxieties expressed by the honourable gentlemen when deciding on the farm prices and associated measures for 1983-1984, and wishes to emphasize that the decisions it took were very much in line with what the Commission had proposed. It must be stressed that these decisions provide for the prices for Mediterranean products to rise by more than those for the products of the northern countries of the Community. These increases become even more significant when account is taken of the effects of the readjustments to the green currency parity levels of the Mediterranean countries. In fact, and in the case of Greece especially, the devaluations have reached the order of 7%. Moreover, the Community has given special financial support to the mountainous areas of Greece by adjusting the compensatory mechanisms to take account of the special needs of the Greek regions and by making more funds available for Greece. I remind you, furthermore, that the Council is currently examining the Commission's proposals as regards the integrated Mediterranean programmes.

Finally, the rate at which Greek farm prices approach those of the other Member States is laid down in the treaty of accession. Article 60 of the treaty, which permits the implementation in Greece of joint prices when only a slight difference exists between Greek prices and the joint prices applicable in the rest of the Community, is implemented by decision of the Council when the requisite conditions are fulfilled.

Mr President, as you and all the honourable Members are aware, these replies carry the unanimous approval of the Council of Ministers.

**President.** — (GR) Ladies and gentlemen, what do you prefer? Shall we carry on with the debate until all those down to speak have spoken, or shall we suspend the sitting now and commence again at 3 p.m. whether the President of the Council is here or not? What do you prefer? I put it to you.

**Mr Arndt (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, the agenda refers to a 'joint debate' from 12 noon to 1 pm. If the President of the Council and his colleagues were misinformed — and that is obviously what has happened, for the agenda, which is also available in Greek, states 'joint debate' — that cannot be blamed on Parliament. Since the President of the Council has taken the whole hour for his statement, we can no longer hold the joint debate now. Since the President of the Council has taken these 30 or 35 minutes of debate from Parliament, he should now try to make up for the mistake his people made and be available to us for questions later. For Parliament to continue the sitting under the present conditions would be undignified.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — *(GR)* Mr President, I really do regret very deeply that you are endeavouring to create the impression that the President of the Council of Ministers is in the wrong. This is just not correct.

*(Shouts of protest)*

Like all of you I have before me the agenda, and according to this the joint debate, including the statement by the President of the Council on the preparations for the meeting of the European Council in Athens on 5, 6 and 7 December, was scheduled to last from 12 o'clock midday until 1 p.m.

**President.** — *(GR)* It says 'joint debate'.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — *(GR)* I think the responsibility is being shifted around. No such responsibility attaches to the President of the Council. The President of the Council will come here at Question Time.

**Mr R. Jackson (ED).** — Mr President, may I draw the attention of the President-in-Office of the Council to a word that he used several times in his long speech, the word 'dialogue'. We cannot have a debate which is based on monologue; we must have a dialogue. It seems to me that it is normal courtesy for the President-in-Office of the Council to hear the conclusion of this debate, which means that he must wait until we have had the other speakers from the different political groups. Then he will have an opportunity to answer, and then there will have been a debate — a dialogue rather than a monologue.

**Mr Enright (S).** — Mr President, I think that this House is being grossly unfair to the President-in-Office of the Council. It was this House that spent 20 extra minutes on the very important debate that we had on nuclear missiles, and it is all the more unfair, therefore, to blame the President-in-Office for examining fully the issues that we place before him, which are serious and weighty measures upon which we are going to pontificate. If we are going to discuss these things superficially, Mr President, it simply is

not good enough. We might as well revert to a simple Thursday morning debate, where we would discuss everything and then leave it alone. I think that the way in which the President-in-Office has been treated by this House is scandalous, and I think you should apologize to him on behalf of the House.

**President.** — *(GR)* Colleagues, this situation cannot carry on, with me allowing points of order to be raised all the time. I am putting the matter to the vote so that you can decide whether to continue with the debate now or to suspend the sitting and resume at 3 p.m.

*(Parliament decided to suspend the debate and resume at 3.15 p.m.)*

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — *(GR)* Mr President, I have the agenda before me. The President of the Council of Ministers bears no responsibility for the debate running behind time, and I must inform you that I have a meeting with the President of the European Parliament at 1 p.m. That in itself is an indication that everything was arranged with a mind to the debate being concluded by 1 p.m.

**President.** — *(GR)* Yes, but the debate is not yet over, Mr President of the Council.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — *(GR)* No blame can be attached to the President of the Council of Ministers for that.

**President.** — *(GR)* No blame was being attached. The simple fact is that the political groups have not yet spoken and that time must be found for them to have their say.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — *(GR)* Let them speak this afternoon.

**President.** — *(GR)* Very good, that is what I put to the vote and the majority decided to suspend the sitting now.

*(The sitting was suspended at 1.15 p.m. and resumed at 3.15 p.m.)*

#### IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

*President*

**Mr Enright (S).** — Mr President, this morning before we adjourned the session, there was a most disgraceful episode which, from whatever angle it is viewed, brings this House into disrepute. It seems to me, at any rate, that we should send a letter of apology to the President-in-Office of the Council. In any case, I think this matter should be referred to the Bureau and that the Bureau should examine it so that such disgraceful incidents do not occur again. I should be grateful for that assurance.

**President.** — I should like to make a very brief declaration related to the points raised by Mr Enright. I think we all appreciate the fact that the President-in-Office, notwithstanding a heavy agenda, was able to be here at 9 a.m. this morning. Because we decided to have a somewhat longer debate on missiles, we encountered some problems concerning time at the end. I appreciate very much that Mr Charalambopoulos is present again this afternoon to hear the debate on the brief he gave on behalf of the Council of Ministers. I think that problem can be settled without letters in the presence of the President-in-Office. I thank him for his presence here.

##### 5. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

**Mr Chanterie (PPE).** — (NL) Mr President, just before the adjournment of the sitting I asked a question about the deadline for tabling amendments to the motion for a resolution winding up the debate on nuclear missiles. The deadline was 1 p.m., but the text was not available in Dutch at that time and possibly not in other languages either. The President of the sitting announced that we would be informed of the new deadline at 3.15 p.m.

**President.** — It has already been decided that amendments may be tabled to the motions for resolutions on the missiles. This means that amendments may be submitted up to 6 p.m. in connection with the aforementioned resolutions, though this of course is subject to the reservation that Parliament agrees to an early vote. We shall be taking this vote presently.

##### 6. *Council statement — European Union — decisions to be taken on all four aspects of the negotiations — Enlargement of the Community (continuation)*

**President.** — The next item is the continuation, for a maximum of 35 minutes, of the joint debate on the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council and the oral questions (Doc. 1-958/83), (Doc. 1-961/83), (Doc. 1-951/83) and (Doc. 1-953/83).

**Ms Clwyd (S).** — Mr President, I am sorry that the debate was so disrupted this morning, and I should like to reiterate what Mr Enright said. Blame should not be attached to the Greek Presidency, but rather to the organization of Parliament's timetable.

I speak specifically on the enlargement of the Community, on behalf of the Socialist Group and also as chairman of the European Parliament's delegation to Portugal. We put down some oral questions, to which, I am sorry to say, we do not appear to have had very specific answers. In fact, the President-in-Office said this morning that solutions have been found but certain things remain in abeyance. I should like

clarified this afternoon what precisely those things are and what precisely they are in relation to Portugal.

Mr President, I find it very difficult to continue talking when Mr de la Malène is shouting. Perhaps he would be kind enough to keep quiet.

The questions we put down on enlargement were based on the resolution on the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal adopted by the European Parliament by a large majority on 17 November 1982, when we reaffirmed the political will which we have expressed on many occasions in this House that Spain and Portugal should join the Community by 1 January 1984 at the latest. We went on to urge the Commission and the Council to use every possible means to ensure that the negotiations for their accession were completed by 30 March 1983. You see how redundant our resolutions are by now. This has, of course, led to a certain amount of disillusion in both those countries about the real intention of the European Community as far as the negotiations are concerned.

We were told that the obstacles regarding Mediterranean fruit and vegetables were resolved in Luxembourg in October. Therefore, the question we continue to ask is this. What are the problems which remain? The five Socialist Prime Ministers of the Mediterranean met in Athens, and we learn from the press that they are agreed on the European Community giving a green light for the accession of Spain and Portugal. Obviously we welcome this and we hope for the same determination at the Athens Summit in December.

But I must make it clear to the House — and I know many of my colleagues are aware of this already — that while we continue to let Spain and Portugal await our pleasure, public opinion in those countries is growing increasingly colder as far as the European Community is concerned. It has been said to me time and time again in Portugal that they do not want accession at any price. They have also warned us that if we continue to keep them waiting, then, just as when a taxi is kept waiting outside somebody's front door for the passenger to enter, the meter keeps on ticking, as far as Portugal is concerned the meter keeps on ticking there as well. They think that we ought to pay a price for continuing to keep them waiting for a firm date for accession. I agree with that point of view, and I think we should consider very carefully the penalties we may have to pay as a result of keeping those two fledgling democracies waiting.

Obviously, I should like to know, as chairman of the European Parliament Delegation to Portugal, whether there is any possibility of Portugal entering the Community on its own, although, obviously, I should like to see both Spain and Portugal enter together.

**Clwyd**

May I conclude by wishing the Greek Presidency every success in its efforts to achieve the aims of the Athens Summit on all subjects — not just the question of enlargement.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*Vice-President*

**Mr Rumor (PPE).** — *(IT)* Mr President, I must begin by saying to the Presidency of the Parliament how very sorry I am that such a limited amount of time has been allotted for matters as important as those on the agenda.

Mr President of the Council, I am not satisfied by your statements and by the reply you have given to problems which are an essential part of the Community's progress.

The problems to which I am referring concern two subjects which are interrelated: the first refers to the mandate given to the Council of the Community by the European Council at Stuttgart on the matter of cooperation; the second refers to the implementation of the resolutions adopted during these last two years concerning institutions.

You know that the Political Affairs Committee chose to put forward to the Parliament itself proposals aiming to restructure the relations between the Institutions while remaining within the terms of the Treaty. It has, indeed, presented eight reports on the relations between the European Parliament and the other Community Institutions, and the Parliament has approved them and forwarded them to the Institutions concerned.

I must tell you that the Commission has reacted favourably to the resolutions of Mr Rey and Mr Van Miert which concern it and likewise the Economic and Social Committee, which is the subject of Mrs Baduel Glorioso's report. However, the Council of the Community has remained silent and aloof from the reports of Mr Hänsch, Mr Antoniozzi, Mr Blumenfeld and Lady Elles which concern it. Only the Blumenfeld report has evoked the beginnings of a reply in the solemn declaration. And yet on 24 January 1983, at a meeting in Brussels between the Foreign Ministers and a parliamentary delegation, it was agreed that discussions should begin between the Parliament and the Council, with the participation of the Commission, to determine which of the proposals advanced might lead to an agreement and so to a joint declaration.

Mr President, I should like to remind you of the clear and binding decisions taken by the European Council at Stuttgart, and in particular of paragraphs 2.3.6 and 2.3.3 of the Solemn Declaration on the European Union; the terms of the mandate concerning coopera-

tion must be considered binding as they lay down that 'the Council will enter into talks with the Parliament and the Commission', and for a very clear purpose: to improve the cooperation proposed in the Joint Declaration of 4 March 1975 and to extend its field of application within the framework of a new agreement. This means that there must be a considerable and emphatic overhaul of the present procedure and field of application as regards cooperation.

Further to this matter, if during its next session the Parliament examines and approves Mr De Pasquale's report on cooperation procedures, this will act as a basis for the discussions which could begin with a view to a new agreement on cooperation.

As regards the four resolutions on institutions, I would remind you that the European Council at Stuttgart asks for replies, as the text says, to 'resolutions concerning questions of major importance and wide-spread effect'; and there is no doubt that the resolutions which were the subject of last January's agreement fall clearly under this heading. You yourself, Mr Dankert, emphasized this plainly in the letter on this subject sent to the Council on 28 October last.

Minister, while I state again my dissatisfaction with your statement and reply, I request that the Council should at last shake off its regrettable inertia on this matter: that it should support our determination to reach a constructive conclusion and to create, by these instruments among others, the conditions for a more meaningful cooperation between the Institutions so that the Community may finally cease to stagnate in its present disturbing fashion.

**Mr Prag (ED).** — Mr President, I do not believe it is particularly useful to comment here on the course of the vital negotiations in Athens, except first to thank Mr Charalambopoulos for his unexpectedly detailed account and secondly to make clear the British negotiating position, because I find it is still so often misunderstood and misrepresented in this House. The United Kingdom is ready to consider an increase in own resources on two and only two conditions. The first is that there is a mechanism to limit the size of the net contributions of Member States. The second condition is that the rate of increase in agricultural expenditure should be brought under control and kept below the general rate of increase in spending. The United Kingdom has also presented a detailed paper on the development of new and existing Community policies. These, to my mind, are modest and reasonable aims.

I now turn to my main theme: the Stuttgart Declaration. If the Stuttgart Declaration is to mean anything, it can only be through the 10 governments applying with sincerity, speed and determination the principles and sentiments which it sets out.

## Prag

In paragraph 1(3) of the Declaration the Member States pledge themselves solemnly, in order to achieve ever-increasing solidarity and joint action, to more efficient decision-making procedures and greater coherence. If they really want these, then it is time they did what they promised to do namely, to enter into talks with the European Parliament and the Commission with the aim of improving and extending the scope of the conciliation procedure of 1975. That is the very first essential step towards breaking the log-jam of the Council's procedures — the log-jam of more than 350 Commission proposals on which the Council has failed to reach any decision. What is the Council waiting for? The preliminary work has been done, the Commission put forward nearly two years ago practical proposals for making the conciliation procedure work. The basis for discussion is there. This is not a minor matter, it is the acid test of the sincerity of the Member States over the whole Stuttgart document. Did they mean it or did they not? Will they set about implementing their promises, or will the Stuttgart Declaration remain, like so many other documents, a list of pious wishes to moulder in half-forgotten files and become dog-eared relics, material for future researchers who will wonder at our national particularism, our incompetence, our lack of imagination, our inability to transform our Community with all its promise into an effective instrument of policy at home and on the world scene?

We cannot accept that this economic giant should remain a political dwarf. We have been marking time for far too long, Mr President. If the Greeks of Athens and Sparta had behaved as the Council of Ministers, and in particular the Greek Presidency, are now doing, the city states would have been overwhelmed by Persia and western civilization, as we know it, would have been overwhelmed almost before it began. If the governments mean business and do not like our proposals, let them transform their own brave words ...

**Mr Fanti (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President of the Council, I would like to thank the Greek Presidency for the work done over these months not just in calling the numerous meetings of the various Councils but also in presenting a series of proposals in the search for common ground and agreement.

However, Mr President of the Council, we cannot conceal our very great concern at the fact that the recent meeting of the Special Council on the renewal of the Community, held in Athens from 9 to 11 November, ended in its turn without anything being done and in an atmosphere of great uncertainty and confusion; and once again, in the best traditions, the decisions have been held over to a further meeting of the Special Council scheduled to be held on the very eve of the European Summit in Athens on 6 December where a last-minute attempt will be made to reach a compromise position which will inevitably be an inglorious one.

We are concerned at the statements made by the various Ministers participating in the Council who, apart from the usual professional optimism, revealed the basic rifts and differences resulting from their inability to overcome the need to defend their own established interests; and as we had predicted, these negotiations were not Community negotiations but intergovernmental talks. Moreover, contrary to the initial statements, during these meetings we gained the clear impression that the proposals drawn up by the European Parliament on the problems which formed the subject of the negotiations were not taken into account at all.

This is why we wish to emphasize some basic points.

First of all, the invitation to the representatives of the Governments of the Ten to adhere strictly to the mandate given by the Stuttgart Summit concerning the preparations for global negotiations on the four basic aspects for the renewal of the Community which should certainly respect the legitimate interests of all the Member States but the outcome of which should confer a new and genuine vitality on the Community, providing it with new objectives.

In order to achieve this it is first of all essential to increase the relevant resources which, in our view, must not be less than 2 per cent of VAT if the renewal and enlargement of the Community is to be made credible. Secondly, in our opinion the undertakings given to finalize the European monetary system must be carried out. Both of these are preconditions for a genuine spirit of renewal at the European Summit.

The other point which we wish to put quite clearly is that we consider it absurd and counterproductive to find that among the measures suggested there is one which concerns limiting the budgetary powers of the European Parliament. When we hear the suggestion that expenditure should be planned on a multiannual basis we want to know exactly what this involves and we warn the Council that there could be extreme tension in relations between the Institutions if any consideration at all were given to this idea.

What can be done between now and 6 December? Last September the chairmen of the parliamentary Groups already drew the attention of the Council and the Commission to the great dangers which would result from the failure of this Summit.

I should like now to put a question. I wish to put it to the Council, the Commission and my parliamentary colleagues: before the Athens Summit opens, is it still possible to discuss face to face — at a meeting which could be one of our Parliament and of its Groups — the opportunity for finding common ground on the basis of the results of the negotiations which are being referred to the Heads of State or Government for their consideration.

**Fanti**

I think that we must all act together to ensure that we avoid any failure for the Community at the outcome of the Athens Summit.

**Mrs von Alemann (L).** — (DE) Mr President, Mr President of the Council, I have the honour to say a few words on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group on your statement of this morning. We are aware that the Greek summit in Athens at the end of 1983 implies a major responsibility. The citizens of the Community are expecting decisions to be taken, they are not waiting to hear whether there have been six or five Councils of Ministers. It is essential to prepare well for the meeting. This is not the time to discuss preparatory meetings any more but simply what must in fact be decided. These decisions have been pending too long and we cannot let the European public wait any longer for them. May I now make a few brief remarks on some specific points you raised this morning.

The European public is expecting these decisions to be on a scale that will finally put a halt to the stagnation of European policy. That can be done only by decisions on specific matters, not by another declaration. As my group's spokesman on transport policy, I would also like you to tell us when the Council of Transport Ministers — the proposal for a regulation has been before the Council since 1976 — will finally take the decision on transport infrastructure measures. That is a matter of detail and perhaps you will say that it does not form part of the actual mandate, Mr President of the Council; but unless these sectoral decisions are taken, your grand design will not succeed.

You are right to say that regional policy is one of the really big problems this Community must resolve; but here too one can but say that detailed decisions simply must be taken on the funds and investments and that declarations are not enough.

I was very disappointed, Mr President of the Council, that you did not discuss the question of enlargement with the accession of Spain and Portugal until you spoke to the oral questions on the subject by Mr Galuzzi and others and that you did not refer to it earlier in your general statement. When you say that this enlargement must take place rapidly, I say to you that I do not think the Spanish and Portuguese people will tolerate this kind of attitude much longer. It is not enough to say that the work on this matter is proceeding rapidly. All of us here in this House know how difficult it is to formulate a coherent economic policy. We understand the problem because we are working with it. But we do expect decisions to be taken.

Another question I wanted to raise was where the responsibility for the stagnation of European policy in fact lies. Next year we, directly elected Members will be going into the campaign for the next direct elec-

tions to stand as candidates for the second directly elected European Parliament. It will be our responsibility and duty as Members to say whose fault it is that this European policy is making no progress at present, for we all know that our future as citizens of this European Community depends on whether the Community is able to take decisions or not. It depends on whether we as Members of this Community can work together and take decisions. As election campaigners, as candidates and Members, we will have to say that the blame for the fact that we are not managing to get on lies not with the European Parliament nor with the Commission, but with the Council of Ministers and the European Council, Mr President of the Council. That is why I implore you on behalf of the European public and on behalf of my group: please make sure that decisions are taken in Athens. The time for preparatory Councils of Ministers is past. We need *decisions* to prove to the European public next year that some progress is being made in Europe.

The European public is very concerned; it can no longer see the point of all these Councils of Ministers. We ask you, in view of your great responsibility as Council authority, to see to it that these decisions are taken, for the European public is entitled to that. The Community is largely responsible for the good that has occurred in the world in the past years, but it will also have to answer for the fact that it is not moving ahead and the citizens of the Community are not seeing the forward-looking decisions for which we are all waiting. I call upon you to ensure that this Council in Athens takes decisions that will make it a real summit meeting!

**Mr Lalor (DEP).** — Mr President, I welcome the recent submission from the Commission outlining its correction of budgetary imbalances and indicating to Athens new criteria for calculating the distribution of Community expenditure among the Ten.

I was absolutely amazed at the extraordinary outburst from the Budgets Commissioner, Mr Tugendhat, by way of reaction to his own institution's recommendations. How could he come to accuse his own directorate-general of being responsible for cooking the books, or did his accusation come from his inside knowledge, from experience? They certainly did not cook an Irish stew. In recent weeks we have seen Ireland becoming the victim of the EEC; agricultural and fisheries payments have been halted and, in addition, our vital dairy industry now comes under threat from the super-levy. We cannot mutely stand by and see all that we have worked for in the past 10 years wiped out by short-sighted, selfish policies. We want convergence, not divergence. Let there be no doubt that freezing dairy production at its present level in Ireland would create an unacceptable situation for us, because 9% of our GNP comes, in fact, from milk production.

**Lalor**

The Treaty is quite explicit about the need to reduce differences between the developed and less-developed regions of the EEC, and while recently the Social Fund has honoured this need and proposes to give priority to less-developed regions, the latest proposals on the Regional Fund clearly demonstrate that there is no clear commitment to tackle this problem. The views of Parliament have been ignored. Only by concentrating the Regional Fund on the less-developed areas will the goals of the Treaty be realized, and I urge support for this and call for such a guarantee to be given. We certainly need to increase the Communities' own resources so as to develop both of those funds and so finally resolve our agricultural difficulties.

**Mr Blaney (CDI).** — Mr President, might I at the outset say that I welcome the contribution made by the Greek President-in-Office here today and regret that he was criticized rather than praised for the manner in which he had endeavoured to enlighten this House as to the intentions of the Presidency in the immediate future.

I was particularly taken with the manner in which he approached the whole scene so far as the common agricultural policy is concerned and, naturally, in the circumstances in which my country now finds itself *vis-à-vis* the proposals of the Commission, I was especially pleased to hear him mention that Ireland was being considered with a view to alleviating the undoubted disaster that will befall us if the proposals, as they have been made, should be put through.

On the CAP in general and the monies, there is no doubt that we do take by far the greater part of it, but it is untrue to say, as is believed, that 67 % is projected to be spent from the entire budget next year. That is a phoney figure and one which includes items that rightfully belong in the accountancy books to other headings. The actual figure on a true accounting of what the CAP will cost in 1984, on the proposals we have already got, is 43 % and not 67 %.

Having said that, might I say that I agree with those who feel that we are bumping off the ceiling, that we are in bad need of further own resources. I am heartened by the British speaker just now who gave a clear indication that his country is not against raising the VAT ceiling but that two conditions must apply. The first is that increases in agricultural production should be controlled, and the second is that the net contribution of Member States should be sorted out. I could not agree more with him on that. I implore the Presidency here today to ensure that there is a proper assessment of what the benefits are — not just what a country has paid into the accounts as its share of the VAT and what it has directly got out, but what it has reaped indirectly as a result of its trading with other countries, within the Community and particularly

outside the Community under special international agreements such as GATT.

This is where the fat is really being creamed off, not by the poorer countries that can be shown to be getting much more than they are putting in, but by the larger countries that are sending their manufactured goods freely into third countries, while in return the farming community is being crucified as a result of the imports of agricultural produce such as cereal substitutes that we do not need and have got to send abroad thereafter at a great loss to the Community budget. These are the things we need to look at when we talk about who is getting what out of this Community.

In my estimation and in view of all the circumstances, we are spending perhaps enough money at the moment on milk, but it is badly distributed. This whole idea of flat across-the-board increases is wrong in every way. Added to the MCAs in the better-off countries, the low inflation rates in those same better-off countries, the cheap feed that is coming in to those better-off countries, the higher prices that they are obtaining for their milk produce have contributed to the creation of the milk lakes, the butter mountains and so forth. It is not the fault of small countries such as mine, which accounts for only 4 1/2 % of all the milk produced in the entire Community. A 2 % increase in Germany's milk production equals the total production of my country; they are getting a higher price for it, they are paying lower sums for their feed and everything is in their favour. We ourselves have been responsible by inducing such countries to produce more and more, and now we are trying to lock the stable door after the horse has bolted.

I would appeal, then, to the presidency to recognize that we need the MCAs dismantled — and fast; that we want an immediate and very definite curtailment of the imports of cereals and cereal substitutes and that we want price support for our farmers, whether in milk or otherwise, to be on a differentiated basis; to those who need it most should go the most, rather than a flat increase which in one country may mean an increase of 2 or 3 % in real terms and, for instance, in my country a reduction of 10 % in real terms. I believe we can curtail the spending, we can satisfy those who criticize what is being spent by doing it better, redistributing it more fairly and making it more transparent that those who need our help are getting it and those who do not need it are getting less of it.

**Lord Douro (ED).** — Mr President, almost exactly one year ago this House adopted a resolution, almost unanimously, calling for the accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community as soon as possible. It is sad to realize that at that time, only a year ago, we still



**Douro**

thought that the entry date of 1 January 1984 was still possible.

However, much has happened in the last year. As the President-in-Office told us this morning, there has been progress on certain chapters, but it is clear now that the Council will not make a decision on enlargement until the whole question of own resources is decided. That is, unfortunately, inevitable because the exhaustion of own resources means that we cannot contemplate two additional countries until we have more revenue-raising ability for the Community. The exhaustion of own resources has therefore delayed enlargement. Those who, like me, are so much in favour of seeing Spain and Portugal join the Community should also remember that one of the reasons that enlargement has been delayed is the enormous increases in agricultural expenditure which have brought about the exhaustion of own resources.

Mr President, we certainly want to see decisions in Athens. We want to see decisions on the control of common agricultural policy expenditure; we want to see a long-term solution to the unacceptable situation in which the United Kingdom finds itself; we want to see a decision on the increase in own resources and, most importantly, we do want to see in Athens a decision in principle to conclude the negotiations with Portugal and Spain as soon as possible so that the deadline of 1 January 1986, which both the Portuguese and Spanish Governments have committed themselves to, can be met by the Community. I very much hope that the President-in-Office will use his influence at the Athens Summit to achieve this result.

**Mrs Weber (S).** — (DE) Mr President, the European Community bears some responsibility for the European and worldwide worsening of environmental conditions and it is time it took that responsibility just as seriously as all the others. The Europeans do not want a Sunday-best Europe of lofty speeches and summit meetings but one that solves their everyday problems; after its great declarations at the Stuttgart summit, if the Council is really concerned with protecting the environment, then it must not simply give its specialised ministers homework to do but must ascertain at its own meeting what has been done to respond to great demands with truly great deeds.

What has become of the only instrument of preventive environmental policy, the environmental compatibility checks? What progress has been made in combatting cross-frontier atmospheric pollution and the death of the forests? Will 1986 finally see the introduction of lead-free petrol in this Community? Why does the Council not call for the question of the cross-frontier carriage of dangerous waste to be settled as soon as possible?

Question upon question. Environmental policy must be a firm component of all European summits. But

these Olympic gatherings must not just use it to pat their own backs. This policy must penetrate into every hamlet of all the 270 million citizens of this Community, for protection of the environment is one of their elementary needs and the summit debates must take account of their concerns.

**Mrs Ewing (DEP).** — Mr President, while it is not possible, of course, to prove this, I believe — in common, I think, with many Members of this House — that the decision on the part of Spain and Portugal to follow a democratic road post-Franco was partly influenced by the existence of this Community and by the fact that all the parties fighting in the new democracies in Spain and Portugal wished to enter this Community. I feel that this was a factor in what must be one of the most important events of our lifetime — the fact that these two countries, which were dictatorships, are now democracies.

However, I would like to say, in common with other speakers — I think Ms Clwyd mentioned it — that the stop/go policy we seem to have adopted with regard to these two countries has caused very bitter disappointments. I visited Spain and met politicians from all parties there and also met Portuguese politicians and parties. They feel very disillusioned and are really beginning, I think, to doubt the sincerity of the welcome that was extended, or apparently extended. As has been said, enthusiasms can wane.

What concerns me, as a Member with some problems about enlargement — notably on the fishing front — is that the stop/go policy has been accompanied by a considerable lack of information to Members of this House. Questions to the Council on matters relating to enlargement, such as my questions about fishing, very often get bland, non-detailed answers. We heard today from the President that encouraging statements have been made about fishing. Well, that is fine, but could we not please know what they are? Or are we to fall back on reading about the details of the negotiations on the stumblingblocks, of which fishing is one — there are many others? Are we to depend on our reading of press articles? After all, many MEPs here were elected by a million electors — I myself have a much smaller electorate than that — and when one considers that, surely we are entitled to be abreast of the details of what is holding up the negotiations.

So I would ask, seriously, that instead of making encouraging statements and giving encouraging assurances, we get down to the nitty-gritty of the thing, such as the fact that there is no room for the Spanish fleet — two and a half times the size of the UK fleet — in the North Sea. Could we not discuss a proposition put by Mr Cheysson when he was Commissioner, and by myself and many others in Lomé, that the natural route is a new partnership with the Lomé West African countries that are thirsting for joint

**Ewing**

ventures, for guidance, for financial guidelines? Surely that kind of detail is what we are entitled to.

Lastly, can we have a likely date for the accession of Spain and Portugal?

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (GR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as you will have noticed I went into quite a lot of detail in my speech this morning, and this was on account of the fact that the Greek Presidency attaches great importance to the Athens Summit because a successful outcome at that meeting will establish the conditions for launching the Community on a new course. I have listened to all the speakers with great interest. They have exhibited real concern, and rightly so because the Community is in a state of crisis and there are very serious problems which have to be tackled. There is general assent concerning the existence of this crisis although the sides differ in the emphasis they give to its various aspects. All are agreed that the Community is passing through a crisis and that problems do exist, and all will have to demonstrate appropriate concern and a preparedness to make certain sacrifices and compromises in the search for common ground for solutions to the major problems we are faced with.

As you know, the Greek Presidency has had a particularly onerous task and carried a special responsibility since the Stuttgart Summit. It was the recognition that the Community is passing through a crisis, and that ways must be found of overcoming its problems so that it can embark on a new course, that led the European Council at that meeting to make provision for the special Councils.

The Greek Presidency has been very glad, during its term of office, to shoulder the additional duty of taking on the special as well as the ordinary Council meetings with their marathon discussions — because these Councils really do go on and on for hour after hour and whole days at a time. The sixth and most recent of the special Councils took place in Athens between 9 and 12 November and followed up the five which preceded it with discussion on the four main subjects to which I had the honour of referring you in my speech this morning.

All the institutions are fully conversant with the situation. The Commission has a much sharper first-hand awareness of the difficulties facing the Community, but the European Parliament is following the situation with close concern as well, and it is clear from what all of its factions have said today that it wholeheartedly endorses the view that common ground must be established and that it is incumbent on all the countries of the Community to make the compromises which are necessary for the finding of a solution.

The four subjects referred to are basically the most important ones. If, after the discussions at the special

and general Councils, at the informal Foreign Ministers' Councils, and at the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers due at the end of this month to prepare the ground for the Summit Conference and, in a sense, set it in motion, there is a full awareness of the gravity of the Community's predicament, then, I say, we can be optimistic. At this moment, although so many months have gone by and only three weeks remain, I am neither optimistic nor pessimistic. I have, at any rate, ascertained that everyone recognizes the difficult reality. The Greek Presidency is doing everything it can to lead us to a solution but, as you appreciate, ladies and gentlemen, it is not a matter of how the Greek Presidency, or any other presidency, handles these various complex subjects, but how the Member States themselves face up to them. Hence, regardless of what the Greek Presidency or any other presidency does, it is up to the 10 Member States, in full awareness of the gravity of the situation to make whatever compromises are necessary for the establishment of common ground.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I want to thank all those of you who have spoken and all who had the patience this morning to listen to my speech which, though informative, did not prejudice the outcome. Let us all hope that logic and political will win the day, and that the Member States, rather than just going through the motions, actually have the courage to make such compromises as will lead the Community on to a new course.

(Applause)

**IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER***Vice-President*

**President.** — The debate is closed.

(Parliament decided to take an early vote on the two motions for resolutions to wind up the debates)

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

**7. CAP**

**President.** — The next item is the debate on the report (Doc. 1-987/83) by Mr Curry, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on

the communications from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-645/83 — COM(83) 500 final) on the common agricultural policy: Commission proposals. Included in the debate will be the following oral questions with debate:

— by Mr Papaefstratiou and others (Doc. 1-950/83) to the Council:

Subject: Measures to assist farmers in countries facing particularly complex problems

**President**

In view of the fact that for the 1983/1984 marketing year the Commission has put forward inadequate farm price proposals representing a rise of less than 7 %, the minimum rate allowed under Articles 39 et seq. of the Treaty of Rome, and that it is both necessary and fair to introduce specific measures to help farmers in countries with high rates of inflation, can the Council of Ministers say what measures it intends to take :

- a) to eradicate the wide disparities between the incomes of farmers in the various Member States ;
- b) to implement specific development programmes in mountain and hill farming areas and problem areas in general and in the Mediterranean areas of the Community in particular ;
- c) to bring agricultural prices in Greece into line with those in the rest of the Community at the same time as reducing or abolishing the transitional period ;
- d) to grant Greek farmers certain subsidies and aids to enable them to meet the substantial rise in their production costs ?

— by Mr Sutra and others (Doc. 1-955/83) to the Commission :

Subject : Vignerons Occitans

The producer group 'Les Vignerons Occitans', which sells some of the wine produced in the South of France to the United Kingdom, has suffered substantial losses as the result of the bankruptcy of its buyer.

Surprisingly, the British Government has retained the customs duties paid by 'Les Vignerons Occitans' even though the goods have not been paid for.

In such cases, should not the British Government be obliged to reimburse duties levied on goods that have not been paid for? The losses incurred through the unnecessary payment of duties amount to more than quadruple the value of the product lost.

Is it conceivable in a Europe supposedly allowing the free movement of goods, for wine growers who venture to sell their product in the United Kingdom to risk losing a total amounting to five times the value of the product of a year's labour ?

Does the Commission think it normal that the buyer should have demanded payment of duties by the supplier in advance ?

Does the Commission intend to see that the United Kingdom reimburses the duties to the

producer group, which did not owe them and which has lost everything ?

Does the Commission intend to bring up with the United Kingdom the fact that certain of its traders demand the advance payment of customs duties, arguing that these have to be paid when the goods are cleared through customs whereas the buyer refuses to pay them before receiving possession of the goods ?

— by Mr Antoniozzi (Doc. 1-959/83) to the Commission :

Subject : Community aid for olive oil

Having regard to the alarming reports now circulating that Community aid for olive oil is to be greatly reduced, can the Commission :

1. provide precise information on the initiatives in progress, which should at all events abide by the philosophy that inspired the establishment of a system of Community aid for olive oil,
2. undertake a thorough analysis of the world market in oils and fats and its development in the medium term,
3. ensure that the objectives embodied in the system currently in force and the economic and social considerations underlying it are adhered to,
4. provide an effective and well-founded assessment of the current and long-term cost to the Community, having regard to prices and inflationary forces.

**Mr Curry (ED), rapporteur.** — Mr President, we in the Committee on Agriculture have the sensation of having undertaken a long voyage around the CAP. Now we have the feeling that perhaps the harbour is in sight but all around that harbour there are rocks and shoals. Will we get the boat into the haven or will we run it aground on the rocks and let the wreckers carry off the pieces? Those are the issues which are at stake over the next few months.

Nobody can pretend any longer that the crisis is a mere mirage. We know that in 1983 there is no money left. We know that 1984 must bear the carry-overs from this year. We know that there is going to be a very large expansion in American plantings in 1984, and that the consequences of an abundant southern hemisphere harvest may well weigh on the market. We know that the Community must balance its books and that it cannot borrow. And we know that politically it would be dangerous for agriculture to try to raid other funds to make good its deficit. The committee recognizes this explicitly in its statement that CAP spending over a reasonable period must not outrun the growth in Community resources.

## Curry

Even if new money were made available tomorrow, because of the need for ratification in 10 parliaments, it would take two years before the first penny-piece tinkled into the coffers. Therefore, we must live through 1984 in the shadow of an imminent crisis. In these circumstances, radical change is required, and the Committee on Agriculture has proposed radical changes. What's this? Radical changes from the Committee on Agriculture? Can that be possible? It is possible. It has happened. The Committee on Agriculture is challenging the *status quo* at every turn. It is challenging it by calling for an end to the unlimited guarantee in areas of permanent surplus, this to be done by applying ceilings on output. It is challenging it by asking for renegotiation of the whole series of international agreements within the context of our international obligations relating to imports of protein and energy into the Community for use in animal feeds. There is a substantial body in the Committee on Agriculture which believes that these imported products form the raw materials upon which the surpluses are based, thus creating the need for their subsequent export. The committee also challenges the *status quo* as it affects the monetary situation — the dislocation of the markets caused by the existing disharmony in economic development.

How does one go about it? How does one get control of agricultural spending? There are two basic routes. The first route is via prices. Cut prices; let the market sort out the efficient from the inefficient; let the market apply the pressures to be more efficient. In other words, let the sword smite the just and the unjust equally.

The other route is the route of quotas. Limit output directly; act quickly. The cost, inevitably, will be additional bureaucracy, additional control and a loss of flexibility in structures. The Commission, faced with these two essential options, has come out quite clearly for quotas, and for one clear reason. It believes that pressure applied exclusively through prices would simply wipe out a whole layer of small farmers throughout the Community with the consequent damage to the social, regional and economic structures of large parts of the Community — possibly, larger parts of the Community than many people realize. It is a call for quotas not merely in the dairy sector but for products which are in persistent surplus. This is a radical formulation of a solution to our problems.

But although it is a radical formulation, Mr President, it is a radicalism which draws its strength from a sense of continuity — continuity in a recognition of the importance of the CAP as a social policy, a policy which sponsors economic development, and a recognition of the need to maintain the essential principles which have sustained the CAP through the years. It is continuity in our recognition of the obligations placed

upon us in respect of farm incomes. It is continuity in particular in the importance we place on the traditional family farm and upon those regions with special difficulty, with a very heavy dependence upon agriculture or whose contribution to the national economic wealth is of particular importance in the agricultural sector. And it is continuity also, Mr President, in our recognition of the importance of putting the Community's food export policy on a firm and coherent basis so as to play a legitimate role in an open and orderly competition for world markets.

The committee recognizes the need for greater Community resources in the context of a more harmonious and a more vigorous Community economic development. But we recognize that if we are going to embark on this policy, then there are things about which we need to be certain. We need to be certain that the disciplines will be equal, will be seen to be equal, and will be enforced equally. There must not be one Europe where the farmer is subject to the vigorous enforcement of the letter of the law and another Europe of permissive — either deliberate or by neglect — administrative connivance in the breach of the law. And we have the right to ask of the Commission in its proposals for quotas what machinery it envisages for the enforcement and the surveillance of those policies, because in its documents I see nothing which comforts me in the belief that it is going to preside with equal and impartial vigour over the implementation of those proposals.

Now, Mr President, these decisions are needed urgently. They are needed urgently because the whole Community needs it. No international body can operate on the basis of being one cheque away from receivership. It is required because our international partners require it. They need to know the shape and the balance and the form of the policies which are part of our international relations. The trade needs to know it so that they can create and hold the markets upon which the producer is dependent; we must remember the role of this Community as one of the world's great trading blocs, and there is no reason why food should not be as legitimate a part of that trade as any other product. The citizens of this Community require it because this Community is supposed to be a guarantee of their future and not an echo of their past. And the farming community needs it because they feel besieged, they feel attacked and they are asking constantly, what is going to happen to us? They need the reassurance that they will not be regarded as criminal for exploiting a system made freely available to them and that they will have a clear perspective on where the future lies.

Finally, Mr President, I wish to make an appeal to this Parliament. It is quite possible that everybody will find in the report as it is finally voted something they do not like. When you get such a complex document — such a complex series of proposals as this — it is

## Curry

almost inevitable that there will be bits which we like and bits that we do not like, but I would like to ask my colleagues to do all they can to support a voice of this Parliament in this great matter. We face as a Community the twin challenges of the reform of the budget and the changes in the CAP. These twin tracks of decision are going to decide the direction of this Community over the next several years. We can either be spectators of the decisions taken by other people or we can seek to be participants in the formulation and the implementation of these policies. I did not come into this Parliament in order to be a spectator of the world's arena, I wish to be a participant and I would hope that my colleagues will find it possible at the end of the day to support this report and not merely for what it says, but in doing so to assert that they, as parliamentarians, wish to exercise that historic role of parliamentarians and to play a part in the shaping of the future of the Community which we have the honour to represent.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Louwes (L), draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Budgets.** — (NL) Mr President, as you say, I am speaking this afternoon on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, and I should like briefly to explain the amendments I have tabled on the committee's behalf.

The principal object of these amendments is to regain control over expenditure on the common agricultural policy by improving the effectiveness of the market organizations and by reducing expenditure on aid and premiums which do not, or no longer, accord with the aims of the policy.

The opinion my committee has forwarded to the Committee on Agriculture explains this in detail. I should like to place particular emphasis on some of the salient points made in this opinion. Firstly, the Committee on Budgets points out that the present situation is the consequence of the Council's failure to make the economies which the Commission has been recommending for years. The Council, not the Commission, is principally to blame. Nor would I say, in passing, that Parliament is completely blameless in this respect, since it has been inclined to pay greater attention to price increases than to suitable control measures.

This is not to say that we have no criticism to make of the Commission and its proposals. For example, the restrictive price policy seems very cohesive on paper, but in practice recent years have seen doubts arise as to whether it is on the whole politically and socially feasible. An assessment is impossible in the absence of reliable information on the actual effect the proposals have had on farm incomes. And yet a restrictive price policy at present seems to be the only way of achieving a genuine reduction in structural overpro-

duction. But the Commission should then supplement its general statements with specific data, and it must not delay this until the annual marathon debate on prices, when, as we know, the long-term solutions often remain in the background.

As regards the administration of markets, the Committee on Budgets says that the automatic nature of a number of arrangements does not allow a flexible reaction to developments in the market situation. The attitude of the Council, which takes many of the decisions on administration itself or through the management committees, has a similarly adverse effect on the implementation of the agricultural policy.

There is an extremely urgent need for the Community to develop efficient decision-making mechanisms that permit a rapid response to market trends. The Commission must be put in a position to perform this task, and it must be able to make full use of the administrative and implementing powers conferred on it by the Treaty. To be specific, Mr President, this means that existing market organizations which confer such powers on the Council should be changed.

As regards the aids and premiums I mentioned just now, I merely want to say this: this kind of aid and the amounts earmarked for this purpose have risen sharply in recent years, replacing export refunds as the largest item of EAGGF expenditure.

To conclude, a few words on the financial guidelines the Commission has included in its proposals. The Commission proposes measures of a procedural nature which I will not repeat here owing to a shortage of time. My committee believes, however, that, in constitutional and budgetary terms, these proposals give the impression that they have not been thought out properly. They would give the Council, of whatever Ministers, power of its own and independence, they would detract from the principle of the annuality of the budget, and they would probably undermine Parliament's budgetary powers. We feel this is completely unnecessary and that it is enough for the members of the Council to realize quite simply that there can be no spending if there are no budgetary resources and that it is not just the Council but the budgetary authority which provides the budgetary resources.

Mr President, as my time is limited, I refer the House to my opinion for further explanations.

To conclude, I will just say this: we have not considered the merits of the implementing measures. Nor is it our intention to attack or remove the principles and objectives of the common agricultural policy. On the contrary: we want it retained, but that will only be possible if we can bring costs under control, monitor implementation closely and effectively and restrict uncontrolled growth. That is the right course of action for the economic giant that is our Community, with its great responsibility towards the rest of the world.

**Mr Collins (S)**, chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. — Mr President, I have listened very attentively to the two speeches that we have heard so far from the rapporteur and chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the rapporteur from the Committee on Budgets. It has been quite remarkable that neither speaker, unless I misheard, has paid very much attention to the 270 odd million people in the European Community who are sometimes known as 'consumers'.

There is a well-known English language textbook in social administration entitled *Blaming the Victim*, in which it is argued that the poor and the disadvantaged are frequently in the end blamed by society for their very poverty and for their enforced squalor. When I read the proposals for reforming the common agricultural policy, I am reminded of the general thrust of that book. Many consumers right across the Community see the common agricultural policy and the way that it has been operated over the past several years as exacerbating the systematic pillage and rape of the hedgerows, the copses, the interesting and attractive parts of the countryside, as well as the ecologically valuable elements of the countryside. In addition, many consumers have seen prices rise and rise every year as we struggle to maintain the dwindling incomes of small family farmers. In effect, what we have done over a good many years is to force a kind of back-door food-tax on consumers right across Europe.

The result has been that the mistress or master of the house is every week forced hard up against the ceiling of their own hard-pressed resources as they struggle to do their weekly shopping. Then, just at the point where this profligacy reaches its zenith, when the money is all but exhausted, when countryside and consumer alike are drained and worn down, the bailing out begins. Apparently, it begins with an attack on the very consumer who has been a victim of the system in the past several years.

The oils and fats tax is a classic example. Consumers have been forced to give up their butter because they cannot afford it any more, and have turned to margarine because it is cheaper and in many ways healthier as well. But the Commission comes along and says, but we want to sell our butter, to get rid of our butter mountain. One way of doing that is to tax incoming oils and fats and thus force up the price of margarine. That will not necessarily reduce the butter mountain, but what it will do is to reduce still further the nutritional value of the diet of very many people right across the Community: the victim, in fact, has been blamed yet again by the Community.

My committee has had a great many reservations about the proposals. We are unhappy about quotas and levies and so on, because we think this may simply mean increased production as farmers struggle to maintain their already dwindling income so. We are in favour of price restrictions and of direct aids to

income (which do not figure in these proposals). We are in favour of family farms, of keeping people on the land, of looking after the countryside and the consumer alike, but we do not see these figuring as high priorities in the Commission's proposals. Frankly, we do not see them being debated as high priorities in Parliament either.

Fundamentally, we believe there will be no solution to the common agricultural policy and no solution to the crisis of the Community either until it is recognized that it is not a farm policy which we need at all, not an agricultural policy, but a food policy. We need a food policy for our consumers, and we believe that mere tinkering with quotas and levies and all the other instruments that have been produced will achieve only short-term relief from what will, in the long term, be disaster and collapse.

**Mr Woltjer (S)**. — (NL) Mr President, the present European agricultural policy is clearly bankrupt. Present costs are to be met in the future, stocks are rising to unprecedented levels, and prices cannot be raised further in 1984 to meet any increases there may be in farmers' costs. The unlimited price guarantees, against which I have been protesting in this Parliament in every possible way for the last four years, have finally taken their toll. We obviously cannot go on like this. While we were still saying a year ago that the agricultural policy must not be determined solely by the budgetary aspects, we must realize that the only determining factor now is the financial consequences of the proposals, in the short term at least. The other aims of the policy, such as reasonable incomes for farmers, fair distribution of the advantages and disadvantages of the CAP, more thought for employment in agriculture, greater care of the countryside and the environment and, last but not least, better animal welfare and an improvement in the quality of the food supplied to the consumer, are in danger of being increasingly overlooked. Growing renationalization of the CAP is threatening to swamp the Community. Accusations are now flying back and forth. 'It's not our fault: our farmers produce less than the average,' cries one Member State. 'We have always had to import milk,' claims another. And no one wants to accept responsibility, joint responsibility for this situation. Soya beans from America are suddenly seen by many as responsible for everything, and those who use them are looked at askance. Is the Dutch farmer, for example, really to blame? We taught him, after all, to produce as efficiently as possible. Has he broken the law? Has he failed to abide by the present policy? We would do better to look at each other and to review the situation.

Mr President, in the present situation I find it difficult to stand here as a victor and cry: 'I have been warning this could happen for years.' As long ago as 1974 I was saying that the agricultural policy must be revised if all this misery was to be avoided. My group

**Woltjer**

submitted proposals to the Commission. Barbara Castle, Edgar Pisani and many other colleagues and I myself proposed a solution. My group made an almost impassioned plea at the time for measures to tackle overproduction as a way of saving the common agricultural policy and preventing the farmers from hitting the Community's financial ceiling with a mighty roar. But the results were meagre. The Plumb report was the outcome. The majority of my group voted for it at the time because it was at least a step forward. The Liberal and Democratic Group and the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the other hand, voted against with a wry face, it should be noted, because the report referred to a global quantum policy. As world market prices rose, the Plumb report was then quickly cast aside, and in the Committee on Agriculture it was shelved as a youthful sin committed by a new-born Parliament, after which a modest silence had to be maintained.

Last year, Mr President, the Commission, still full of grit, was saying that the administration of the CAP was now in good hands and that it was convinced agricultural expenditure, averaged over a number of years, would rise less steeply than own resources. I am not saying that the Commission deliberately painted a false picture of the situation, but only last week the Court of Auditors, obeying instructions issued at the Stuttgart summit, gave the lie to these remarks by the Commission. Waste, inadequate administration and unrestricted use of European money are words that can easily be found in this report from the Court of Auditors. Thus this report too shows that a reform of the agricultural policy is urgently needed and that agricultural expenditure must be brought under effective control in the future.

In this connection, I should also like to draw the attention of the Committee on Budgets to the conclusion drawn by the Court of Auditors that the normative nature of the agricultural budget must now be accepted once and for all, so that the Agriculture Ministers no longer have the right to make unlimited increases in agricultural expenditure without regard for the budgetary authority.

The new proposals now before us are clear-cut. One proposal concerns a quota system for milk, a reduction in the prices of cereals, the collection of the considerable amounts of money that have been given to various Member States during the price negotiations in recent years and, last but not least, a margarine levy that will cost the consumer 1 500 m guilders. Unfortunately, this last point appears to have been overlooked by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, since it is not mentioned in its conclusions.

We know what the reactions have been to the proposals the Commission made in July. A heavy rumbling from the Member States indicated that the storm had struck. The international press reported the threat of a

US veto. COPA, on the other, has so far remained silent. Does it only spring into action, I ask COPA in this situation, when price increases are under discussion, and does it not realize that the reorganization of the agricultural is also a matter that concerns COPA? I at least cannot see the reason for this silence.

I should like to look rather more closely at some aspects of the Commission's proposals. First — and this will come as no surprise — the proposed quota system. My group supports this proposal but would also like to see flexibility built into the system so that small farmers and underprivileged areas — and this also concerns my Irish colleagues — are given some margin within the overall production quota.

We are pleased to see that the majority of the Committee on Agriculture has now approved this amendment. We have also provided clear evidence of our political will to reach compromises by agreeing to support the amendment tabled by Mr Bocklet.

The majority of my group — and I now come to the second point — have opposed a tax on oils and fats on many occasions in the past. I therefore believe that this aspect of the report needs to be changed. I consequently call on the Christian-Democratic Group to agree to compromise with us on this point in the same spirit of cooperation that prevailed when we were discussing the introduction of the quota system. There is a danger, as the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has pointed out, that Parliament will be left out in the cold if we vote against each other's proposals. I feel we must avoid that, because this is very important for Parliament's prestige with the public, which has declined substantially since the last debate on prices.

Thirdly, the MCAs. A proposal for the revaluation of the green ECU to the level of the strongest currency is doing the rounds in the Council at the moment. I would point out that this in particular can have very serious repercussions for the consumer, particularly in countries with weaker currencies. To summarize, I feel I must say that the Curry report now before us is an important report and may play a significant part in saving Parliament's prestige. I appeal to everyone who is positively disposed towards this report to ensure that a final solution is found this week and that it is adopted by a large majority.

**Mr Ligios (PPE).** — *(IT)* Mr President, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party I should like to make some comments on the renewal of the European Economic Community and more particularly on some technical aspects which might make it difficult to take the necessary political decisions which lie at the very heart of the idea of renewal of the Community which has been discussed so extensively during the last few months as a result of the Stuttgart mandate and in the light of the meeting of the European Council in Athens in December.

## Ligios

The political will to overcome the paralysis which has for years marked the Community's attempts to construct Europe can be evinced first of all by establishing priorities which are clear and comprehensible to the public and not just to those directly involved. First of all, the negotiations must be global in the widest sense of being relevant and balanced. Secondly as is, I think, unanimously agreed, the present Community policies must be revised. The aim of this revision must be to make them more effective and equitable so as to facilitate progress towards integration. It will be so much the better if budget savings can be made, as long, however, as this is done without any prejudice to what has already been achieved. It is utopian and politically short-sighted to think that new policies can be implemented by cutting back expenditure on present policies. The problem of increasing own resources can, therefore, no longer be avoided. New measures and new policies must be implemented with the aim of creating new European industrial technologies and research, promoting investment and employment and making business competitive once more. The imbalances created by the CAP are known to all and can be corrected as long as there is no insistence on maintaining the privileged positions which have built up over the years and which, in my opinion, have far exceeded the hopes of the beneficiaries themselves. To put it very simply, I think that the breeders and milk producers, to give one example, had absolutely no idea at all that they would be able to continue to pillage a large slice of Community resources for so many years. I should like to draw the attention of my colleagues to Document 80/800 drawn up by the Commission, I think, in the December of 1980. It exposes the distorting effect of the CAP through a faultless analysis which no-one has contested. In practice it is stated and shown, with figures to prove it, that it is the rich farmers of the Community who receive more aid than their poorer counterparts within the same region. And it is stated also that the farmers in the richest areas who have received more aid from the common agricultural policy than those in the poorest and most disadvantaged.

These two examples, Mr President, demonstrate the distorting effect of the common agricultural policy. These effects must be corrected without further delay. And first of all those regulating mechanisms which lead to the creation of structural surpluses must be abolished wherever and whenever they are identified.

As regards enlargement, the EPP Group maintains the principle that the economic cost of accession — which does exist and is considerable — must be sustained equally by the whole Community society and not just by the farmers and, even worse, by the farmers in the poorest and most disadvantaged areas of the Community. And finally there must be a fairer distribution between the resources which the Commu-

nity allocates to guaranteeing markets and those allocated to structures in the widest sense of the term.

The development policy for the Community's poorest regions does indeed require greater resources which should be allocated not just exclusively towards modifying the agricultural sector, as has been the case until now, but should be used increasingly to further harmonious and balanced development and take account of all the sectors which could be exploited. That is, priority must be given to integrated projects which lead to closer involvement of the country concerned and the people who will benefit from the aid.

However, some important basic principles of the common agricultural policy cannot be omitted. First of all, farmers' income must be protected and maintained equally, independently of the type of farming. It is no longer acceptable to defend the Community principle under which the producers of meat, milk, sugar and cereals, which are the typical products of the strong regions, should receive greater protection than producers in the South, on the spurious justification that Northern products have greater food value for human beings.

Wine and olive oil producers are farmers of equal worth and rights with their more fortunate counterparts in the North. The rules for aid support may be discriminating, but the criterion for remuneration must be equal.

Even in the case where some products have a more detrimental effect on market balance than others, the conversion of agriculture must be accompanied by the proper incentives, so developing other productive sectors and not just abolishing those which exist.

These are the 'knots' which the Stuttgart mandate must 'untie'; The Commission proposals and the results so far obtained within the Council cannot be called encouraging. Everyone must make some sacrifices, but it is particularly those whose privileged position is made increasingly evident by the policy of cuts in agricultural expenditure who must be disabused.

Mr Curry's report, which we amended within the Committee on Agriculture, while not entirely in line with our own ideas for reforming the CAP which aim basically at a fresh balance between structures, products markets and farmers' incomes in the 10 countries, nevertheless represents a kind of compromise on the basic principles which should shape the decisions on the revision of the common agricultural policy.

However, the European Council still has a fair number of problems to solve concerning the right political direction to follow for the revision of the CAP as does the Commission, as it will have to make concrete proposals for sectors at market level on the basis of the overall plan for reforming the CAP.



### Ligios

The problem remains of how to find a fair and positive solution for monetary compensatory amounts, as they represent an obvious alteration of conditions of competition at the level of income, favouring farmers from countries with more advantages than ours.

The European Parliament is therefore alerting the Heads of State or Government who will meet in Athens that the reform of the CAP should not become the swansong of agriculture but should be a key moment for renewing the Community economy which has great need of clear, courageous and opportune action.

**Mr Provan (ED).** — Mr President, the background to this debate and the proposals from the Commission are well known, but bear repeating. All the figures available show and prove that agricultural expenditure is roaring ahead far faster than our own resources, and that these resources are now running out.

Over the last 10 years agricultural expenditure has grown by 500 % whilst resources have increased by only half that amount. In this last year — 1982-1983 — the picture has worsened. Agricultural expenditure is up 25 or 30 per cent whilst own resources are only up 9 % according to the very sound opinion of Mr Louwes of the Committee on Budgets. I am sorry to say that this has happened because of 10 taken by the Council and the European Parliament, where from year to year increased farm prices have been agreed with no reference whatsoever to budgetary consequences. All this is well-known, and my group has been warning Parliament for the last four and a half years. We have been supportive of the Commission most of the time when they have been trying to better the situation. We are all the more amazed therefore when we see such an overwhelming attack on some of the mechanisms of the CAP which are of benefit to the consumer in helping to reduce the surplus problems that face us as a Community, and to Britain in the form of butter subsidies, beef and sheep premiums in particular.

We are also amazed that the Commission has not come forward with proposals to tie agricultural prices to the budgetary costs involved. Where are the links requested by the Council at Stuttgart between agricultural prices and budgetary consequences? Should there not be proposals for announcing agricultural farm prices and the Commission budget at the same time? Should there not be proposals for strict financial guidelines with perhaps a three-year rolling average so that agriculture has some stability and so that farmers can have greater indication of any changes that may be taking place. Production cycles in farming are long; so should the financial guidelines for such an important industry also be. Should there not be procedures for Agriculture Ministers and the Council to acknowledge financial guidelines so that they can be kept within their budget allocation? These requests will have to be answered by the

Commission. If they are not, there is no chance of increasing own resources, and that must be a necessity if Europe is to move out of stagnation.

My group, in a global amendment to the Curry report, insists that growth of agricultural expenditure should be less than the growth in Community resources, and that once this is established, we will accept the need to increase own resources, in order to permit new policies.

We must make certain modification to the policy which has proved highly successful in achieving its aims and objectives over the twenty-year period of operation. We need greater sensitivity to market requirements. The CAP has shown itself to be interventionist and rigid, almost operating against the free market. All the aims of the CAP as defined in Article 39 of the Treaty are not necessarily compatible today and can be seen to be contradictory. Support prices alone cannot balance the market at a time of growing surplus and guarantee incomes. We therefore need several policy instruments to prevent and cure imbalances. We need threshold mechanisms and prices policy. For crisis management as we have in the milk sector at present, we also need, and we accept, some form of quota policy for a limited time. For the social consequences and the less-favoured areas we need a rejuvenated structural package and an agreed criteria for help to be granted to the smaller farmers and those operating in difficult conditions. The development of a rural policy coordinating agricultural, regional and social policies is an objective, especially in such areas as Ireland, Southern Italy, and mountainous areas such as much of my own country of Scotland.

Is producing food for the consumer at reasonable prices compatible with maintaining high farm prices compared to our competitors? Remember that the consumer is the farmer's best ally. Is it consistent to discriminate against efficient farms? I would submit that efficient farms need to be encouraged and not discriminated against. We must not allow ourselves to be overtaken by our competitors. We cannot stand still or bury our heads in the sand. Technology does not stand still, and we must keep adapting our production to changing circumstances. The energy crisis will return, and it is only efficient and modern farms in a modern industry that can be viable.

We do realize, however, that the CAP is very necessary for the development of Europe and is viewed as especially important in some of the rural areas. We need to maintain the margin of profit whilst reducing the overall price and the input costs together. That is what I mean by efficiency. Research and development is needed to guide the industry in that direction.

The suggestion from the Commission that an oils and fats tax is necessary is one of the real problems in their proposals. We believe that the consumer has a strong legitimate interest in seeking food at reasonable prices. We therefore totally reject this proposal. It

## Provan

must have come forward for purely budgetary reasons, to raise some cash. However, it could have untold consequences, and not only within the Community, because such a proposal could be the single issue on which a trade war could break out between ourselves and our friends from the United States. This would be a trade war that we would have no hope of winning and that would inflict tremendous damage on ourselves through retaliatory action from the other side of the Atlantic, and all to raise a little cash for the disposal of butter. This must not be allowed, and to tax competitive products to cure an ill in the milk sector will cause the consumers — some of whom are the poorest in our society — to react violently against the agricultural industry.

If my recall of history is correct, Mr President, it was taxation on basic foodstuffs that led to a king of France having his head chopped off. My group totally and utterly rejects any such tax proposal especially the one in the report before us where it is a tax only on imported oils in fact.

With regard to the cereals sector, my group accepts the need for thresholds, thus limiting the open-ended commitment that is currently in operation. The livestock sector has for too long been the poor relation of the cereal producer, and this has caused the imbalance we find in many areas of the Community. High prices encouraging monoculture of cereals for a guaranteed market has become a main reason for the exodus from the rural areas. High cereal prices have meant that fewer people are required to operate farms in the arable areas, whilst the high cereal prices have also meant in the less favoured areas that livestock production has suffered and, therefore, so has employment. Livestock producers need better access to intervention cereals, and I hope that this can be put right. Unless we put balance back into the cereals sector, we will also face tremendous budgetary consequences.

You will recall that in order to regain a market in Egypt the Commission last month increased by 10% the export refund on wheat flour. This shows graphically what could happen to the European budget if we do not act now. The PIK programme and drought in the USA have let us off the hook for the present, but massive increases in production next year could have severe consequences for the budget. We must recognize that protectionist measures inviting retaliation could destroy the CAP. We cannot afford that if we are serious about building Europe.

Let me draw to a conclusion. Calls for budget economies in agriculture are not new. The present calls are different because of the necessity for decisions to be taken. We must take decisions now rather than just examine the problem and hope that it might go away.

Let there be no doubt in this House that the whole of Britain — and I believe much of Europe — is behind

our Prime Minister in seeking a resolution to the problem of the budget and the agricultural policy. If we can achieve it, the CAP will survive as a stable policy for the future on which to build a strong, united and viable Europe.

**Mr Pranchère (COM).** — (FR) Mr President, the proposals for the reform of the CAP submitted by the Commission in preparation for the Athens Summit have been largely rejected by French farmers holdings and by their organizations. We support these protests. The Commission has approached the problem of agricultural policy reform solely from the budgetary point of view. It has, incidentally, been given a formidable hand in this at our budget part-session with the Scrivener ploy to put a thousand million ECU of EAGGF funds into reserve. To make a saving of two and a half thousand million ECU the Commission would like to slice off 15 % from the guarantees for producers. These savings would go towards preparations for the enlargement and the implementation of new common policies.

Well, we do not believe that the construction of Europe can be pursued at the expense of the peasants. And I have a word of warning for those who want to reduce agricultural expenditure. Do they really think that if the farmers go bankrupt this will induce the rest of the population to pursue more actively the new common policies? According to a recent poll 50 % of French farmers believe that the common market is detrimental to the interests of agriculture. It is a finding worth contemplating. It also confirms our own assessment which did much to dispel some of the illusions on the supposed benefits of the common market.

In actual fact, French agriculture is at present among the greatest victims of the CAP. The 13 % rate of Community aid it now receives is well below the 15 % or 20 % of the FRG and the UK, or the 30 % of the Netherlands, Denmark and Belgium. This is why we are against maintaining the CAP in its present shape, because it has imposed profound changes on our agriculture.

If the Commission's proposals were to be executed, their guarantee thresholds and their restrictive price policy would only worsen its plight. We reject this narrow budgetary approach which can only result in reducing agricultural output. Instead of a patching-up job and partial solutions, what the CAP needs today is a new dynamic: it should become much more of an agricultural and much less of a monetary policy. And that means no arbitrary ceilings on agricultural expenditure, which would be contrary both to the Community spirit and to the principle of financial solidarity.

The CAP today is in need of reform, but the reform must go in the right direction. First of all, it must be stood on its feet again, i.e. we must go back to the Community principles. This is an essential prelimi-

## Pranchère

nary, before any discussion of possible production targets can begin. It is because its foundations (uniform prices, Community preference, financial solidarity) have been shaken that the whole CAP structure is falling apart.

Take the example of milk, where the problems have the greatest urgency. No one will deny that the present imbalance is essentially due to the compensatory amounts, with all the distortion of competition they have entailed, and to the abandonment of Community preference in regard of imports of raw materials for the manufacture of cattle-feed. This has been to the benefit of the milk-processing factories, but to the disadvantage of the family farmer.

It must be said again, and said emphatically: the PAC should benefit the peasant farmer and not the agricultural industrialist. Nor had the policy been conceived to maintain soya prices or to find a use in Northern Europe's milk factories for the by-products of the American agri-foodstuffs industry...

A new dynamic for the CAP also means, and most importantly, asserting the EEC's exporting capability, even if this should lead us into a trade confrontation with the United States, into which they want to push us. But we must equip ourselves with the necessary means and instruments, such as long-term contracts, for instance.

The Committee on Agriculture's report takes account of our proposals to some extent. It rejects the Commission's restrictive price policy and demands that the objective method be respected; it is in favour of the observance of Community principles, of the dismantling of monetary compensatory amounts, of limiting imports, of strengthening the exports policy. But, on the eve of the Athens Summit, it opens treacherous paths in accepting the introduction of a quota system. We have, in fact, tabled a number of amendments to correct the report's deficiencies and errors. The peasant struggle, which we have supported and represented in this Assembly, has already succeeded in opening some interesting breaches, for the Commission has put forward a plan for the dismantling of monetary compensatory amounts, for a surtax on milk factories and for the taxation of oils and fats. It goes to show that resolute action brings its rewards in Brussels, as indeed elsewhere.

In fact, the die has not yet been cast, either in Brussels or Athens. We should make the most of the Commission's concessions, first, so that the Council will take them into account, but also to widen the breaches in order to improve the incomes of family farmers and to secure the progress of agriculture by exploiting all its potential.

In my country, after seven consecutive years of falling incomes, we have begun to redress the balance and to help French agriculture out of the mire into which it had been sunk by governments of the Right. It is a

long-term task and we are not prepared to see Brussels undermining the efforts being made in France.

This is why we want decentralization and why we call for readjustment of Community regulations, because over-centralized and bureaucratized administrations find them difficult to apply. We want each country to be in command of its own development and of what it is going to produce.

**Mr Jürgens (L)** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Liberal and Democratic Group has considered the Curry report and the Commission report and would like to begin by saying that the system of European agricultural policy has proved its worth and that the objectives of the Treaties of Rome have largely been fulfilled as regards food supplies. Unlike the speaker from the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, we think that consumer expenditure in comparison to real incomes fell from 40 % in 1960 to 20 % in these years. That should also be taken into consideration, which means the European Community can also be said to have created a consumer policy.

Farmers' incomes have improved. But what we would criticize is the deficiencies of the European agricultural policy, which lie not so much in the system as in its implementation, the instruments. The surpluses cannot simply be blamed on the bureaucracy or the Commission, but primarily on the unanimity procedure in the Council of Ministers. The Heads of Government who complain about agricultural policy should address themselves first to their specialized ministers! I also think that national considerations and national technical developments have often led to surpluses. Family undertakings should remain the guideline of agricultural policy. For we should not forget that they have helped look after and preserve the land.

Serious attempts have been made in past years to check production in the dairy sector by export incentives and the co-responsibility levy. They were not successful. That is why we think that paragraph 35 of the Curry Report should be deleted. A restrictive price policy would mean that the incomes of the smaller family farms would fall considerably. We also think that since it is not feasible to introduce a graduated co-responsibility levy, the quota systems should be so designed as to take account of farm structures and their importance to the economies of the individual Member States.

We therefore propose that three different basic factors should be taken into account in any quota system. The proportion of pasture land in the total used agricultural area should be taken into account in each country. May I point out that in Germany, for example, 39 % of the used agricultural area is pasture land. It is 80 % in Ireland. So it is quite clear that this must be taken into account.

## Jürgens

Secondly, when quotas are assigned to the various countries, account must also be taken of the proportion of milk produced by small and medium-sized farms. There are differences between the various countries in this respect. Thirdly, any quota system should consider the proportion of agricultural exports in a country's overall exports. In Germany the figure is 4 %, in Ireland 37.6 %. This clearly shows the important effect of agricultural production on the economy, which must also be taken into account in a quota system.

Moreover, such a system should guarantee that small and medium-sized undertakings are not only protected but can do better, especially in pasture lands. Here we consider it most important for national aids to be abolished and to ensure that small-scale milk production is not burdened with quotas. We must also remember that a number of undertakings have started up in recent years would be particularly hard hit by a quota system based on the 1981 situation.

The Liberal and Democratic Group would also like to see paragraph 24 deleted. It decided by a majority that oils and fats must not be taxed because 80 % of edible oils are used for purposes quite other than dairy cattle feed or the margarine industry. Here we must look very carefully at the overall situation. Furthermore, only a part of the linked products of seed oils are used for dairy cattle feed. Most of it is used for other types of animal feed. Here again the family farms would be hard hit.

It is true that only 15 % of vegetable protein is produced in the Community and that we must therefore encourage its production. But we should also consider how to create incentives for the production of regenerating raw materials which can also be used to develop new energy sources. Here we must concentrate the research carried out in the European Community. The Committee on Agriculture made a start here.

We should stop always referring to the share of agricultural expenditure in the total budget. Certainly this needs discussion. For we need to decide on measures and to make proposals. The share of agricultural expenditure in the total budget would not be nearly as large, however, if the national governments and parliaments were willing to transfer more tasks and more resources to Europe, because then other matters could also be resolved much more successfully on a European basis and the share of agricultural policy would certainly be smaller. The Liberal and Democratic Group supports the Curry report.

**Mr Kaspereit (DEP).** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to make two series of comments.

The first concerns the Commission's proposals. While I can subscribe to the Commission's analysis, I must

say I am rather surprised by its conclusions. I admit that its hands were tied, and that it could only draw the logical conclusions from the limbo in which the common agricultural policy has existed for several years now in the absence of a common political resolve to define a European food policy and a world food strategy.

The CAP is today in danger of disintegration because the political will which had inspired its introduction in the sixties is no longer there. In a world dominated by an economic, financial and monetary crisis it is budgets that call the tune.

Despite its denials and despite continuing to invoke its own aims and the fundamental principles of the CAP, the Commission is motivated by the only facts with which it is confronted, and these are that the rate of CAP expenditure is outstripping the Community's own resources, that the latter will become insufficient from 1984, that a new financial regulation will have to be prepared, and that this entails revising the existing mechanisms. All this the Commission summarizes in the alternative: either the CAP must be rationalized or the agricultural policies revert to the national domain.

But there is a particularly unpleasant aspect to this rationalization. The centre-piece of the mechanism devised by the Commission to reduce the cost of the CAP is the introduction of a guarantee threshold for the major outputs. In other words, in one form or another, the producers will have to share in the cost of disposing of surpluses.

To complement this concept of the threshold, the Commission proposes the introduction of a pricing policy that will bring prices in the Community closer to those of its principal competitors on the export markets and it does not, by any means, exclude the possibility that some nominal support prices in national currencies may have to be lowered. We should remind ourselves, in this connection, that the quota policy, particularly as it affects milk production, has the serious disadvantage that it will perpetuate the *status quo*, but will harshly penalize those producers who could still improve their productivity.

This will hit hardest farmers in those countries where the compensatory amount policies have discouraged expansion of production; it will also penalize young people who were thinking of setting up on their own. As for the possibility of freezing, and perhaps even lowering, producer prices, this will have the most serious effect on farmers' incomes, and the countries with high inflation rates will suffer the most.

To all these objections the Commission unconvincingly replies that it will be profitable to concentrate on measures to improve structures.

It is an interesting proposition, but only if we remember that any benefits will only be seen in the long term. The Commission therefore, perhaps

## Kaspereit

because it is aware of how much would be demanded of the farmers if its proposals were to be implemented, offers some additional suggestions: a mechanism for the automatic dismantling of the compensatory amounts — but past experience makes us rather sceptical of the practical effects of such a measure; long-term export agreements; strengthening Community preference; introduction of a tax on all oils and fats consumed (with the exception of butter); establishment of a minimum price for imported sheep-meat etc. etc.; and, finally, the invocation of the GATT safeguard clauses for certain cereal substitutes.

Overall, the proposals are undoubtedly consistent, but they entail a risk and they have a flaw. The risk is that, under pressure from certain Member countries, restrictive measures affecting Community agriculture will be adopted without the essential accompaniment of elimination of compensatory amounts, strengthening of Community preference and settling of the question of cereal substitutes.

The flaw — and here I start my second series of comments — is in according priority to what is essentially a budgetary solution. Let me repeat; we appreciate the exigencies of the hour, but let us not forget that budgetary measures are but a means, they are policy tools, but do not constitute a policy in themselves. How glad we should have been if the Commission had reversed the order of its proposals, if it had accorded priority to what it has made secondary, and vice versa! What I mean is, we should have welcomed from the Commission proposals that did not merely confirm, but, above all, at last gave effect to certain important principles and to certain methods of procedure, without which no common agricultural policy can be more than an illusion. Then, many of the sacrifices for which the Commission's proposals call would become unnecessary and the remaining ones could be contemplated and even accepted. In a word: we reject the budgetary solution and we want a political response.

I have not enough time to describe in detail my own and my DEP colleagues' views as to what such a political response should comprise. I shall only list some of the main headings.

Europe has surplus output, but its leaders do nothing to initiate a resolute policy of entry into the world markets. Europe has serious shortages in a number of important sectors, but nothing is done to end her foreign dependence. In both cases, the cost of omission shows in the budget and in the external balance of payments.

The United States have an agricultural and food strategy — Europe hasn't. And unless we quickly manage to work one out, we shall soon be at the mercy of the Americans, both for raw materials for our agriculture and as regards exporting its products.

That is, we shall be dependent not only in energy, but also in food. Yes, by all means, let us look for long-term supply contracts, as the Commission suggests. But let us do more. Let us grant long-term credits where these are needed. Let us help with investments, both in Europe and in the importing countries. Let us establish an Export-promotion Fund and let us associate the farmers, the processing industry and the exporters with this initiative. There is a crying need for an export policy and one can only wonder how we have come to be fixing quotas when, instead, we could — if only we made up our minds to it — export.

Revision of the common agricultural policy should mean, not least, reaffirming its principles, principles which, let it be said again and again, are not negotiable. It should mean, above all, financial solidarity and it should mean the rapid restoration of uniform prices, which the existence of compensatory amounts has destroyed.

The proposals that have been put forward to this effect must not be allowed to remain in the sphere of pious wishes. The Commission has already suggested the techniques for eliminating the compensatory amounts, but once they are gone we shall still have to take steps to ensure that the difficulties we are experiencing today do not recur. We know that it can be done, by introducing adjustments to incomes, instead of adjusting exchange rates, as is done at present.

A reformed common agricultural policy also means implementation of Community preference. We should not forget that the breaches made in this principle by some of our partners are in no small way responsible for the expenditure that is worrying us today.

Is it tolerable that ever greater quantities of agricultural produce should be entering free of duty, free of levy, free of preferential tariffs, so that the Community is deprived of part of its revenue, net CAP expenditure is increased, and the Community is itself forced to export more and more, thus increasing the gross cost of the CAP? One can see from the Commission's report that it is aware of the problem, but nothing precise emerges in its proposals.

Did you know, for instance, that Europe is importing 45 million tonnes of cattle feed and that it would only need to bring another 10 million hectares into cultivation to become self-sufficient in this domain?

I shall not go on with the examples. They are enough to show that there can be another agricultural policy, different from the one we are being offered. The Committee on Agriculture dimly perceived that, but it has chosen instead to concern itself with a multitude of details of implementation and has gone so far as to accept some of the Commission's proposals which are heavy with ominous implications.

**Kaspereit**

For these reasons my group cannot support adoption of the resolution as it stands, before the amendments tabled today are examined.

Mr President, in concluding I should like to quote from a Commission document: 'The CAP has performed its task, it is now paying the price of having been the only genuinely common policy, it has given Europe a modern agriculture in many sectors, it has in many cases made it possible to cross the threshold of self-sufficiency; it is paying the price of success and of the fact that no one has managed to make it progress sufficiently to be able to adjust to a world which it, itself, has helped to change.'

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, let us never forget that if the CAP were to be jeopardized, or if it should disintegrate because of our inability to correct its distortions, that would be the end of the European construction.

**Mr Skovmand (CD).** — (DA) Mr President, I suppose that most people now realize that there are problems with the CAP, and that there is not enough money for expenses arising from the CAP. Why is that so? One can read that in the Commission's explanations to its proposals. It states that production grows by 1.5 % per year, whereas consumption only grows by 0.5 %. For dairy products, production is even growing by over 3 %, but consumption hardly grows at all. Naturally this cannot go on. What is really amazing is that the crisis has not come earlier. This is due first and foremost to the fact that world market prices during several years have been uncommonly high. This has enabled the EEC to sell its surplus production cheaply on the world market.

For a time one was able to live under the illusion that the CAP didn't cost very much. This is why food prices were raised more than one would normally have done. Even worse, expenditure in non-CAP areas was increased. Now the Commission feels the pain and tells us that drastic changes are necessary. That e.g. the prices for dairy products must be reduced by 12 %. Or maybe even that the co-responsibility levy should be augmented or that production quotas should be introduced. It doesn't look too bright, nor does it look good for those Danish farmers who up to a few years ago believed that the EEC would solve all their problems. They can now see that their market share in third countries has fallen, that they are exposed to unreasonable competition within the EEC, amongst other things through the MCAs from which the German farmers benefit, and that the EEC price guarantees, by and large, lost their credibility. Maybe for a short period one can solve the problems for the farmers, as suggested in the Curry report — to raise the VAT ceiling and thus funnel more money from the Member States into EEC's lean purse. But that will be expensive, because money is also needed to finance

Spain and Portugal's accession to the EEC. Maybe it will become so expensive that even the Danish farmers associations will have to realize that it would be cheaper and better if Denmark left the EEC, and that one could solve the agricultural problems with the help of the money thus saved.

**Mrs Spaak (NI).** — (FR) To be effective, any Community policy, be it industrial or agricultural, must be based on a structural policy. The example of the CAP makes that clear. But whereas there is a Community policy of price guarantees, structural policy remains essentially in the national domain: the Commission admits in its document that Community structural expenditure in agriculture amounts to only 6 % of what the Member States spend for the same purpose.

Insufficiency of financial resources forces the Community to confine itself to only subsidizing the national policies. Add to this the fact that the Community has not enough money to control how the measures to which it contributes are implemented, and the whole system is seen to be a perversion of the aims pursued. Because the States are the Community's sole interlocutors, they are able to conceal from it what goes on at the administrative level.

The operation of the ERDF is particularly revealing in this respect. To take the example of Belgium, that country's Government has never proposed Brussels as a region qualifying for ERDF aids, despite the fact that current statistics show considerable economic decline there. What is more, several Member States, including Belgium, use up only a small proportion of their quotas. The governments give too little publicity to Fund contributions for private investments and, what is more, the money passes through the governments' hands, instead of being paid directly to the private investors. There is a veritable conspiracy of silence in this respect.

I should like to demand that the regional authorities have a greater say in the formulation of Community structural policies. Could not the Commission do more to inform regional authorities on these matters?

There is one other thing. No Member State takes advantage of the possibility existing under the ERDF Regulation of obtaining aid in the form of interest rebates on loans from the European Investment Bank. How does the Commission explain the fact that this borrowing facility, an important source of financing and of investment for the future, is so little used under the ERDF?

Reform of the operation of the Funds concerned with structural policies will be an important issue in the coming election campaign. It should become a major stage in our institutional reform, leading to a diminution of the role of the States and of the Council to the

**Spaak**

benefit of this Parliament and therefore of the citizens of Europe.

**Mr Gautier (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, looking at the current agricultural policy it is clear that the European Community is in a state of profound crisis. We now have structural surpluses in nearly all agricultural products, e.g., nearly 900 000 tonnes of butter in storage, more than a million tonnes of skimmed milk powder, and so on.

This situation could have been foreseen three or four years ago, and as Social Democrats we say that part of the blame lies with the Christian Democrats and Liberals in the European Parliament; for even if, as Mr Jürgens put it so well a while ago, they are now in favour of reform, the Liberals and Christian Democrats have always voted for unwarrantably high prices in recent years. Need I remind you of the 14% price rise for which they voted, or of the 8% last year. Now these same people stand here and bemoan the present state of agricultural policy even though they themselves are partly to blame. The European public should know this and not let itself be soothed by the weighty speeches the Christian Democrats and Liberals are now making before Parliament. They are only doing this now because they feel that in practice the European Community is bankrupt and because they can see no other way out either.

The blame also lies with the Council of Ministers; in the past three or four years it has proved unable to make any reform of European agricultural policy. In spite of all the justified practical objections to the great variety of price decisions taken by it, that Council has again and again acted as spokesman for the agricultural lobby of the European Community thank to its famous principle of unanimity.

As a result of the combination of Christian Democratic, Liberal and other majorities here in Parliament and of the decisions taken in the Council of Ministers, we now find ourselves in a situation for which we Socialists — may I also say we Social Democrats — bear no responsibility. For we in the Socialist Group have always agreed in recent years that things cannot go on as they are, that we need incisive changes to the present form of the European Community's agricultural policy and that the unlimited price guarantee under the common agricultural policy must come to an end.

That is why I want to clarify some of the SPD principles on the present reform of European agricultural policy again, for the sake of my colleagues here and for the public, so that we do not show ourselves in a false light now in relation to the way we will vote later.

Firstly, we believe it essential to restore the market equilibrium of the European Community.

Secondly, we believe that we do indeed need a fixed income guarantee for farm workers, but that this must not mean that we treat everyone alike and create an income policy that makes the rich even richer and the poor even poorer.

Thirdly, we believe in the need to increase agricultural trade, world trade in agricultural products. This is especially true with regard to the developing countries, where we as the European Community bear a special responsibility, since agricultural products from the developing countries also come onto the European market and this can increase their foreign exchange.

Fourthly, we believe — and here we agree with the Commission in its most recent document on biotechnology — that the European chemical and biotechnical industry must be supported in the same way as its competitors in third countries. Agricultural raw materials must be supplied under the same conditions as they are to the industries of other countries. Here the trend in Europe is disastrous, for our agricultural policy is making our own industry unable to compete.

Fifthly and lastly, our basic principle is that we must keep costs under control. As a Parliament we decided, although during the actual vote hardly anyone adhered to this decision, that agricultural expenditure must rise more slowly than the European Community's own revenue in the framework of the 1% VAT ceiling. As Social Democrats we remain committed to this principle and do not think much of Mr Ligios' statements to the effect that we could solve the problem simply by increasing the European Community's own revenue. That is a bottomless pit and the Social Democrats are not prepared to make more money available to the Community just so that it can be thrown away on the sacrificial altar of agricultural policy.

The Social Democrats think the most sensible approach would be for us to pursue a price policy at European level to coordinate supply and demand again and resolve the resulting social problems by income transfers to the farmers, who really need it, and to combine such a policy with a sensible, integrated, regional and agricultural structural policy.

Those are the principles we have followed as Social Democrats in the European Parliament and which we still consider right. It is true that tactically we are in a rather difficult position, which is why I have opened with these rather lengthy observations. In its document, the Commission of the European Communities proposed a number of incisive measures in the agricultural sector which we do not really like.

For instance, in effect, the Commission has proposed introducing quotas in the dairy sector. We Social Democrats have serious reservations about quotas.

**Gautier**

They would certainly mean that existing structures become consolidated, that we will probably see a rise in consumer prices and that some farmers will be treated unfairly. It is true that we are now faced with the fact that European agricultural policy is virtually finished because we can no longer finance it. For that reason — and I emphasize this — we Social Democrats are prepared to support a Community quota policy during the vote in the European Parliament. But may I say quite clearly that we regard this as a transitional measure and would prefer to see a different policy.

We look upon it as an emergency solution and refuse all responsibility for it. But we find ourselves in a situation in which as part of the European Parliament we have to join in taking a decision on the reform of European agricultural policy. So the only possible compromise for the present seems to be to support the principles of the Commission's proposal. Similarly, in principle we support the Commission's proposal on cereals, which is based in the long term on guarantee thresholds and provides for an adjustment of cereal prices to the prices of our main competitors on the world market. On this matter too, I may say that we Social Democrats are prepared to compromise and would support the Commission if it negotiated import restrictions on cereal substitutes pursuant to Article 28 of GATT.

May I say a word on the intended tax on oils and fats. We oppose this categorically. We do not regard it as an objective of agricultural policy. All we would achieve would be to impose an additional tax burden on consumers and workers in the European Community, on the very groups of people who are already worst hit by the present general economic crisis. I am surprised at the irresponsible way the French Communists, like Mr Pranchère, can stand up here and defend such ideas. I wonder whether their only electoral basis is the French farmers, or whether the French Communists can still claim any electoral support in the labour movement. I have always understood that they also have a basis in the labour movement — at least that is what the Socialist and Communist movements claim. We Social Democrats in Germany do have this basis and we also defend the interests of the workers in the Federal Republic of Germany, who have no desire to pay even more money on consumer goods in the present difficult situation. We do say quite plainly that another reason we do not want this is that we are afraid it might engage us in a major trade war with the United States, which would have to be paid for not by the farmers but by the industrial workers. That is why we do not want it.

Two further points. We endorse the Commission's proposal to reduce MCAs on principle. However, we

would warn that in future this will make some negotiations somewhat more difficult, as far as the revaluation of the DM in the European Monetary System is concerned.

Still, I believe in principle that we must dismantle the MCAs. In our view, the proposal to make the DM or strongest currency into a key currency is unacceptable for political reasons, because of the very nature of the European Monetary System and because if the DM were the key currency for the green currencies, this would risk producing inflation in the weak currency countries.

As a group and in particular as Social Democrats we think that in future the Council of Ministers of Agriculture must adhere to the amounts fixed by the budgetary authority when it takes price decisions. That is why we are in favour of changes to the institutional structure which would give the budgetary authority more say in price fixing. I call upon the political groups of this House to accept a compromise on this matter of such importance to Parliament and to the European Community. If no-one is prepared to give any ground in their demands, the vote will lead to chaos. As Social Democrats and Socialists we are prepared to endorse a compromise. We also call on the other groups to accept a compromise which will preserve the European Community from further harm.

IN THE CHAIR : MR LALOR

*Vice-President*

**President.** — The debate is adjourned until tomorrow morning at 9 a.m.

#### 8. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

**Mr Van Minnen (S).** — (NL) Mr President, at 3 p.m. the Chair set 6 p.m. as the deadline for the tabling of amendments to the resolutions on missiles. Some of these amendments concern resolutions which are not available even now. As we still do not have the documents, it seems to me that it will be difficult to leave the deadline at 6 p.m. Could you perhaps set a new deadline and above all ensure, as far as the President's policy allows, of course, that the original documents are distributed as soon as possible.

**President.** — I appreciate the point made by Mr Van Minnen and I think that we have to accept that it is a logical point. I rule therefore that the deadline for the tabling of amendments be put back to 10 a.m. tomorrow morning. It is to be hoped that all the documents will have been translated and circulated by then.



### 9. Topical and urgent debate (announcement)

**President.** — In accordance with Rule 48 (2) of the Rules of Procedure, the list of subjects for the topical and urgent debate to be held on Thursday between 10.00 a.m. and 1.00 p.m. has been drawn up.

*(The President read the list of subjects)<sup>1</sup>*

**Mr Davern (DEP).** — Mr President, on a point of order could I say that this Parliament considers items for urgency, many of which are outside the Community. I had one down on the Windscale nuclear plant, which today is causing growing concern not only in Ireland but right along the English coast as well. Ten per cent more children have contracted leukaemia in Cumbria than anywhere else. On the Irish coast the Down syndrome has now been diagnosed in many children. We must wake up to these facts. We must speak about Community matters before all these other things and stop making this Parliament the eunuch that many people believe it is.

**President.** — Mr Davern is quite concerned about this, and maybe justifiably so, but that was not a point of order. However, we take note of his comments.

### 10. Question Time

**President.** — The next item is the first part of Question Time (Doc. 1-1015/83).

We begin with questions to the Council.

Question No 1 by Mr Papaefstratiou (H-273/83):

What specific steps does the Council of Ministers propose to take in the immediate future to put into effect the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes proposed by the Commission, the implementation of which would be a particularly timely move for the development of the most backward and disadvantaged regions of the Community?

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers.** — (GR) As the honourable Member knows, the Commission's proposal for a regulation instituting the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes was submitted to the Council only on 23 August 1983. The Council consulted Parliament on 2 September 1983, and on 14 October 1983 requested the adoption of urgent procedure. The European Parliament rejected that request this morning.

The Council has begun its preparatory work, but the scope of the proposals and their financial repercussions make it impossible at this stage to state when it will be in a position to issue the proposed regulation.

The question has also been submitted to the special committee which is preparing the European Council meeting in the wider context of efforts to improve the Community's structural Funds.

**Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE).** — (GR) I should like to ask the President of the Council of Ministers whether the Greek Presidency, whose term is now drawing to a close, intends to raise this matter at the European Council meeting in Athens in December. I also wish to ask him if he thinks that the individualistic stance adopted by the Greek Presidency in its present governmental form is liable to hamper progress towards a decision on the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, which are of vital concern to the Greek people.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I shall answer only the first part of Mr Papaefstratiou's question. As I emphasized this morning in my statement on the special committees currently meeting to prepare the Athens Summit, the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes unquestionably fall within the scope of the Summit. The Greek Presidency will certainly raise the matter because of the obvious and indeed imperative need to include the Programmes among the new policies which are perhaps the most fundamental of the major issues that the Community must address if it is to advance towards solutions at the Athens Summit.

**Mr Battersby (ED).** — In the context of the fisheries aspects of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes and in view of the report that France now intends to extend its Mediterranean fishery zone to 12 miles, can the Council state if it intends to establish a uniform Community 12-mile fishery zone in the near future in the Mediterranean and has it taken this aspect of Mediterranean policy into its deliberations?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) The issue is naturally under discussion within both the special committees and the Council of Ministers. However, I cannot say at present that the process to which the honourable Member referred has reached the point where it might bring about a solution to the problem.

**Mr Kallias (PPE).** — (GR) Considering the colossal economic and social importance of the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes, might they not be regarded, Mr President, as the foremost of the new policies rather than simply one among others, because the others are particular branches of policies whereas this is a major new policy?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I sympathize with Mr Kallias' interest in these Programmes and I must say that they really are one of the cardinal issues. Indeed I believe I stated as much earlier on. As far as the Presidency and the special committees are concerned, efforts will certainly be made to ensure

<sup>1</sup> See minutes.

### Charalambopoulos

that the Integrated Mediterranean Programmes form the foundation, or basis if you like, for setting the Community on a new course.

**President.** — Question No 2, by Mr Moreland (H-289/83):

In the light of the Parliament's resolutions on this subject and the action taken by the Council on the Harp and Hooded seal, what action has been taken to reverse the deteriorating position of the Mediterranean Monk Seal?

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers.** — (GR) The Council noted with interest Parliament's resolutions of 11 March 1982 and 16 September 1982 on the protection of seals, especially the proposals for the conservation of the Mediterranean Monk Seal populations.

Though the Council has not taken specific measures to protect this species, the regulation issued on 3 December 1982 on the application in the Community of the Washington Convention on international trade in species of wild fauna and flora threatened with extinction has helped to strengthen the legal protection of the Mediterranean Monk Seal populations. The convention prohibits trade in this species.

**Mr Moreland (ED).** — I am sure that the Council will agree with me when I say that all evidence on seal stocks indicates that the Mediterranean monk seal is probably the seal species nearest extinction. The Community has taken action on the harp and hooded seal. It has also taken very stringent action against a third country.

Does the President-in-Office of the Council not agree with me that it would be somewhat hypocritical if we did not take stringent action concerning seals within our own Community waters? He says that there is legal protection from the Washington Convention. Does he not think that the Member States concerned, which might be somewhat near to his own heart, should take tougher action than they are taking, if they are to avoid being accused of hypocrisy?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I do not think I have anything to add to what the honourable Member said. I fully share his views. The Council has in fact been informed that the Commission, as requested by Parliament, has started work on specific measures for the protection and conservation of the species known as the Mediterranean Monk Seal. I believe that to be our duty and I like to hope that the work in question will lead to practical results and the adoption of practical measures.

**Mr Muntingh (S).** — (NL) Until recently we thought that there were still between 500 and 1 000 monk seals left in the world. In all probability, there are far fewer, probably no more than 400. This animal is therefore practically extinct. Of the 400, a rough estimate indi-

cates that half are to be found in Greece. Greece therefore has an extremely serious duty to protect the monk seal. May I therefore ask the President of the Council to refer the Greek Government in the strongest possible terms to its very great responsibility and to urge it to do whatever it can and as soon as it can, together with the Community, to save the monk seal.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) The species in question does indeed exist in Greece and it is a fact that its numbers are decreasing year by year. What I should like to tell the Members of this Parliament, and more specifically the Member who asked the question, is that the Greek Government, in particular the Minister for the Environment Mr Tritsis, has taken practical steps to protect the species and that in addition to the measures and expenditure already approved, the Government will spare no effort or expense to save this rare species.

**President.** — Question No 3, by Mrs Ewing (H-389/83):

Will the President-in-Office comment on the outcome of the last meeting of the Council of Fisheries Ministers?

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers.** — (GR) The Fisheries Council devoted most of its meeting on 3 and 4 October 1983 to the internal sector of the common fisheries policy. It approved technical conservation measures amending EEC Regulation No 171/83, which provides for a number of technical measures to preserve fishery resources. In the structural sector, furthermore, the Council issued a regulation on the modernization and development of the fishing sector and a regulation on the promotion of experimental fishing and fishing cooperation through joint enterprises. The Council also issued a directive on action to adjust the fishing potential. As far as upper fishing limits and quotas are concerned the Council, at its meeting on 19 and 20 October 1983, resumed its overall consideration of the Commission's proposals on the common fisheries policy for 1983. Also on the agenda for that meeting was a new Commission proposal dealing primarily with the distribution of herring stocks in the North Sea. Despite considerable efforts to devise a general compromise solution, no agreement was reached on this point. The Council accordingly agreed to resume its work on 14 December 1983 with a view to reaching a definitive agreement.

**Mrs Ewing (DEP).** — I thank the President-in-Office of the Council for his answer, but may I ask him if he does not think that 14 December is very near the end of the year in which we were meant to have had a CFP? Is he aware of the extreme bitterness and disappointment of the UK fishing associations that although we are already in the eleventh month, the

**Ewing**

basic elements of the CFP — certainty, fairness and policing — have not materialized? Is there any good news on the horizon for the next meeting which will give fishermen some indication of what their fishing opportunities are going to be in 1984?

On the specific question of the last series of meetings, may I ask the Council for an assurance that the Council was not responsible for ordering the reduction in the number of the UK fishing representatives who have traditionally attended in Brussels from 12 to 6 thereby excluding vital sectors of the industry, although it is admitted, I think, by all parties that these fishing representatives have been of great assistance throughout all the talks on fishing over the years?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I understand the honourable Member's anxiety, but as I said earlier, though 14 December 1983 is very close, we believe the Council will make every effort on that date to take a speedy decision leading to the solution of the problem. I cannot say more at the moment. The main point is that a date has been fixed — even if it is very close, as has been observed — and that the Ministers have expressed their intention, if not determination, to solve the problem on 14 December 1983.

**Mrs Ewing (DEP).** — It is a very simple specific point of order about the exclusion of the fishing representatives. Although I believe the President-in-Office took it on board when I asked it, it has not been answered.

**President.** — That is not a point of order. It is a supplementary question. Perhaps the President-in-Office will deal with it when he replies to the next supplementary question.

**Mrs Le Roux (COM).** — (FR) I should like to know whether the Council has prepared a time-table for the consideration of the social aspect of fishery activities. If not, what prevents this consideration being undertaken?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) On this truly important point I do not have an answer at present, but I shall forward your question to my colleagues so that after discussion and deliberation a solution may be found as soon as possible.

**Mr Seligman (ED).** — Does the President-in-Office of the Council share my fear that the fishing policy has not been fairly and thoroughly enforced by all Member States? Will he ensure that adherence to the common fishing policy is a precondition of Spain joining the Community?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) As far as the external sector of the common fisheries policy is concerned,

since you refer to Spain, the Council, at its meeting on 3 and 4 October 1983, adopted a regulation instituting a number of measures for the protection and management of fishery resources in 1983, applicable to ships flying the Norwegian flag. This regulation mainly allows Norway to complete its allotted quota by trawling herring. At the same meeting the Council decided to bring the draft agreement with the Government of São Tomé and Príncipe into effect on a provisional basis in order to enable fishermen from the Member States to start tuna fishing at once in that country's waters.

**Mr Calvez (L).** — (FR) Mr Simitis, the Minister who presides over the fisheries Council, has apparently said that, in the absence of any progress, there was no point in meeting every fortnight. Does this mean that there is no political will to reach an agreement on the 1984 herring quotas before the end of the year? Surely the President of the Council must realize how harmful these repeated fiascos are to fisheries policy? What does the Greek Presidency propose to do if no agreement can be reached on 14 December? Will it be calling a meeting of the fisheries Council before 31 December?!

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I should like to make one point only, since you refer to the Greek Presidency. I am sure the honourable Members have realized, from the numerous debates held on a variety of topics in this chamber, that the Presidency — any Presidency — is not the key to solving the Community's problems. The Presidency endeavours to create the conditions for a compromise in the vent of a conflict. You will agree with me, however, that the key is the existence of the political determination to which you alluded. As long as that determination exists, there is no problem. So far there may be good intentions, but there is no sign of the political determination which will enable us to achieve practical results. I hope and wish to see it emerge, so that we may have some practical results.

**Mr Clinton (PPE).** — May I ask the President-in-Office whether at that last meeting of the Fisheries Council there was any discussion on the removal of refunds on exports of mackerel? Is he aware of the appalling problem this has caused to a large number of Irish fishermen who depend largely for their livelihood on exports of mackerel and who are now unable to meet the repayments on their boats?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) The subject was not discussed, my dear colleague. However, I agree with you that this is an extremely serious problem for Ireland. I can say this much, that I shall come to an understanding with my colleagues the Ministers so that the mackerel issue may be placed on a sound footing enabling a solution to be found.

## Charalambopoulos

I agree that your country has a problem, but as you know, all the member countries have problems, and compromises are designed to allow a certain amount of give-and-take within the Community. The important point is the existence of the political determination to devise a solution benefiting the Community as a whole. That is the only way to set the Community on a new course.

**Miss Quin (S).** — Can the President-in-Office make an up-to-date report on the position of the EEC fishing inspectors? Are they now in a position to do their job, and what has their experience been? Will the President-in-Office agree with me that rules which are not enforced or are not respected are almost worse than having no rules at all?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I agree. There are indeed procedures which should produce the outcome you mention. However, I am not in a position at the moment to tell you whether, and if so to what extent, they have yielded positive results, as you wish and as I believe the Council also wishes. But progress has been made and we have reached the stage of trying to establish how effective this system can be.

**President.** — Question No 4, by Mr Kaloyannis (H-440/83) (1):

Approximately three years ago, the Greek Parliament, desirous and concerned to prevent and stamp out terrorism, passed a law on terrorism which included provisions and judicial safeguards providing for severe penalties for those convicted of acts of terrorism. Despite the fact that the feeling of security in Greece has recently been shaken and the country is now pervaded by fear and uncertainty as a result of an increase and escalation of acts of terrorism, the perpetrators of which have managed to elude detection by the judicial authorities, the Greek press reports that the Minister of Justice of the Greek Socialist Government is tabling a bill revoking the existing law on terrorism or amending it through the introduction of milder provisions.

In view of this situation and the last three notorious crimes committed in Greece — namely, the murder of Mr Georgis Athanasiadis, the editor of the daily *Vradini* who was dedicated to democracy, the attempted mass murder of New Democracy cadres headed by Mr Paliokrassas, the Secretary-General of the Parliamentary Group, and the bomb attack on foreign diplomats in Psychico, Athens — can the Council of Ministers ask the Greek Government — in view of its concern for a common approach in dealing with the problems of law and order and terrorism — how, given the circumstances described above, the Greek Government can justify the introduction of milder anti-terrorism laws, and duly inform the European Parliament of the outcome?

<sup>1</sup> Former oral question without debate (0-24/83), converted into a question for Question Time.

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers.** — (GR) Mr President, I shall answer my compatriot and friend Mr Kaloyannis' very lengthy question in a single sentence. The Council is not competent to deal with the honourable Member's question.

**Mr Kaloyannis (PPE).** — (GR) I should like to ask the President of the Council of Ministers whether he is aware that this Parliament has repeatedly adopted resolutions advocating the harmonization of national legislation to safeguard public order, especially against acts of terrorism.

So in view of the recent upsurge in crime in my country, where a certain degree of peace used to prevail — and three incidents will serve to illustrate my question: the murder of George Athanasiadis, the editor of the daily *Vradini* who, as my friend the Minister knows very well, was actively involved in the struggle for democracy, and the attempted murders of New Democracy cadres in northern Greece and of an American officer — can the Minister really reply that the Council is not competent to address such matters?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) The events referred to by my colleague and compatriot Mr Kaloyannis are distressing ones, which we condemn irrespective of the country in which they occur. However, I said that the Council of Ministers was not competent to deal with them. Problems relating to the suppression of terrorism are not discussed by the Council or in the context of European Political Cooperation, but as part of intergovernmental cooperation under Trevi, which is another matter altogether. I wanted to clarify this point to prevent any misinterpretation of what I said initially, or at least any confusion over my reply on behalf of the Council of Ministers.

**President.** — Question No 5, by Mr Rogalla (H-228/83) (rev.):

Is the Council aware that every day citizens of Community Member States going for walks on the so-called 'green' internal frontiers (between Member States) are harassed by officials and made to pay hefty fines for technical infringements of obscure and outdated regulations, and what does the Council propose to do to stop it?

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers.** — (GR) The Council has not been informed of the incidents reported by the honourable Member. It is currently examining a Commission proposal for the simplification of frontier checks. Point 3 of the proposal provides for a simplification of checks at small frontier posts and on the movement of persons residing in frontier areas.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) Since my name is not linked to this question on page 5 of the German version of the document containing the questions for Question Time, I found it rather difficult to locate this question. I thank the President of the Council for his reply and would like to ask him whether he agrees

Rogalla

with me that all our efforts should be concentrated on the future of the citizens of our Member States? Does he also agree that the regular crossing of frontiers will make our citizens feel closer to one another and is he able or willing to make use of all the powers the Council has *vis-à-vis* the Commission and to request the Commission, pursuant to Article 152, to list the cases in question? Is he prepared, furthermore, to ensure, pursuant to Article 152, that the Commission is instructed at last to co-ordinate the measures to combat drug offences, which are often still used as a pretext for maintaining border controls in the countries of this Community?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) In a reply I gave on this subject about a month ago, I believe, I had occasion to highlight the reality of the problems to which you referred in speaking of drugs. The question is under discussion among the Member States of the Community, the touchstone invariably being protection against the activities you mentioned and the ultimate aim, of course, being the issue of a common passport for the ten Member States. I am, however, compelled to agree with you and stress the importance of monitoring the movement of drugs through intergovernmental cooperation. The matter is still under study in a number of Community countries and has not yet been finally settled.

**Mr Van Minnen (S).** — (NL) The routes taken by drug-smugglers are, of course, many and varied. What the President has said does not sound very hopeful, but in the final analysis none of these diversionary tactics can disguise the fact that we are talking about checks on ordinary citizens at internal frontiers.

Can the Council perhaps see to it that checks are suspended during the week from 10 to 17 June 1984, the week in which the second direct elections to the European Parliament will be held, so that the elector at least has the impression that there is such a thing as the European Parliament.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I cannot but share your view, which I shall convey to my colleagues so that efforts may be made to speed up the procedure which will bring about the satisfactory outcome you mention, namely the solution of the problem before the forthcoming elections to the European Parliament.

**President.** — Question No 6, by Mr Gerokostopoulos (H-447/83)<sup>(1)</sup>:

It is a known fact that more than four million Europeans (including Belgian, French, Greek, Italian and Dutch nationals) were victims of decolonization and suffered the consequences of the Second World War.

Their problems and demands have been repeatedly formulated and aired in many different quarters by the organization representing them, the European Confederation of Victims of Decolonization (C.E.S.O.M.).

On 2 and 3 May, 1983 the C.E.S.O.M. organized a meeting in Athens, which adopted a resolution — a copy of which is attached — protesting at the Community's failure to concern itself with their problems.

Does the Council intend addressing itself to the abovementioned problem — which concerns so many million inhabitants of the Community — and seeking means of solving it?

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers.** — (GR) Except where otherwise provided by the Treaties, the Council exercises its powers on the basis of proposals by the Commission. However, the Commission has not submitted any proposals or communications to the Council on the subject mentioned by the honourable Member. If it should be established that certain problems arising from decolonization and affecting a substantial number of nationals of the Member States fall under the jurisdiction of the Community, the Council will certainly consider any initiatives taken by the Commission.

**Mr Gerokostopoulos (PPE).** — (GR) I cannot say that I find the President's answer satisfactory, since it shifts the responsibility onto the Commission.

I should like to take the opportunity of asking the President whether he knows that under legislation introduced in Zaire, a promise has been made, or rather an undertaking given, to pay compensation to nationals of foreign states over a period of ten years at an interest rate of 8 %.

I should also like the Minister to tell me whether there is any likelihood that the opportunity afforded by the current negotiations over the new Lomé convention may be used to exert pressure on countries which expelled foreign nationals without compensation, in order to secure a specific undertaking that they will seek a genuine solution to the problem.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I have not shifted the responsibility onto the Commission as you allege. What I can say, however, is that a formal meeting attended by the Foreign Ministers of 68 countries, and over which I had the honour of presiding, was held last month in Luxembourg to discuss the new convention — which I shall not call Lomé III because we do not yet know what its name will be. There really are many problems on both sides. It would consequently be preferable not to use the word 'pressure', but to raise the matter you mention during the deliberations on the new convention. I think you will agree with me that the problem you brought up with regard to Zaire must be viewed in that context.

**President.** — As the author is not present, Question No 7 will be answered in writing.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Former oral question without debate (0-51/83), converted into a question for Question-Time.

<sup>1</sup> See annex of 16. 11. 1983

**President**

Question No 8, by Mr Seeler (H-448/83)<sup>1</sup>:

In its answer to my Written Question No 2020/82<sup>2</sup> the Council fails to answer my specific questions directly. I would therefore ask the Council again;

1. What practical effects on Soviet policy towards Poland have been achieved up to now by the economic sanctions imposed in March 1982?
2. What practical effects on Soviet policy towards Poland does the Council expect to achieve with a continuation of these sanctions?
3. If the Council has been unable to ascertain or is not expecting any practical effects on the Soviet attitude towards Poland, what objectives is it pursuing, with the continuation of economic sanctions against the Soviet Union?

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers.** — (GR) Bearing in mind the Council's answer to the honourable Member's question No 2020/82, I must point out once again that the decrease in imports from the Soviet Union decided by the Community in March 1982, and since renewed, is just one element of the overall policy approved by the Council in response to the imposition of martial law in Poland. So these measures must not be assessed in isolation without due regard to their political context.

**Mr Seeler (S).** — (DE) I thank the President for repeating the written answer I received. But may I point out that I asked what political effects these sanctions have had. I have still not received an answer to that question. So I ask you whether you, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, agree with me that the Council is not aiming at and has not achieved any political results with its sanctions.

My second question is why does the Council maintain these sanctions although martial law has now been suspended in Poland and the situation there has become somewhat normalized? There is no justification for that.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) In reply to the honourable Member's comment I can say that the Council has no statistical analyses of the practical repercussions of these measures on trade between the European Community and the Soviet Union. The other point you raise is a political one and I am not authorized to give you a precise answer on it at the moment. However, I can tell you that steps are being taken with a view to either lifting the sanctions or neutralizing their political impact. That is as much as I can say because, as you know, the Council of Ministers continues to discuss East-West relations and exchange views on the issue you refer to, but I am not at present authorized to disclose its opinion.

**President.** — As the author is not present, Question No 9 will be answered in writing.<sup>1</sup>

Question No 10, by Mr Eisma (H-422/83):

It would appear from the Council's and Commission's answers to Written Questions 64/83 and 65/83<sup>2</sup> by Mrs Krouwel-Vlam that the 1976 proposal for a regulation<sup>3</sup> on the introduction of a Community consultation procedure in respect of power stations likely to affect the territory of another Member State is still under discussion because one Member State is strongly opposed to it.

Could the Council say which Member State this is, what its objections are, how the Council intends to are, this difficulty and why the Council should not perhaps reach a decision by a qualified majority?

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers.** — (GR) With regard to Mr Eisma's first three questions it must be remembered that under Rule 18 of the Council's Rules of Procedure, proceedings are secret unless the Council decides otherwise.

With regard to the last question, it must be remembered that as the Commission bases the proposal in question on Article 235 of the Treaty, the Council is required to take a unanimous decision.

**Mr Eisma (NI).** — (NL) I thank the President for his answer. But I should like to know how the Council intends tackling the difficulties surrounding this regulation on a consultation procedure, because it has not discussed the subject since 1981. I therefore request that this item be put on the agenda for the forthcoming meeting of the Council of Environment Ministers. Perhaps the President can pass this request on to Minister Tritsis. And if this is not possible, I would ask the President of the Council to draw up an extensive file on this subject while Greece still has the Presidency, so that it can be taken up immediately after the French Presidency, because, as you will realize, this problem will not be considered while France has the Presidency.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) As you yourself indicated by referring to the forthcoming French Presidency, a speedy settlement of the issue is impossible. The question really requires time and discussion. However, I can assure you that I shall definitely convey the content of your question to my colleague the Minister of the Environment and Regional Planning, Mr Tritsis, and ask him to take appropriate action as soon as possible.

<sup>1</sup> Former oral question without debate (0-68/83), converted into a question for Question Time.

<sup>2</sup> OJ C 197, 25. 7. 1983, p. 6.

<sup>1</sup> See annex of 16. 11. 1983

<sup>2</sup> OJ C 189, 14. 7. 1983, p. 35.

<sup>3</sup> Doc. COM(76) 576 final and OJ C 149, 15. 6. 1979.

**President.** — Question No 11, by Mr Marck (H-425/83):

In October 1982 the European Parliament adopted a resolution by a large majority on the strengthening of controls on the application of Community rules on agricultural products (Doc. 1-528/82). Why has the Council not taken action on the Commission's proposal for a regulation (COM(82) 899)?<sup>1</sup>

Are there not enough examples of fraud and abuse?

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers.** — (GR) The Council's subsidiary bodies have been examining the proposal for a regulation mentioned by the honourable Member since May 1982. In the course of their work it has become apparent that a number of legal difficulties preclude the approval of the regulation in the form proposed by the Commission.

**Mr Marck (PPE).** — (NL) I know there are difficulties over the application of this decision. The question is, of course, whether the will exists to apply it, and the impression I have from the discussions is that various countries do not have this will. Does the President of the Council share this view?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I to agree that not all Member States possess that determination, but the problem is to get all the Member States to agree on a solution.

**Mrs Ewing (DEP).** — Does the Council not think that the practice of keeping secret the names of persons who are found to have committed agricultural frauds should be discontinued, making these wrongdoers, indeed, the most privileged class of criminals in Europe?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) In reply to this question I can say that we are following the procedures the Council has always applied. The Greek Presidency is doing nothing new. I understand your anxiety, but this is the practice that has been adopted.

**President.** — We turn now to the question addressed to the Foreign Ministers. In relation to Question No 25, Mrs de March's place has been taken by Mr Chambeiron.

Question No 25, by Mrs March (H-467/83)<sup>2</sup>

The Turkish military junta has addressed a number of requests for extradition to the governments of several Community countries. The ten Member States are, however, aware of the constant systematic violations of human rights in Turkey, a country where arbitrary imprisonment or imprisonment for expressing opinions contrary to the regime is widespread and people are frequently sentenced to death or tortured. Almost 100 000 persons are thought to be in prison in Turkey.

Turkey is, however, a signatory to the European Convention on Human Rights and has been linked to the Community by an association agreement since 1963.

Do the Foreign Ministers not agree that it is urgent and imperative to adopt a common position on the rejection or blocking of the requests by the Turkish military junta for the extradition of political refugees until such time as individual rights and freedoms are once again respected in Turkey?

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — (GR) I must point out that matters like extradition and the granting of political asylum come under the exclusive jurisdiction of the individual Member States and are regulated by national legislation. They consequently fall outside the scope of European Political Cooperation. I should nevertheless like to take this opportunity of stating once again that the Ten have repeatedly drawn the Turkish Government's attention to the need to respect human rights.

**Mr Chambeiron (COM).** — (FR) I take note of the decision of the President-in-Office of the Council. I do not question that political asylum is a matter only for the States. But I should nevertheless like to insist that no one can claim at this point that the recent elections in Turkey have restored the freedom and the democratic rights which the military junta had trampled upon. I should like to hope that, within the framework of cooperation, the Governments of the Ten will ensure that the kind of tragedy that happened a few weeks ago in Federal Germany will not be repeated, and that political refugees will be able to have the benefit of their status and will not be delivered to the Turkish authorities, that is to say to the Turkish State whose courts today are not instruments of justice but tools of repression in the hands of the rulers.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I share this view, but the problem raised by the honourable Member has not been discussed by the Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation.

However, it may conceivably come up for discussion in the future.

**Mrs Clwyd (S).** — The President-in-Office of the Council may not be aware, but the numbers in prison in Turkey have increased since last night when in once of the most savage sentences handed down by a Turkish martial-law tribunal, 23 leading activists from the Turkish Peace Association were given jail terms of between 5 and 8 years. The Minister may not be aware that they include many celebrated names including the Peace Association President, a former Turkish Ambassador to India, Mr Dikerdem, who incidentally is also ill, suffering from cancer. The sentences are very severe and the verdicts, of course, came on the eve of the parliamentary debate.

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 381, 31. 12. 1982, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Former oral question with debate (0-55/83), converted into a question for Question Time.

Clwyd

Would the Minister intervene and request the Turkish military rulers to reconsider the sentences and to release the prisoners on bail pending an appeal and would he assure us that he will continue to withhold economic and other aid to Turkey while human rights are suspended in that country?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I think everyone knows that, as the Turkish authorities themselves have acknowledged, there is an enormous number of political prisoners. I also refer you to statements by officials of the Turkish military government admitting that torture has taken place.

I am of course addressing you now as President of the Council of Ministers, but I confess that I find myself in a difficult position for two reasons. Firstly, anything I say about these indisputable facts may be thought to have a bearing on relations between Greece and Turkey. Secondly, I remember the seven years and three months of dictatorship in Greece, during which I was imprisoned, together with colleagues present in this chamber, for five and a half long years. So you will understand my feelings on the subject of political prisoners and torture.

In conclusion, I wish to say that either I myself or a colleague will bring up the matter of torture and violations of human rights at a future political cooperation meeting. It has already been laid before the Council of Europe by Member States of the Community, so it must unquestionably be discussed in the context of political cooperation.

(Applause)

**Mr Adamou (COM).** — (GR) Mrs de March's question concerns refugees, human rights and the responsibilities of the Turkish junta.

I should therefore like to ask the President what position the Foreign Ministers are adopting with regard to the new and extraordinarily dangerous provocation mounted by the Turkish junta's instruments in Cyprus, namely the declaration of an 'independent' Turkish Cypriot State in the northern part of the island, and to the immediate recognition of that State by the junta in Ankara.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) In reply to Mr Adamou I propose to refer to the previous pronouncements of the Council of Ministers. In answer to questions put by the Members of the European Parliament on the misguided threat to declare an independent Turkish Cypriot State, which has since been carried out, and with the unanimous agreement of all partners, I made the following statement at the European Parliament's session of 6 July 1983. 'The Ten disapprove, and will condemn, any action likely to jeopardise a negotiated solution of the Cyprus problem or hamper the initiatives taken in the matter by the Secretary General of the United Nations.' May I remind you that the Ten voted in favour of Resolu-

tions 3212 (1974) and 3995 (1975) of the UN General Assembly urging respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus.

I may add that the Heads of Political Affairs Departments of the Foreign Ministries of the ten Member States of the Community are meeting today in Athens to discuss other matters. However, this has coincided with Denktash's declaration of the 'independent Republic' or 'independent State' of northern Cyprus. The EPC Political Committee meeting in Athens has accordingly discussed this development and, I am informed, drawn up a text 'Ad referendum' for submission to the Council of Ministers and subsequent publication.

I can disclose this much, that the text supplements the statement I made on behalf of the Ten on 6 July 1983 concerning what was then the threat to declare an independent Turkish Cypriot State.

**President.** — Question No 26, by Mrs Ewing (H-178/83):

Could the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation bring pressure to bear on Cuban Authorities to release from prison five Cuban citizens, together with their lawyers, who sought to establish a free trade union?

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — (GR) The Foreign Ministers of the Ten have been informed that five Cuban citizens were sentenced to death for their involvement in independent trade union activities. The penalties were later altered to long terms of imprisonment. Unfortunately, we have so far been unable to gather all the details needed to give us an accurate picture of the situation. If further details reach us in the future, we shall then decide how to respond.

**Mrs Ewing (DEP).** — I must thank the President-in-Office for his answer, which I think is very helpful. I would just add that Amnesty International were urging Members of this Parliament to raise this matter, and it may be that they have fairly up-to-date information. It seemed a tremendous additional breach of human rights that even the lawyers acting for the alleged offenders were also given prison sentences.

**President.** — That was not quite a supplementary question, so I can call Mr Alavanos for a supplementary question. I should like to ask the President whether there is any question of Community intervention in Caribbean affairs on account of the situation in Grenada and the threats to the Republic of Cuba.

**President.** — That question concerns Cuba and has nothing to do with Grenada. I am not passing the question.



## President

Question No 27, by Mr Lomas (H-339/83):

A report has been published in a British newspaper, *The Observer*, stating that the following companies in South Africa are breaking the EEC Code of Conduct, by paying wages below even the EEC's rather modest minimum recommendations.

British Electric Traction

Quinton Hazell (of which the British Prime Minister's husband is a director)

Dunlop

GKN

Lonhro

Low & Bonnard

Turner & Newall

Wimpey

Do the Foreign Ministers propose to take any action to remedy this disgraceful state of affairs?

**Mr Charalambopoulos, President-in-Office of the Council of Foreign Ministers.** — (GR) Let me first remind you that the Ten have on repeated occasions, both jointly and separately, expressed their opposition to apartheid. As part of this opposition, they have adopted a Code of Conduct whose provisions must be observed by companies acting through branches, subsidiaries or simply representatives in South Africa. The advantage of this policy is that it lays down guidelines for improving both the working conditions and, more generally, the living standards of black South Africans.

Among other points, the Code stresses that companies must avoid discrimination in the payment of their employees' wages and comply with the principle of 'equal pay for equal work'. This principle has been broadly accepted by the great majority of firms. Most black workers employed by companies belonging to Member States of the European Community are paid higher wages than the minimum set by the Community. A copy of the third Community analysis of the reports submitted by the Member States pursuant to the Code has been forwarded to the European Parliament. The analysis makes it clear that most British companies and most companies belonging to other Member States comply with the guidelines laid down by the Code of Conduct.

Lastly, I should point out that European companies are responding in a most encouraging manner to the principles set forth in the Code and are showing a growing awareness of their Community responsibilities. We hope they will pursue their efforts to apply the provisions of the Code.

**Mr Lomas (S).** — I am grateful for the President-in-Office's reply, but in the case of these persistent offenders, would the Foreign Ministers not at least tell these specific companies that they are behaving in a disgraceful manner in continuing their blatant exploitation of black South Africans by paying starvation

wages which are below even the very modest minimum laid down by the Code of Conduct.

(Cries of 'question, question!')

Does the President-in-Office not think that it is particularly scandalous that the company of the husband of the British Prime Minister is on this list of shame? We all know the Prime Minister's passion for Victorian values, but is it not carrying it a bit too far to pay Victorian-level wages? Will the President-in-Office use his influence with the Prime Minister to get her husband's company to pay black workers a decent wage?

(Cries of 'hear, hear')

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) The point raised by Mr Lomas in his supplementary question is one of national policy, I believe, since it concerns the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. It is consequently a matter for the United Kingdom. But if basic principles such as those mentioned by Mr Lomas are being violated, the issue must in my view be taken up by the United Nations.

**Mr Hord (ED).** — I should like to ask the President-in-Office whether he would accept that in South Africa there is complete freedom for all workers to have trade union representation...

(Protests from the left)

... full facility to have representation by trade unions and therefore there is every facility for the workers to make proper representation to their trade unions in order to get fair wages. Furthermore, would the President-in-Office also accept that if conditions were as bad as the questioner maintains, there would be few other African countries which would allow very large numbers of black migrant workers going to South Africa?

(Mixed reactions)

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I believe that in my answer to Mr Lomas, namely that the Ten had on repeated occasions, both jointly and separately, expressed their opposition to apartheid, I alluded to the manifold breaches of the law implied by the existence of such a system. And I do not think Mr Hord can single out one aspect in order to weaken the condemnation of apartheid by the European Community, which is an established fact.

**Mr Jakobsen.** — (DA) Does the President-in-Office not think, especially in view of such misleading information given by the first speaker, and the not-proven assumption which the President himself put forward regarding the conditions in South Africa, that there is a reason for our countries to stop this completely archaic act of condemning something which nobody has seen, because no one has lowered himself to visit the country they are attacking. There are maybe four

**Jakobsen**

or five Members who have been there and seen for themselves. The information produced stems from agitators in other countries. It is not information which can be founded on facts from South Africa. Is it not time to pull ourselves together and send someone down there to investigate whatever it is we are talking about? Would that not be more reasonable, than just condemning the situation from a lofty height on the basis of some agitators' pamphlets published by some neighbouring states, all of which does not, however, prevent them from sending their workers to work in the country in question?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) The subject of your question cannot be dealt with in the context of political cooperation. It concerns the United Nations. The Ten have stated their position with regard to the situation in South Africa. It is clear, precise and unequivocal. The Ministers acting in political cooperation cannot, therefore, undertake efforts to identify particular violations of human rights. What is certain is that the racist system in South Africa has been condemned and that the Ten have taken a clear stand on the matter.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Enright (S).** — Would the President-in-Office please, first of all, accept my apologies for the abysmal and culpable ignorance of some of my colleagues who fail to recognize the desperate situation in South Africa and the fact that the Community, through its Lomé agreement, is helping the Southern African states to strengthen their independence?

*(Cries of 'question, question!')*

The question is, would the President-in-Office accept my apologies?

If we could now come to the evidence that has been produced by Winnie Mandela and Nelson Mandela which show everything to be quite contrary to somebody, I have to call my honourable friend opposite

and the views that he has put forward. We know very well that there is suffering and degradation in South Africa. We also know that European firms are taking part in this. What we would like to ask the President-in-Office is: Would he say to the other nine Member States that they should ensure that any firms with which they are connected uphold that law which they have signed and agreed to with the European Community, and in particular ask Mrs Thatcher — a well-known lady for upholding law and order — to command her husband that he obey law and order in South Africa? Law and order does not exist in only one country.

So, please, will the President-in-Office make sure that one lamb — or should I say one ewe — does not go astray and bring her back into the fold of decent people?

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (GR) I think I made myself very clear and Mr Lomas should be satisfied with the answer I gave him on behalf of the Council of Ministers. I should like to add that I shall have no difficulty at all in bringing the matter up again in the sphere of political cooperation so that my younger colleagues may understand more fully, after what they have heard today, the absolute accuracy of my introductory statement on behalf of the Council of Ministers. As far as I am concerned, you may rest assured that I shall convey these views to my colleagues and insist on full compliance with the Ten's decisions.

**President.** — The first part of Question Time is closed.<sup>1</sup>

I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of the House, of thanking the President-in-Office for his full replies to our questions.<sup>2</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> See Annex of 16. 11. 1983

<sup>2</sup> Agenda for the next sitting: See Minutes

## SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 16 NOVEMBER 1983

## Contents

<i>Lord Douro; Mr Deschamps</i> . . . . .	100	<i>Forth; Mr von der Vring; Mr Arndt; Mr von der Vring; Mr Arndt; Mr Forth; Mr Kellett-Bowman; Mr von der Vring; Mr Nikolaou; Mr de la Malène; Mr Arndt; Mr de la Malène; Mr O'Mahony; Mr Sutra; Mr de la Malène; Mr O'Mahony; Mr Simpson; Lord Douro; Mr Arndt; Mr von der Vring; Mr Langes; Mr Arndt; Mr Forth; Mr Woltjer; Mrs Ewing</i> . . . . .	149
1. CAP — Report by Mr Curry (Doc. 1-987/83) contd): <i>Mr Tolman; Mr J.D. Taylor; Mr Vitale; Mrs S. Martin; Mr Paisley; Mr Eyraud; Mr Dalsass; Mr Hord; Mrs Le Roux; Mr Delatte; Mr Vernimmen; Mr Bocklet; Mr Simmonds; Mr Adamou; Mr Maher; Mr Blaney; Mrs Castle; Mr Hord; Mrs Castle; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Kirk</i> . . . . .	100	7. Question Time (contd): Questions to the Commission: — Question No 47, by Miss Quin: Ship-building: <i>Mr Andriessen (Commission); Miss Quin; Mr Andriessen; Mrs Ewing; Mr Andriessen; Mr Adam; Mr Andriessen</i> . . . . .	155
2. Welcome . . . . .	114	— Question No 48, by Mr Geronimi: Pilot project for an operating subsidy for fares on ferries to Corsica: <i>Mr Giolitti (Commission); Mr Harris; Mr Giolitti</i> . . . . .	156
3. CAP (contd): <i>Mr Maffre-Baugé; Mr Goerens; Mr Vgenopoulos; Mr Clinton; Lord O'Hagan; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Nielsen; Mr Davern; Mr Marck; M Battersby; Mr De Gucht; Mrs Gredal; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Welsh; Mr O'Mahony; Mr Stella; Mr van Aerssen; Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Sutra</i> . . . . .	114	— Question No 49, by Mr Seligman: Sunday trading laws: <i>Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Seligman; Mr Narjes; Mrs Cluyd; Mr Narjes; Mr Marshall; Mr Narjes; Mr Gerokostopoulos; Mrs Ewing; Mr Narjes</i> . . . . .	156
4. Structural funds — Agricultural structures — Reports by Mr Davern (Doc. 1-990/83), by Mr Patterson (Doc. 1-906/83), by Mr De Pasquale (Doc. 1-930/83) and by Mr Thareau (Doc. 1-923/83): <i>Mr Davern; Mr Patterson; Mr De Pasquale; Mr Thareau; Mr Protopapadakis; Mr von der Vring; Mr Colleselli; Mr Hutton; Mr Flanagan; Mr Chanterie; Mr Provan; Mr Vgenopoulos; Mrs Boot; Mr Barbagli; Mr Griffiths; Mr Kaloyannis; Mr McCartin; Mrs Fuillet; Mrs Dupont; Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Giolitti (Commission); Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Nikolaou; Mr Bombard; Mr Patterson; Mr Dalsass</i> . . . . .	129	— Question No 51, by Mr Purvis: Imported polyethylene material: <i>Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Mr Purvis; Mr Haferkamp; Mr Moreland; Mr Haferkamp</i> . . . . .	158
5. Topical and urgent debate: Objections <i>Mrs Castle; Mr Enright; Mrs Lizin</i> . . . . .	148	— Question No 52, by Mrs Ewing: Fishery negotiations with Spain: <i>Mr Contogeorgis (Commission); Mrs Ewing; Mr Contogeorgis; Mr Harris; Mr Contogeorgis; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Purvis</i> . . . . .	158
6. Votes <i>Mr Barbi; Mr Mommersteeg; Mr Haagerup; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Boyes; Mr Simmonds; Mr Collins; Mr Arndt; Mr</i>		— Question No 53, by Mr Gerokostopoulos: Greek edition of the 1980-81 annual report of Eurydice: <i>Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Gerokostopoulos</i> . . . . .	159

— Question No 57, by Mr Sherlock : Chemicals inventory : Mr Narjes ; Mr Sherlock . . . . .	160	<i>Annexes</i> Mr Beyer de Ryke ; Mr Enright ; Mrs Charzat ; Mr Vankerkhoven ; Mrs Gaiotti De Biase ; Mr Boyes ; Mr Didol ; Mr Puletti ; Mr Israël ; Mr Skovmand ; Mr Bonde ; Mr Bøgh ; Mrs De March ; Mr Hänsch ; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul ; Mr Barbi ; Mr Chanterie ; Mr Haagerup ; Mr Brok ; Mr Lalor ; Mrs Van Hemeldonck ; Mr Balfe ; Mrs Veil ; Mr Alavanos ; Mr Adamou ; Mrs Lizin ; Mrs Baduel-Glorioso ; Mr Di Bartolomei ; Mr Glinne ; Mr Forth ; Mr Balfe ; Mr Adonnino ; Mrs Boserup ; Mr Eyraud ; Lord Douro ; Mr Notenboom . . . . .	163
— Question No 58, by Mr Rogalla : Direct elections to the European Parliament : Mr Pisani (Commission) ; Mr Rogalla ; Mr Pisani ; Mr Seligman ; Mr Pisani . . .	161		
— Question No 59, by Mr Marshall : Free movement of capital within the Community : Mr Pisani ; Mr Marshall ; Mr Pisani . . .	162		

## IN THE CHAIR : MR JAQUET

*Vice-president*

*(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)*<sup>1</sup>

Lord Douro (ED). — Mr President, I see that today's agenda provides for voting at 4.30 p.m. and Question Time from 5.30 to 7 p.m. As I understand it, we have five or six reports to vote on at 4.30. Several of them have quite a lot of amendments, and I cannot conceive that we shall conclude the voting by 5.30. Therefore, we shall be faced with either having to postpone some of the voting till the following day or curtailing Question Time, both of which I think would be rather unfortunate, and I would ask you, Mr President, to consider with your colleagues in the Bureau whether there should not be some adjustment either to bring forward voting-time or to change the time of Question Time in order to maintain the one-and-a-half hours. I wonder if you would consider this.

President. — I agree, there is a problem here, which will be raised at the meeting of the enlarged Bureau that is due to take place in a few minutes' time. That, I think, is where a solution can be found.

Mr Deschamps (PPE). — (FR) Mr President, I entirely agree with what you have just said, but whatever happens, I would urge you not to adopt the

suggestion that has just been made of bringing forward Question Time, in view of the importance of the votes.

President. — We shall be seeing to this in the enlarged Bureau in a few minutes' time<sup>2</sup>.

### 1. CAP (contd)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the report by Mr Curry (Doc. 1-987/83).<sup>3</sup>

Mr Tolman (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, the debate on the Curry report concerning the Commission's proposals is, in my view, of fundamental importance for the common agricultural policy. It is absolutely essential that, in view of the precarious financial situation, the Committee on Agriculture — and, I hope, the European Parliament — begin by opting for a policy that provides for quotas and for a superlevy on overproduction in general.

I approve the Commission's proposals without enthusiasm, but I regard them as a temporary necessity. I shall not discuss the implementing measures at this stage: they will be considered in due course. The common agricultural policy is in fact in difficulty because of a combination of what are at the moment unfavourable circumstances: a decline in sales, third countries, increased imports of agricultural raw materials, rising production and declining consumption. The fact that budgetary criteria determine the agricultural policy further aggravates the problems. If the

<sup>1</sup> For adoption of the Minutes, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

<sup>2</sup> For documents received, see the Minutes.

<sup>3</sup> See the preceding day's debates.

## Tolman

quota policy — the restriction of production and the restriction of financial guarantees — is generally accepted, we must also ensure that it is applied consistently.

What I fear is an exemption race. We cannot have that. It would undermine the measures and make them pointless. Certain unavoidable exemptions for developing farms and young farmers should be granted on an absolutely uniform basis throughout the Community. A direct superlevy on overproduction of milk is a very drastic, but possibly effective measure: the least bad choice of the three — a lower price, a steep rise in the co-responsibility levy and a superlevy on overproduction. Agreement to this last measure will also justify an objectively acceptable price policy and the abolition of the co-responsibility levy.

The acceptance of limits on production must not lead to prophesies of doom for European agriculture. Agriculture has been forced on to the defensive far too much: it must go on the attack, and the slogan should therefore be: 'Not less production, but different products.' This is particularly important when we consider employment in agriculture. Major opportunities exist for the growing of high-protein crops, of which we import so much. This policy must therefore be redirected.

Finally, Mr President, the agricultural proposals must be seen as a single package. They must be assessed as such, which means that we must expect there to be a levy on oils and fats, that imports of butter from New Zealand are no longer acceptable and that imports of agricultural products must at least be stabilized.

To conclude, Mr President, a great deal has been said about the bankruptcy of agriculture. It must be realized that, if there is talk of a better balance between supply and demand, there can be no talk, or there has been no talk, of the bankruptcy of agriculture. So far we have not had to queue for food, and the food we buy has been good and cheap. Mr President, I hear voices expressing some concern about higher consumer prices, and I believe that, if there is to be a better balance between supply and demand, this is inevitable.

**Mr J.D. Taylor (ED).** — Mr President, in the two minutes available to me I cannot address myself to the general problems of the common agricultural policy, but I do want to direct my attention specifically to a particular area much dependent upon agriculture — namely, Northern Ireland.

When we joined the European Community in 1973, we found our intensive pig and poultry sectors strangled. Milk, however, was one of our success stories, and now we find that this is also in serious

trouble. Agriculture employs some 15% of our people in Northern Ireland, mainly in small family farms. That is in a community where we have over 20% unemployment. But, of course, there is surplus milk in the Community, and there must therefore be a curtailment of milk production. This we accept in Northern Ireland. But the effect must be fair in all countries, and this does not mean uniformity of application. Milk constitutes 33% of Ulster's agricultural production, employing 3.5% of our people and accounting for 2.5% of our gross domestic product. Therefore you can readily understand that the future of the milk industry is vital to the Northern Ireland economy. The present proposals would result in a reduction of 12% in our income from milk — a loss of £25 million from the present total of £200 million.

Nor would the present proposals be equal in their application throughout the United Kingdom. The cost per cow would be twice as much in Northern Ireland as in Great Britain, because 1981 was an especially low-production year in Ulster. The present proposals therefore have an unfair basis; an average of three years would be better.

Not only is this unfair, but, unlike most of Europe, Ulster producers have no alternative means of agricultural production. Our milk industry is a grass-based industry. Price reductions create problems, as they simply encourage increased production. If a fair basis of quotas is agreed, then it should also apply to southern Ireland. Milk is equally important to southern Ireland. If an exemption is made in southern Ireland's case, then it must also extend to Ulster. Otherwise, unfair competition and smuggling would be supported by this Community between the two States within our island of Ireland.

**Mr Vitale (Com).** — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think we all realize that this debate goes very much further than just the agricultural sector, covering as it does all the questions of the construction of Europe, its internal equilibria, its enlargement, and its international relations.

The Committee on Agriculture has tried to cope with this multiplicity of subjects but, despite the very laudable efforts of the chairman, Mr Curry, has been unable to avoid a number of contradictions remaining in the final document, which leaves the way open to both the supporters of cuts in expenditure and their opponents.

Of course, the contradictions do not stem from the Committee on Agriculture. They lie, in reality, in the proposals of the Commission, which, taken as a whole, do not constitute a programme — a project for agricultural development, the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy, and the balancing of expenditure.

## Vitale

What kind of agriculture do we want ten years hence?  
What should be its rôle in the European economy?  
And what its rôle *vis-à-vis* the rest of the world?

In proposing a general, indiscriminate across-the-board cut in expenditure, the Commission provides no answers, makes no decisions, fettered as it is by the budget and by American pressure, both of which lead to the simple, straightforward reduction of the rôle of agriculture both in the European economy and internationally.

It is true — and we recognize this — that the Commission has for the first time made a genuine effort to place a limit on surpluses, introducing guarantee thresholds and even milk quotas — our old proposals. But this measure, just as it is, which we approve because it is aimed at resolving a situation that is leading to the collapse of the Community budget, becomes unacceptable if, instead of being part of a political plan for the restoration of general equilibrium — which would make it possible to distinguish those who produce for intervention and those who produce for the market, the small producer and the large producer, the areas of surplus and those of deficiency — it subjects everyone to a co-responsibility tax which, because it is indiscriminate, ends up by perpetuating inequality and imbalance.

And there is another point: under the terms of what political project, Commissioner Dalsager, is the production being penalized of commodities that are not in surplus, which is the case of the majority of the Mediterranean products?

No, this is not a political plan for the recovery of European agriculture! It is not a programme aimed at internal equilibrium coupled with a different, though nonetheless incisive, European presence in international markets! It is nothing more than a budget operation that provides no foundations for the construction of Europe.

Obviously there is a budgetary problem, but it is one that is to be solved with a very much more complex set of incentives and disincentives which, on the one hand, selectively penalizes surpluses wherever these arise, drastically discourages farms without land, and quickly and automatically abolishes compensatory amounts; but which, on the other hand, encourages the production of commodities in short supply, lays down a different pricing system that rewards quality, protects the less-favoured regions and weaker social levels, widely relaunches structural policies along the lines indicated by the Thareau Report — which we support — and initiates a genuine exports policy, based not on subsidies but on export credits and long-term contracts. That is the kind of project that would

make possible the increase in the Community's own resources that is now indispensable.

These are the things for which the Italian farmers were asking when they came in their tens of thousands last week to Brussels to protest, not against Europe but for Europe, for which they will be asked to vote in a few months' time. A positive response on our part to those demands would represent a genuine contribution — far beyond the Athens summit — to European recovery, to popular support for this Parliament, and at the same time to the popular legitimation and prestige of the new Parliament.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs S. Martin (L).** — *(FR)* Mr President, coming as it does after the budget debate, this debate on the CAP brings home to us that we are now at the crossroads.

The changes that we make in the CAP will therefore be of vital importance. They should be directed towards two objectives: first, while rectifying the imperfections or deviations that have developed over the years, they should give European agriculture the opportunities for expansion that it has earned by modernizing when called upon to do so; secondly, they should create the conditions for optimum exploitation of Europe's only major natural resource, so that it may make a decisive contribution to our balance of trade.

Unfortunately, we are once again forced to the conclusion that the Commission's proposals owe much more to budgetary considerations than to a thorough economic analysis of the rôle of agriculture in a developed economy.

In addition to this, it is to be feared that one Member State after another will reject some proposal with an eye to their national interests, or alternatively in response to lobbying.

We are all aware, though, that we cannot go on as at present. There is no gainsaying that the unlimited guarantee, which has served well as a means of developing output of products in which the Community had shortfalls, is becoming increasingly difficult to justify in the case of products which are now in surplus on the world market. It also has to be recognized, however, that the unlimited guarantee has been most beneficial to the largest holdings and that, in the dairy sector, which is seen as the main culprit, it has fostered the development of industrial production, which is the main cause of the surpluses.

Unlike the Commission, we are unable to overlook the risks entailed by an abrupt switch to a strict system of inflexible limitation of production, because

**Martin**

it is likely to cause unacceptable social and economic disruption. Moreover, proposals for quotas, especially quotas based on prices, involve many dangers: they ossify existing structures, they leave no scope for correcting the undesirable distribution of factors of production that has been associated with the emergence of factory farms, they prevent the modernization of traditional holdings, and they make the establishment of new businesses problematical, not to mention administration of the system and monitoring of quotas. On the other hand, a system based on a co-responsibility levy graduated according to levels of production would avoid most of these disadvantages and would also be an effective means of discouraging the development of industrial dairy units. At all events, if the House decides in favour of a quota system, it should be aware that neither a linear co-responsibility levy nor duty-free imports of products directly in competition with our own could be maintained alongside such a system.

However that may be, it would be unfair to point out only the negative features of the Commission's proposals, which make up an integral whole. We must recognize the need to limit the output of certain products which are in surplus so that it can be developed where there are shortfalls. We must abolish monetary compensatory amounts, we must intensify research effort and, above all, we must be less timid in our approach to commercial policy. The Commission's proposals in this last respect are too sketchy.

The Council itself does not appear to be aware of what is at stake. We cannot kowtow to the United States whenever it raises its voice. While we are aware of the need for understanding extending beyond the Community, I for my part am convinced that the way to promote such understanding is to make a clearer affirmation of the will of the Community to exist.

**Mr Paisley (NI).** — Mr President, I welcome the fact that the motion for a resolution before Parliament today stresses that any adjustment of the CAP should not be to the detriment or disadvantage of family and small farms in less-favoured areas of the Community. Nowhere is this more important than in Northern Ireland, where the main basis of the economy is agriculture, which of necessity is dominated by grassland dairy and beef production representing together over 60 % of the value of the total agricultural output in the province. It would be nothing short of a disaster for the milk producers of Northern Ireland if there were to be a supplementary levy on milk, especially one based on the 1981 delivery to dairies. Current proposals imply a levy of 13 pence a litre, which would mean a loss of income to the dairy industry of Northern Ireland of some £ 25 million out of total receipts of £ 189 millions.

In addition, dairy farmers taking enlargement investment decisions since 1981 were unaware of the

severity of the levy now being proposed and some were encouraged in their enlargement decisions by grant aid from the Commission. All in all, I believe that the present proposals on milk will increase the cost of transportation, processing and marketing and that the net result of the levy will be an increase in prices leading to a further reduction in consumption.

There are particular difficulties attached to the disposal of skimmed milk in Northern Ireland. It is to be regretted that the Commission has not considered alternative disposal schemes more closely tailored to the market conditions. Further, Northern Ireland farmers feel strongly that the elimination of the special subsidy for butter consumption would be counterproductive. The subsidy should be retained as a means of helping to narrow the gap between butter and margarine prices. This would help to increase consumption of butter. I would have thought that it was the duty of the Commission to formulate proposals to stimulate the demand side of the market and to ensure that proper financial support is made available from co-responsibility funds for market production activities. This they have clearly failed to do. In all their calculations the Commission should bear in mind that Ulster farmers must be able to compete successfully with their counterparts in the Republic, and in the negotiation of market support measures every effort must be made to ensure that Northern Ireland's agricultural industry is not disadvantaged.

Turning to the proposal to amend beef support measures, it should be noted that beef production represents the largest sector of Northern Ireland's agriculture with an estimated value of over £ 220 million in 1982 and representing over 30 % of the total agricultural output. The proposals as they stand will result in the cessation of a substantial amount of financial aid to the beef sector, and this would mean that the progressive decline in beef herds in Northern Ireland, apparent since 1974, will continue. The beef variable premium scheme which operates in the United Kingdom must be retained, since it benefits consumers by providing supplies of beef at reasonable prices. The alternative of substantial intervention buying would prove more expensive to the taxpayer and would have serious implications for Northern Ireland, where access to intervention is already restricted by the physical limitations of handling and storage facilities. I might add that the proposal for a Community-wide trigger mechanism for intervention purchases would be totally unworkable, and Northern Ireland's status as a separate region for intervention purposes would need to be maintained.

I fully endorse the call in Mr Curry's motion for the Commission to make available studies indicating the social and economic results of these proposals. I also share the concern of the committee over the future of areas of this Community which are mainly dependent on agriculture and its ancillary industries.

**Mr Eyraud (S).** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, who in this Chamber or elsewhere can claim that the CAP is not the only genuinely integrated policy that Europe has? — Not even those who consider it too costly and falsely claim that financing it absorbs two-thirds of the Community budget. And yet, more than half of its history has been a tale of continual postponement of reform. Each new regulation is like another piece of a jigsaw that has now become incomprehensible to everyone. Despite a succession of memorandums, communications, policy reports, recovery plans and mandates, the story of the CAP has been one of an extraordinary lack of initiative. Whereas effectual measures rather than mere adjustments were called for in response to the developments that have taken place in the world economic and monetary situation and the far-reaching changes that have occurred in agriculture in the Community and elsewhere, all that we have seen has been one expedient after another designed to paper over the cracks. The effect has been a slow deterioration in the CAP, which has been gradually drained of meaning. Even though the twenty-year record of 'green Europe' is not completely devoid of successes, the present *impasse* is its logical conclusion.

Two questions therefore arise: why this *impasse*, and how do we get out of it? In the opinion of many Socialists, the main reason for the *impasse* is the wrong approach that has been adopted to the problems, which has taken budgetary considerations as the starting-point. It is wrong for a policy to be dependent upon a budget. The correct approach is to define the policy in broad outline and then allocate the resources needed to apply it. This holds true whether one is talking about the CAP or new policies. And what does the Curry report have to say? That the growth in agricultural spending should be slower than that in overall budgetary resources. No attempt is made to define what is meant by agricultural spending. For instance, it is not logical that refunds on exports to the developing countries should be treated as aid to agriculture. A second factor which has brought us to this *impasse* is the production of 'surpluses'. But can one reasonably talk of surpluses when the EEC's trade balance in agri-foodstuffs showed a deficit of 30 billion dollars in 1981? Of course, there is overproduction in certain sectors, but this is because the Community has always dealt with problems singly product by product, instead of adopting a general approach. It has always concentrated on products, without taking account of the producer or the consumer. This has meant that the EAGGF has never performed its proper rôle, which is the guidance of production.

Of course there is overproduction of milk and cereals, and this is because cheap cereal substitutes are being imported in defiance of Community preference and are competing with fodder produced in the Commu-

nity. Only cassava and groundnuts are subject to quotas, presumably because they come from developing countries, but soya is not, presumably because it is imported from the United States. Is this the price that Europe has to pay for its defence, for the protection of the American umbrella against Soviet missiles? If so, it should be said in as many words. But this is only part of the bill that we have to meet, since there is also the increase in production costs brought about by the rise in the dollar exchange rate, which bears most heavily on the countries with weak currencies, those with the highest interest-rates, which are also the poorest. This additional burden is compounding the imbalances within the Community, the differences in inflation rates and their direct effects — monetary compensatory amounts, which, as everyone knows, favour the rich countries by acting simultaneously as an export subsidy and an import duty.

A further reason for the *impasse* in the Community is the lack of solidarity: the poor are getting poorer and the rich richer. Anyone still unconvinced of this needs only to consider the shares of EAGGF guarantee expenditure received by farmers in the various Member States in 1981, when the average for the Community was 1 150 ECU. Those in the countries where these payments are highest, which I shall not name in order to save their blushes, received an average of 5 100 ECU each. In Greece and Italy, on the other hand, the averages were 160 and 720 ECU respectively. Small wonder, ladies and gentlemen, that their farmers are unhappy!

How, then, do we escape from this *impasse*? Solidarity between poor and rich requires political will. We are looking to the Athens Summit for a display of political will, coupled with imagination. It is this combination which influences the organization of markets: the market external to the Community, in connection with which I wish to emphasize two aspects in particular namely, stricter application of the principle of Community preference and firmness in regard to the GATT, and the intra-Community market, where there is a need for improving the various common market organizations and above all for regionally planned guidance of production.

The principle of differentiating support for farmers must never be lost sight of, and the need for structural aid ceilings will have to be faced. Under no circumstances, however, can we accept an across-the-board cut in farm prices as proposed by the Commission. On the other hand, any planning measure will meet with our agreement as long as it is not based on vested interests.

We are accordingly prepared to accept a quota system, but not any system. Not one which imposes a quota for each Member State on the basis of past production,



**Eyraud**

because this would once again put the richest at an advantage. Such a system would be bound to be rejected by Ireland, for instance, where the process of change is only just beginning in farming, and by Greece, Italy and perhaps others, since it is impossible to agree to an immutable situation. No quotas per agri-foodstuffs business, since it is not the rôle of industrialists or organizers of cooperatives to determine quantities to be delivered, which would be doing other people's jobs for them. No quotas per farm-holding, if they were again based on former production, since this would militate against progress, development and improvements in income for many farmers, including those working under the most difficult conditions, such as the young and hill farmers. Rather than any of these approaches, a quota system should take account of the market conceptions to which I was referring a moment ago and socio-economic conditions in the various regions of the Community.

For these various reasons, it is difficult, for us to accept the Commission's proposals or endorse the Curry report, because neither takes an overall approach to the problems of agriculture in the Community.

Let us hope, for the sake of Europe's future, that the Heads of State or Government meeting at the Athens Summit will show themselves able to speak the language of imagination, reason and commitment.

**Mr Dalsass (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, with the presentation of the Curry report Parliament is being called upon to take an important and difficult decision. Our task is that of demonstrating the manner in which the CAP can be rectified, how structural surpluses can be gradually checked, thereby reducing Community agricultural expenditure without curtailing farmers' incomes and, as a result, threatening their very existence. The limited time at my disposal precludes me from treating this subject extensively, and I have therefore confined my remarks to a few aspects.

A controversial point, as confirmed by several of the preceding speakers, is the fats policy recommended by the Commission. Our Committee on Agriculture has welcomed the measures put forward by the Commission, and indeed they comply with the action called for by this House on previous occasions. Whatever one's feelings on the matter, one point is undeniable: something has to be done to choke off Community imports of cheap cereal substitutes. They are largely to blame for the surplus milk production in the Community. It is an open secret that such imports stimulate milk production. They must, therefore, be reduced, and the means employed to attain this end are immaterial, whether by the imposition of a levy or through negotiations. The Committee on Agriculture has given

its blessing to threshold guarantees and the introduction of quotas in the case of structural surplus production. I am less than enchanted by such measures, for they represent a departure from the market economy, perhaps even an irrevocable one. However, it appears to offer the only possibility of checking surplus production without, in the process, calling into question farmers' incomes. To have exclusive recourse to the price mechanism would be tantamount to sacrificing the smallholders and farmers in mountainous and other disadvantaged regions. It would be a cardinal error to implement reform of the CAP at the expense of the weaker elements.

As a member of the Committee on Agriculture I voted, at the committee stage, in favour of the package now before the House for it incorporates one of my recommendations which stipulates that mountainous regions be excluded from such quota measures. Such an exemption is quite justifiable when one considers the dual rôle of guardian of the countryside and environmental protector which is fulfilled by mountain farmers. It is all the more justifiable when one takes account of the modest milk production accounted for by Community mountain areas that is no more than 6%. Exempting mountain regions from the measures envisaged would also resolve Greece's problem in that the totality of its milk production takes place in mountain areas. I believe the case of Greece calls for a special solution.

Just a word on the Commission's recommendation that all premiums should be abolished: while not denying that economies could be achieved in this way, one should nevertheless refrain from measuring everything by the same budgetary yardstick. Here I am thinking of the calving premium which the Community introduced for certain Member States. Even if Community policy dictates the abolition in principle of such premiums, they ought to be maintained at least for mountain farming regions. This would have the effect of bolstering the weakest agricultural sector, and one which is in dire need. The Member State I represent has a very modest milk production per farm, a little in excess of 18 000 litres per annum. This dictates the need for increased support for such regions.

To close, I would like to say that our Committee on Agriculture's suggestions constitute an acceptable compromise and one which will, I hope, be ratified by this House in its basic orientation, without having unnecessary recourse to amendments.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Hord (ED).** — Mr President, this debate takes place at a time when the CAP has exhausted the Community's budgetary resources. It seems to me that the Commission and even more the Council have really funk'd and avoided this issue in recent years.

## Hord

As we saw the other month, the crunch has now arrived in the problem of the budget.

Nevertheless, we are still failing to get to grips with the problem, and we now see how the Commission is involving itself in rolling over expenditure from 1983 to 1984. Present estimates suggest that in 1984 the Community's own resources will be exhausted in August. Of course, this is all part of a general scenario where the growth of agricultural guarantee expenditure has risen by 500% in the last 10 years, from 3.1 billion ECU in 1972 to the massive sum of 15.8 billion ECU. The rate of growth of agricultural expenditure is twice that of the Community's own resources. Clearly, if we carry on as we are doing, the total budget will be subsumed by agriculture in a few years. Agricultural spending amounts to 2 000 ECU or UKL 1 200 per head of the population engaged in agriculture. This is thanks to the high level of surpluses and the excessive costs of disposal — all as a result of unlimited price and intervention guarantees. Why should not the same degree of support be made available to the manufacturing industry throughout Europe?

Here we are today looking at the Commission's proposals for the reform of agriculture. I would suggest that they are ineffective and totally inadequate. There are critics who believe that the common agricultural policy is protectionist. That may be so, but one thing is very clear to me and that is that COM(83) 500 final is nothing more than a protectionist charter. We see how they plan a tax on oils and fats; they plan a limit on imports of cereal substitutes; they plan a reduction or abolition of imports of New Zealand butter and sheepmeat; they plan a restriction on beef imports; so the list goes on. I suggest that this is the worst type of negative and destructive thinking, which can only cause friction with our friends and dismay in the Third World, undermine European agriculture and penalize food manufacturers and consumers. Would it not be more honest for the Council and the Commission to revert to a realistic price policy? This could be introduced gradually. It would stimulate consumption and lead to a balance of supply and demand. Frankly, I see no other worthwhile solution but in the light of the Commission's proposals such a solution is light-years away.

I believe that the Commission has totally failed to come forward with worthwhile reforms. The reforms they propose are, I believe, nothing more than a rag-bag of petty prejudices that have been paraded on and off for many years and will do nothing to solve the problem that confronts us. I have therefore come to the reluctant conclusion that there is no prospect of the Agricultural Council or the Commission's DG VI securing a satisfactory solution. In this situation I believe it will be necessary for the Community to

inflict a series of new financial disciplines on the agricultural sector and that agricultural expenditure should be limited to a proportion of the Community budget each year. This straightjacket is now necessary, and with that added discipline it would then be incumbent upon the agricultural sector to put its own house in order. All we hear at the moment, notwithstanding the exhaustion of the Community's own resources, is that they want more money to spend more on agriculture.

I suggest that the consumers and taxpayers of Europe have had enough. The CAP has swallowed all the money and there are no solutions before us. I believe it is up to the budgetary authority to take over. To me, without any worthwhile solution in Athens next month, it will be incumbent upon the budgetary authority to reject the budget, because this is the only way to discipline agriculture. This is the only way, unfortunately, to deal with the great European agricultural disaster.

*(Cries of 'Hear, hear!')*

**Mrs Le Roux (COM).** — *(FR)* Mr President, in the Committee on Agriculture, the French Communists and Allies voted against the Curry report following the adoption of an amendment proposed by the Socialist Group calling for the introduction of a quota system, particularly in the dairy sector.

This is a dangerous course to adopt, since it means getting caught up in the wake of the Commission, which is still trying to solve the problems at the expense of farmers with small and medium-sized holdings.

It is true that there is a problem over the volume of milk production in the Community as a whole, but the responsibility for it must be investigated before proposing solutions. Have not some countries been induced artificially to produce ever-increasing quantities of milk, taking advantage of the combination of monetary compensatory amounts and duty-free imports of substitute products? A few significant comparative figures will suffice to illustrate this point:

Stocks of milk products have reached record levels, rising to 24% of the quantity delivered to dairies; the Federal Republic of Germany accounts for 53% of the dried milk in store and 32% of the butter; income support for milk producers, measured by comparing EAGGF expenditure on milk with the value of output, averaged 13.5% in the EEC during 1981, amounting to 26% in the Netherlands, 22% in Denmark and 13.7% in France. Dairy farms in the EEC received an average of 1 900 ECU from the Community budget during 1981, but there were wide variations from one country to another: 4 900 ECU in the United Kingdom, 6 500 in Denmark, 10 800 in the Netherlands, and 1 800 in France and Ireland.

**Le Roux**

These figures clearly show that Community policy in the milk sector has discouraged production based on home-grown fodder and promoted the advance of the milk factories in northern Europe, where milk is produced off the land using artificial feeds.

The Commission's proposals would only accentuate this trend. The quota system is particularly unfair to France, because it perpetuates the system without correcting the distortions. It also provides a means whereby industrialists will be able to accelerate the process of concentration and reconstruction, abandoning the least profitable formulas, especially in the less-favoured areas and uplands.

Before considering these quotas and discussing production targets, we should be tackling the real causes of the situation, we should be returning to adherence to the principles: Community preference and prices. This is the essential first step.

We also propose rationalization of the support machinery, in a way which would not hold back the modernization of farms using home-grown fodder but would take fuller account of the budgetary responsibilities of the various types of holding.

With this in view and in the interests of control and better balancing of expenditure on the milk sector, we have tabled an amendment to the Curry report proposing the following measures: exemption from the co-responsibility levy for holdings producing less than 150 000 kg a year; application of levies to 'milk factories' according to criteria taking account both of the degree of intensification and of the use of concentrate rations; differentiation of intervention according to quantities delivered for intervention; compulsory use of a certain proportion of Community cereals in compound feeding stuffs; a maximum amount of aid per holding in all Member States. In addition to these measures, we are proposing action to develop consumption and the establishment of a proper policy on exports.

**Mr Delatte (L).** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, today's debate is in my view of vital interest to the Community, a point which is well made, in fact, in the report by our colleague Mr Curry.

Our discussion today comes a few weeks before the Athens Summit and follows upon the vote on the first reading of the draft budget for 1984, a budget which, as we all remember, absorbs the full amount of the resources contributed by the various Member States.

My first comment is to say that those who believe that savings can be made on the common agricultural policy so that other Community activities can be developed are labouring under an illusion, which means that the 'own-resources' ceiling will certainly have to be raised if the Community is to take a step forward.

On an overall examination of the Commission's proposals, it is readily appreciated that the main concern

that they express is the concern to reduce expenditure on the common agricultural policy. I am not convinced that this is the right solution, bearing in mind that the cost of the CAP corresponds to 0.4 % of the combined gross domestic products of the Member States.

On the other hand, it is clear that the common agricultural policy, which was brought into being by the Treaty of Rome and the Stresa agreements, is in need of adjustment since, whereas we had shortages of all agricultural products at the time when those documents were signed, we now have surpluses of various products. It has consequently become a matter of urgency to curb the privileged importation from third countries of certain products which are in large measure the cause of European surpluses that are difficult to dispose of on the world market and at all events a heavy charge on the EAGGF budget.

I would point out that this is something that can be negotiated under the GATT rules, in accordance with the procedures laid down in Clauses 11, 19 and 28 of the Agreement.

Is it not paradoxical, ladies and gentlemen, that the Community should be the world's biggest importer of agri-foodstuffs while at the same time spending large sums on exporting produce in quantities directly related to the volume of raw materials imported? The recent report by the Court of Auditors is very explicit on this, pointing out that payments to agri-foodstuffs businesses absorbed 70 % of the guarantee funds in 1981.

Moreover, the enumeration given in this report of the recipient countries shows that the countries which receive the heaviest support from the EAGGF, in relation to the agricultural value added, are generally also those which import the most from third countries. Why should this be? Quite simply because exceptions to the Community rules are leading us to flout the great fundamental principles of the common agricultural policy.

Good reasons are found for not applying the principles of Community preference, financial solidarity and price unity. The best illustration of this is the system of monetary compensatory amounts.

Before reaching our decision on agriculture, ladies and gentlemen, we must ask ourselves a basic question, the question of whether or not the Community wishes to exploit the natural productive potential offered by its agriculture.

My own answer is 'yes', as I consider this to be a vital matter for the Community. I would add that it is now time that we pooled our efforts with our partners on the world market, bearing in mind that the world's surpluses of foodstuffs pale into insignificance when compared with the problem of malnutrition or hunger.

**Delatte**

What we do not find in the Commission's report — although this shortcoming is made good by the Curry report and highlighted in various amendments — is evidence of the will to develop a dynamic export market and to provide incentives for development of crops in which the Community has shortages. Adjustment of the CAP must be an integrated process if it is to produce worthwhile results. Only if an overall approach is adopted shall we make progress towards a valid solution.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Vernimmen (S).** — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the agricultural policy has been under heavy pressure in the various Member States for years. This has usually taken the form of meaningless slogans, which have even gone so far as to claim that Europeans believe it would perhaps be best for the agricultural policy to be done away with altogether. What is all too easily forgotten is that the agricultural policy covers not only farmers' incomes but also consumer interests and an important agro-foodstuffs industry.

The view generally held in the past, in my group at least, that expenditure on the agricultural policy must be reduced, although the effect on farmers' incomes must not be excessive, is now, I am happy to see, echoed in the Commission's proposals. The incomes and the future of family farms must be central to the options we take. We have always said, *ad nauseam*, that the excessive expenditure is due not to the agricultural policy but to the production of yet more surpluses. We remain loyal to the idea that agricultural expenditure must not rise faster than the general budget. In other words, if the Community's revenue increases in the future, we believe that other European policies must be considered first. The expense of agricultural guarantees must not be allowed to go on burdening the European budget unchecked, because I believe this leaves no room for other initiatives. A different policy can be pursued without harming small and medium-sized farms if the restrictive measures are aimed specifically at the sectors that have been producing structural surpluses for years.

A policy of this kind, which is now urgently needed, should be accompanied by suitable guarantees for small producers and, if necessary, by direct social support measures. We feel that the Commission's proposals form a valid basis for the discussion of a genuine reform, albeit in the medium term. However, some kind of price policy must continue to form part of the market mechanism we now have. I fully agree that this should be accompanied by the necessary guarantees. What economic system could support a structure of this kind, and what economist would dare to cite this system as an example? I therefore believe that the Curry report has tackled this problem in a particularly cautious and yet convincing manner. It

principally concerns two important sectors: the dairy and the cereal sectors.

As regards the dairy sector, I feel that the proposed quota system can and must be accepted for the time being. The question is, however, whether we should retain the co-responsibility levy if this system is introduced. That would be initially possible, I believe, but it seems questionable in the more distant future.

As for cereals, substitute cereals should, of course, be seen as the most serious problem. It seems to me that clear agreements and negotiations must be given preference over levies, which will simply encourage protectionism. And I must here express my doubts about the effectiveness and political feasibility of the proposed levies on oils and fats. If we are to respect our international commitments, this levy can be nothing other than a tax on consumers. It is doubtful whether it will have any effect on butter consumption.

On the whole, I am able to approve the Curry report, but I hope that these structural changes will not mark the beginning of the end for the agricultural policy.

**Mr Bocklet (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the realignment of the CAP is confined essentially to the milk sector. I would like, therefore, to concentrate my remarks on an area which, heaven knows, invariably provokes controversy among the public at large. No one will deny that the Commission's recommendations on the introduction of guarantee thresholds or quotas in the milk sector constitute a serious interference in the existing market régime and a heavy burden for the farmers concerned. I am convinced, nevertheless, that the agricultural sector recognizes that nothing short of such intervention will be capable of resolving the problems we are faced with. Having said that, however, the measures envisaged for the milk sector will only resolve one aspect of the overall problem, leaving us exposed as ever on our open flank to imports of cheap cereal substitutes, a problem to which the Community is addressing itself in very hesitant style.

The problem is compounded by a vast array of arguments from various sides which only serve to conceal the real issue. I would like very briefly to demonstrate, by means of a ratio, the real nature of the problem. Community imports of livestock feed correspond, more or less, to the milk production resulting therefrom, which is in turn equal to surplus Community milk production. Such extensive Community imports of cereals are one of the prime cause of surpluses, not to mention the havoc they wreak on the domestic producing areas.

The Commission's courage in attempting to shore up its defences by recommending the levying of a fat-tax has caused an outcry in certain quarters and, more especially, amongst those fine gentlemen who run the oil-mills. While I have no doubt that a fat-tax alone

**Bocklet**

will not solve the problem in its present form, I nevertheless feel that we must sooner or later make an effort to come to grips with it. We cannot submerge the farmers with massive taxes on the one hand while leaving untouched our open flank through which pass the duty-free or partly free Community imports of livestock feed. Hence my conviction that action must be taken in the fats sector. Whether we prevail upon the United States and other third countries to apply a degree of self-restraint with regard to their exports of cheap cereals to the Community or attempt to regulate matters from within the Community through a fat-tax or indeed by means of modifying the GATT is of secondary importance. One way or the other we must ensure that this loophole is to some extent closed so that the charges currently borne by Community farmers can be spread more evenly rather than allowing the real culprit, duty-free cereal imports from third countries, to go unscathed.

The cry invariably goes up that such a measure would provoke price increases for margarine. This may be so, but when sacrifices are called for all round, then I must say it is only fair that part of the burden should be borne by those who stand to benefit from agriculture's ability to provide an abundance of products. Hence my conviction that a Community regulation of the fat sector would be a just and balanced solution for all concerned. I therefore urge you to support the fat-tax as recommended by the Commission and presented in the Curry report.

*(Applause)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR NIKOLAOU

*Vice-President*

**Mr Simmonds (ED).** — Mr President, having listened to the remarks of my colleague Mr Bocklet, I can only suggest to you that there is a difference between some groups in this House and between some nationalities. Certainly, the rôle of my group in this Parliament is not to push up food prices. We prefer to see them brought down. I can state quite categorically that in no way do we wish to see an oil and fat tax introduced. Furthermore, on the question of imported foodstuffs and their effect upon the European market, we would far rather see European corn prices come down so that farmers could afford their pig and poultry enterprises than place an additional tax to keep out imported foodstuffs. But I have been asked by my group to speak on the most difficult product sector of the CAP in Northern Europe, namely milk production, and I must confine my remarks to that. Although I have very grave reservations about the Commission's proposals, I believe that the imposition of a system of quotas will have the best chance — I put it no higher than that — of resolving the problem of dairy surpluses. But I have very serious

reservations about the bureaucracy associated with any quota system and also about the infinite capacity for a quota system to be abused. In short, too many people will cheat the system, and the Commission's record and rôle as a policeman is not a happy one. I therefore welcome the proposal contained in several amendments, including that of my own group, that quotas should be introduced for a relatively short period eventually replaced by a pricing policy. It is only through limiting prices that farmers will be encouraged to produce less milk at lower cost. That means producing it from grass, and not from concentrated corn rations.

May I particularly reassure my Irish colleagues — those of them that are listening to me — that I believe that those dairies which do have a bright future are those which have retained the principles of the family farm, with relatively low input costs both of nitrogenous fertilizer and of concentrate rations. That, I believe, is the criterion of efficiency that we must use in the decades to come. The principle of maximum input of finance, fertilizer and food to produce the maximum amount of milk per cow and per square foot of concrete is outdated.

Mr Dalsager — if I may have your attention for one moment — may I assure you that my group feels extremely strongly about your proposal to introduce some kind of tax on intensive producers. It just will not work. The opportunities for fiddling are too considerable. In order to encourage a transition to less milk at lower cost, my group will support a quota system based on 1983 production figures. Not 1981, Mr Commissioner, Our support is also dependent upon our demand that a pricing policy must in the medium and long term reflect the demand and market for dairy produce, not just in Europe but in the world. That is a sound basis. It is the only basis for an honest and pragmatic food and farming policy for the 1980s. Furthermore, it is also a compromise which I believe every Member of this Parliament can support.

**Mr Adamou (COM).** — *(GR)* Mr President, the Commission's proposals for a review of the CAP will have even greater adverse consequences for Greece's agricultural economy, because as we all know, the Community's rules and procedures were formulated and operate in such a way as to favour economically well developed countries, i. e., the big monopolies and multinationals, while the brunt of the crisis is borne by working people, especially in less well developed countries such as Greece. Since our country's accession to the EEC three years ago, not only have our economic problems been exacerbated to the ultimate degree, especially those in the agricultural sector, which is among the most basic sectors of our national economy, since it occupies 29 % of the working population and contributes 20 % of the gross national

**Adamou**

product, but in addition our potential for economic development is being reduced day by day.

To justify its proposals, the Commission alleges that the Community has passed beyond the stage of self-sufficiency in most foodstuffs, a situation which — it alleges — has upset the balance of the market. This is plainly a deliberate distortion of the truth. There are of course surpluses that have to be disposed of by burial, but these surpluses exist only because millions of people remain hungry. The Commission is fully aware that in the Community there are already 15 million unemployed, which may well rise to 20 million during 1984. It is also aware that in the Community over 70 million people are caught in the poverty trap, i.e., have incomes far below the minimum subsistence level. If all those people were able to satisfy their basic needs, consumption would outstrip production. Instead of proposing measures to increase the consumption of foodstuffs, the Commission proposes further restrictions in agricultural production, with freezes and reductions in the price of agricultural products, the generalization of quotas, and the limitation or abolition of subsidies. In other words, it is essentially proposing the further reduction of agricultural incomes, something which leads to the uprooting of thousands of small-to-medium-sized producers from their homesteads. The Commission alleges that the aim of the CAP review is to integrate the agricultural economy fully into the general framework of economic activity, because the EEC's agricultural exports consist to an ever-increasing extent of processed agricultural products and because agricultural raw materials are ever-increasingly used in the production of chemicals and organic products and as a source of energy.

Of course, these are all pretences, for the real aim of the CAP review is to secure even greater profits for the monopolies by a redistribution of the Community's budgetary resources, by continually lowering the prices of products, by the development of big business in the agricultural sector, and by the greater horizontal and vertical penetration of large capital interests into the sphere of agricultural production.

Moreover, the Commission alleges that the CAP review aims to orient agricultural production towards the cultivation of products in which the Community is deficient. In practice, however, exactly the opposite is happening. For example, the EEC is deficient in cotton and Greece is the only country that produces cotton, covering 15% of the Community's needs. However, instead of supporting and at least doubling Greek cotton production, the Community determined an upper production limit of 450 thousand tonnes of raw cotton. Why? Because the monopolies import cheaper cotton from third countries, make greater profits, and the principle of Community preference is reduced to empty words. The same is happening with Greek dried grapes and dried figs, with sugar, tobacco,

citrus fruit, etc. In three years, the quotas and preferential agreements have consigned to the grave as surplus 700 thousand tonnes of Greek fruit and vegetable products, thousands of chickens — a thing that the Commissioner himself found hard to believe — and eggs, and Greek farmers are right in saying: 'We hear that in the EEC there are butter mountains and huge deposits of powdered milk held undisposed in warehouses, yet never have we heard of even a kilo of butter or powdered milk being buried. Why?'

Mr President, while the implementation of the CAP as it stands at present has had severe consequences for Greek agriculture, its review would be the deathblow to the Greek agricultural economy. For this reason, even though the Committee on Agriculture's resolution has some positive features we shall vote against it, as we did on the Committee itself, while stressing yet again that the only sure way to develop Greece's economy to the benefit of our people and our country is to break away from the EEC.

**Mr Maher (L).** — Mr President, on this occasion I make no apologies for speaking about the situation in my own country, even though I regret having to do so. These proposals, as I perceive them, are virtually putting the lid not only on Irish agriculture but on the whole Irish economy. This is where I find the Commission proposals unacceptable. They have put forward a blanket solution without indicating what effect it will have country by country. They have shown us what the savings will be, but they have not shown exactly what the cost will be country by country.

In our particular case we have had a major crisis arising out of the British demand for their money back. Even though Britain has negotiated entry and renegotiated it, it is still looking for its money back. In our case the effect of these proposals is 13 times as costly to Ireland as the British repayments are to Britain, I repeat, 13 times. This is of vital national interest as far as we are concerned. It is costing us—and I will give it to you directly in money terms—in the dairy-related industries alone 217 million Irish pounds. How do we compensate? Where do we get the money?

We have an adverse trade balance with the other countries of the European Community of 790 million Irish pounds and that in a small economy. We have an adverse trade balance with the UK, which is our nearest trading partner, of 1 179 million Irish pounds. This is arising in the main because we have accepted membership of the European Community with its disadvantages and its advantages. One of the disadvantages is that we have to have industrial free trade, we have to have industries from other countries competing with ours. This has caused us massive unemployment—more than 72 000 Irish jobs lost because of the importation of British and other industrial goods into our country without any trading

**Maher**

barriers. That is the cost to us. How do we compensate? We accepted that we have to pay a price. Now we are being told that in agriculture we have to pay a price too because we cannot develop: a lid is going to be put on our economy.

What is the solution for a country like mine? I correct my friend Mr Jonker, who said that 80 % of our production is from grass. In fact, it is almost 90 %. Because of climatic conditions and soil types, we have no alternative but to utilize our grass. Where do we turn? How do we provide jobs for our people? This Community has made a major effort and has focused especially on the problem of unemployment, and yet the policy it is putting forward for Ireland is, in fact, going to create more and massive unemployment. Mr President, I ask you whether the European Community is entitled to do that to a small country, because that is the result of these proposals. Let no one think any different!

Could I turn to my Socialist and Tory friends and say that, strangely enough, they get into the same bed at times? Mr Gautier might have made Mr Hord's speech, and *vice versa*. They have this simplistic solution that you reduce prices and everything will be alright. I would say to Mr Gautier that perhaps we ought to reduce wages for the people he is talking about, the so-called workers, as if the farmers were not workers. Reduce the wages so that more people can be employed: that is a great solution! Apply the criteria all round! I would like to say to Mr Hord especially that this is an extremely callous resolution, because that is not the only solution. For instance, Mr Hord, how do we buy your industrial goods? We are your fourth best customer. How do we buy your industrial goods when you kill our agriculture? There is no way we can do it. So it is not just as simple as reducing agricultural prices.

I turn to the Commission also and tell them that I believe they are at fault because they are giving us no alternative. That is the question: what alternatives do we have? Where do we turn? There is no forestry policy yet and we have no policy on protein production — two areas where there are massive deficits. We have not had these alternatives and in my view, that is the way we must turn. We have not had regionalization of agricultural production; there is no policy there. Mr President, I call on the Commission to give us a long-term policy for agriculture and to give us an indication of where we can turn for alternative forms production.

**Mr Blaney (CDI).** — Mr President, let me say straight away in the short time available that, though it may contain many attractive paragraphs, while paragraph 34 stands as it is, I am afraid I cannot but oppose the Curry report. I do so for the very good reason that the quota system tied into the superlevy, which we have heard so much about, would spell disaster for my country and for the small milk

producers in other countries as well. If my country is not allowed to develop its total production, that will have the repercussions that my colleague, Mr Maher, has just explained to this House.

We produce 4.5 % of all the milk in the Community. This, to get it into proportion, is only equal to a 2 % increase, for instance, in total German production. Such a 2 % increase would equal the total production of my country. Remember that 10 years ago Germany was a net importer of dairy products. It is now an exporter of dairy products and is creating havoc for the Community's budget, together with its more developed neighbour, Holland, where the farmers, owing to their strong currencies, their MCAs, their major ports and their milk factories developed in these recent years, are, in fact, the people who are really creating the lakes of milk, the butter mountains, and so forth.

When we come to vote on this report, we should look well at the figures on attendance in the Committee on Agriculture. Eighteen members in that committee voted for the report, 12 voted against and 6 abstained. Therefore, it is rather loaded to suggest that this particular paragraph, which was then inserted at the committee stage as it were, was carried with any great acclamation. There were as many against that paragraph as actually voted for it.

If there is to be a solution to the budgetary problem insofar as agriculture and its cost are concerned, then we should be thinking in terms of differentiated price support, so that we may help those most who most need our help and not give across-the-board support to the milk factory producers, the huge combines that are wrecking our markets. We should not be giving them the same support as we give to the smaller producers.

The importation of cereals has increased from 14 million tonnes to 25 million tonnes. By bringing that amount of cereals and cereal substitutes into our market we are creating an imbalance, creating surpluses which we must then export at a loss, and we charge the cost to the agricultural budget. This, I think, is entirely wrong. Those who wish to see reductions in the cost of the common agricultural policy should look at the unnecessary imports, the creation of surpluses by these imports and the cost of disposing of the surpluses so created. They would then realize that the cost of the common agricultural policy is not 67 %, as has been said. By true accounting it is only 43 %, despite all the talk we may hear about it.

**Mrs Castle (S).** — Mr President, everyone now admits that the Community is in a crisis, and that this is overwhelmingly due to the common agriculture policy. We are told time and time again in these debates that the common agricultural policy is the Community, and, of course, we all know that this agricultural tail is wagging the economic dog.

**Castle**

Things must be very bad indeed for the Committee on Agriculture, of all people, to admit that the open-ended spending spree has got to stop. What we are discussing today is how to do it. As David Curry said in his speech introducing his report, there are only two ways of resolving this crisis, and they are alternative ways. The first is to let prices find their natural level, a level at which they bring supply and demand into balance and clear the surpluses, and the alternative is to adopt a system of quotas, i.e., to freeze the present pattern of production but carve it up.

It was interesting that Mr Curry admitted that these were alternatives. I ask his Conservative friends just to ponder upon his speech, because they are trying to have the best of both worlds. I thought in his speech Mr Curry dealt with the first alternative rather cavalierly. Indeed, I was amused at his contemptuous description of the market economy as applied to agriculture. He dismissed it severely with these words: 'Let the market sort out the efficient from the inefficient. Let the market apply the pressures to be more efficient. In other words, let the sword smite the just and the unjust equally!' I must say I thought that was a very good description of the market economy at present being applied in Britain by his own Prime Minister.

At the same time Mr Curry skated hurriedly over the drawbacks of the quota system. Yes, he admitted that it meant additional bureaucracy, additional control, loss of flexibility; but he failed to mention the most serious drawback of all. Not only does a quota system maintain the very high prices which created the surpluses in the first place, but it actually forces prices up higher still. This is something that this Parliament has got to face, because the quota system does nothing to tackle the root problem of the common agricultural policy — the fact that that policy makes consumers support farmers' incomes through high prices, instead of letting the taxpayer support farmers through income supplements. What this inevitably means under a quota system is that if the amount a farmer can produce is cut back by quotas, we can only maintain his income by putting the prices up. Indeed, Mr Woltjer, in certain of his proposals, admitted frankly that a quota system means pushing prices up higher still!

Only a few days ago, the consumers' group in the European Community published a pamphlet showing what has happened to sugar under EEC policy. The pamphlet was called *The Sweet Smell of Excess: The EEC Sugar Scandal*. It pointed out that the surplus production in sugar, despite quotas, still comes to 70 % of Community requirements and that the housewife in Europe is paying three times the world market price for it, while the taxpayer in Europe has to find £100 million to pay for the export subsidy.

So all the main problems will remain if we choose the quota road. Indeed, the Curry report makes it quite clear that the quota system should continue to be bolstered by import levies, by export subsidies and by a tax on the import of vegetable oils and fats. The Commission has been very honest with us. It produced not only a very interesting speech by Mr Dalsager in the Committee on Agriculture but it has produced a draft regulation pointing out that under GATT requirements of non-discrimination we shall not be able to put an import tax on vegetable oils and fats unless we put an internal tax on them as well. They are quite right to be honest with us. Anybody who votes for the Curry report is voting for an internal tax on margarine, lard, dripping, on a whole list of goods set out in the Annex to the draft regulation which the Commission is seriously putting to the Athens Summit next month as part of its solution to our agricultural problems. Here they all are, set out with perfect honesty. Any commodity that contains an oil or fat that is not of milk origin will carry this tax — soups, sweets, cakes, pastries, ketchup, baby foods, ice cream. Although the Commission says that this new tax is only a little one, as the outraged consumers' associations have pointed out in Britain, once you get a tax placed on a commodity it is never taken off. All it can do is go up. I say advisedly to my Conservative friends, exactly the same thing will apply over quotas. Once they are on, you will never shift them. It is no good saying that we will only have them for a short time as an interim measure. The fact is that we have got to choose one of two roads this afternoon; either the road of curbing the excesses of the agricultural policy by bringing prices down to the level that clears the market or you say, no, it is politically too difficult, we will go on the road for quotas, with all the protectionism and the high prices that they bring with them. I want to say advisedly to my Conservative friends that you cannot combine the two. Go for quotas and you will find that you have got them forever and the other alternative has been dodged. Remember, we are not legislating in this Parliament: we are using it as a platform to educate opinion, and we must stand out clearly and unreservedly for the analysis we think is right and then vote for it.

I therefore say that British Labour MEPs cannot support a report which, faced with the crisis we all admit, deliberately chooses the wrong road. What we want is a five-year plan for progressively moderating prices, reducing prices year by year, step by step, to bring them into line with world prices, and I say to my Irish friends — I beg them to listen, because they are rejecting both the quota system and the price controls that under our five-year plan the money saved on the guarantee fund can then be put into income support and supplements, where it is needed most, and you can really finance a meaningful struc-



## Castle

tural policy. We shall be talking structural policies for the rest of the day, and we all know there is no money for it and there will not be any money for it until we stop spending it all on the guarantee front. I want Ireland to get more, and our way is the better way to give it her.

**Mr Hord (ED).** — A point of order, Mr President, I would like to point out for the benefit of Mrs Castle that Mr Curry, speaking in this debate yesterday, did so as rapporteur and chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and not as a member of the Conservative Group or as a representative speaker for this group.

**Mrs Castle (S).** — His words were his own. A man must be answerable for his own words.

**Mr d'Ormesson (PPE).** — *(FR)* If the common agricultural policy is going through a crisis, ladies and gentlemen, it is first because recession and inflation do not provide favourable conditions for the development of trade with third countries, and at the same time because the future financing of the Community is itself in need of review. Since control of the surpluses has become a necessity, it is also a matter of common sense and political will. Seen in this context, the introduction of a price guarantee threshold for structural agricultural surpluses (where, over a four-year period, supply has exceeded the amount needed to meet internal requirements, external requirements and requirements for strategic stocks) is a scheme which recommends itself for adoption.

The Curry report suggests a means of putting this into practice: the introduction of quotas for structural surpluses. This is certainly the least unsatisfactory and therefore the least unfair solution. In keeping with the logic of this situation, the report appositely proposes the introduction of a tax on imported vegetable oil. Finally, it reiterates the need to dismantle monetary compensatory amounts over a two-year period. Since this report has the merit of proposing solutions which do not call in question fundamental principles of the common agricultural policy, I shall be voting for it, assuming, of course, that it is not denatured during the voting.

I should also like to renew the plea that I have already made in this House for a revision of the basis of the British contribution, which I find excessive. It is worth recalling in this connection that the United Kingdom's imports of agricultural produce and foodstuffs from the Community have increased by 250 % over the past 10 years, the fastest rates of increase being observed over the past two years, whereas its imports from third countries have risen by only 150 %. This is an indication of the way in which re-examination of the British contribution is linked to that of the future financing of the Community.

The importance of this matter is heightened by the fact that it coincides with negotiation of Spain's acces-

sion to the Treaty of Rome. Unless new, definitive rules can be agreed to settle the issue of Member States' contributions, insurmountable problems could arise over Spain's accession, since that country may then be disinclined to sacrifice trade with South America for the sake of Community preference.

This comment illustrates the point that, whereas the common agricultural policy can be saved and developed only through adherence to its fundamental principles (unity of prices, Community preference and financial solidarity), its achievements to date cannot be safeguarded unless these basic rules are revised. It is for this reason, in my view, that the future financing of the Community must be based on a more balanced sharing of contributions among the Member States. Following reasonable adaption of the common agricultural policy to present-day conditions, this will be the next priority.

**Mr Kirk (ED).** — *(DA)* Mr President, I listened with great interest to Mrs Castle's speech a moment ago, and I noted that the first seven minutes of the honourable Member's speaking-time were devoted to criticizing the rapporteur, Mr Curry. It took about 30 seconds to tell us what the British Labour Party wanted from the common agricultural policy: a five-year plan with low prices for farm products supported from public funds. That is the Labour Party's farm policy. It was, after all, the agricultural policy of the United Kingdom until it joined the Community in 1973. Was the country able to feed itself? Was it not dependent on imports of cheap food from abroad? Was not that the situation? That situation was only possible for the United Kingdom because the rest of us in Europe produced food and exported our food products to the country. But would it be possible for Europe as a whole to be able to supply itself with food? Would we not get into exactly the same situation as the Soviet Union today, with long queues of consumers, people standing at the shops waiting for something to buy? Is that the policy the Labour Party wants to implement? At all events I am quite certain that no majority could be found in Parliament to back such a policy.

I think that in actual fact the agricultural policy, as it was conceived to begin with, has fulfilled all its original intentions. We are now, broadly speaking, self-sufficient in food, and I think we should be glad of that. We should indeed be grateful for all those millions of farmers who are able to supply us consumers with the food we want at reasonable prices. I think we should stress one point namely, that the real cost of farm products has fallen for everyone in Europe. So we have brought the original idea to fulfilment: to be self-sufficient at reasonable prices. Our problem is simply that we did adjust the mechanism of the

**Kirk**

common agricultural policy after achieving 100 % self-sufficiency. Neither the farmers nor the consumers are to blame; it is the politicians and the administrators who are to blame for the fact that we have not been able to do anything about it. We are now in a critical situation because one Member State is putting immense pressure on the Community and wants an adjustment to the budget. But this whole question should not be seen simply against the background of the budgetary difficulties. It is something we need to debate in any case, because we cannot use our money irresponsibly. We cannot use it for stockpiling food for which there is no market.

I wish to make some criticisms of the Commission's proposal. It is not so many years ago that the Commission proposed and applied a co-responsibility levy. We were told at the time that the co-responsibility levy would effectively control milk production. Did it succeed? Our answer was that it would not, but the Commission tried to persuade us that we should nevertheless apply this form of control. Then guarantee thresholds were applied. Were the problems solved by this means? No, and now quotas are being proposed. I warn most emphatically against applying a system of quotas for milk production. I do not think it will solve our problems, and I think it is a typical administrative reaction. I believe it is more important to apply a graduated intervention system, which will ensure that the farmers have an interest in developing the market and under which they do not enjoy a 100 % guarantee if they cannot sell their products.

In conclusion I should like to say that we are against the levy proposed by the Commission on oils and fats. I think that what the Commission is doing is robbing Peter to pay Paul. It cannot be right to expect the margarine producers to pay for the problems in the dairy sector. Finally, I must point out to the Commission that it will not achieve a settlement in Athens unless the monetary compensatory amounts are removed. The market imbalance caused by the monetary amounts cannot be allowed to continue.

## 2. *Welcome*

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasant duty to welcome to the official visitors' gallery the Right Honourable Dr Henry Jenkins, President of the Australian Parliament, who is visiting the European Parliament today.

We hope his contacts with colleagues and Members of the European Parliament, and in particular with our representatives for relations with Australia and New Zealand, headed by Miss Joyce Quin, will be crowned with success.

Let me take the opportunity to remind you that the magnificent gavel used by our own President was presented to Parliament by Dr Jenkins's predecessor. Dr Jenkins, we wish you a pleasant stay.

*(Applause)*

## 3. *CAP (contd)*

**Mr Maffre-Baugé (COM).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, although there is much in the Curry report with which we are able to agree, some of the ideas that it contains are inimical to the essential interests of our farmers, so much so that although the road to which it points may be paved with good intentions, it no doubt leads to purgatory. When Mr David Curry criticizes the Commission for adopting a strictly budgetary approach, when he rejects the arbitrary imposition of ceilings on agricultural expenditure, when he calls for strengthening of the support machinery for Mediterranean products and its improvement in the course of reform of the CAP, he of course finds favour with us, but when he turns his attention to enlargement, to theoretical, subjective price adjustments, or to tighter application of co-responsibility and quota systems, we are bound to express serious reservations, since this is setting a course likely to lead ultimately, on the pretext of theoretical structural surpluses, towards a free-trade area, by way of a series of gradual disengagements.

Nevertheless, this is a report set squarely in the specific context of today's conditions; as such, it sets out the various aspects of our activities in this field and provides each of us with a basis on which to comment and put forward proposals.

At a time when so many people are trying to attribute all our budgetary difficulties to the CAP, when the Commission is sending out alarm signals in an attempt to cast blame into the Community's farmers (notably the freezing of advances on exports), such a report serves a useful purpose as a discussion document. There has certainly been a need for a review since 1979. I shall confine myself to just one aspect — Mediterranean products — since the speaking time that we are allowed is so short that it is possible for us to discuss a topic in only the briefest terms.

I therefore note that the share of EAGGF resources allocated to Mediterranean products was 5 % in 1978, and 15 % in 1984. Thus, some progress has been made towards rectifying the situation, suggesting that there is now some degree of awareness of what is required, but how many further stages will be needed before a proper balance is established? Let us consider two examples: the 1982 wine-growing regulation, and the fruit and vegetables regulation. The 1982 wine-growing regulation has been presented as representing a step forward, but in the event it has proved

**Maffre-Baugé**

unsuited to its purpose ; far from functioning as anticipated, its mechanisms have failed, since preventive distillation, set at the level of 14.04, is a thoroughly unattractive proposition and is not achieving the aim of putting the market on a sound footing at the beginning of the wine-growing year. The arrangements under which the Commission is able to instigate exceptional distillation involve expense without taking in sufficient quantities and without having any real effect in terms of supporting prices.

The Commission has failed thus far in its efforts to secure a decision on compulsory distillation and, moreover, were it to succeed, it would be unable to police the system. Finally, the Commission is looking for the abolition of premiums on short-term storage contracts. Too much emphasis, in my view, is being put on grubbing-up, and not enough on aid towards improvement of wine-making methods and vine-stock selection. And yet this inadequate regulation is being taken by the Commission as a basis for opening negotiations with Spain and Portugal, in the pretence that the wine-making regulation is working well, whereas in fact it falls short of requirements in every respect. Nevertheless, our aim is to get it improved, not removed.

With regard to fruit and vegetables, some improvements have been secured, so that we now have the outline of an acceptable policy. However, this is no more than that, a good working outline which needs to be built up into a proper set of regulations affording the same guarantees to these products as to others. I would remind the House of the report on this subject that I presented in plenary on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture. Here again, the pretence is being made that the first steps in the right direction are the sum total of what needs to be done and that the obstacles to enlargement have been removed. This is all aimed at creating an illusion and gaining acceptance for the accession of Spain and Portugal. The economic and special problems are being obfuscated, the amounts of the financial commitments are being glossed over, the whole approach is designed to mislead public opinion. Things could have been done differently, on the basis of fruitful, progressive and flexible cooperation taking account of the needs of individual sectors, and building up a system of complementarity, with an agreed timetable and preferential imports. The machinery could have been run in properly instead of taking action which is likely to cause the breakdown of the CAP.

I should like to conclude, Mr President, by expressing the fear that the Athens Summit will degenerate into a Persian market, with each participant claiming that his carpet is the best. The CAP, enlargement, financial policy and new policies will all be thrown together in some insipid concoction, turning the occasion into an opportunistic free-for-all, as a result of which nothing will be settled and everything will be left open. I

sincerely hope, Mr President, that I will be proved wrong.

**Mr Goerens (L).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, when it was first formulated, the common agricultural policy was soundly based. The free movement of goods, market and price unity, and common financial responsibility were destined to achieve the twin aims of the common agricultural policy as defined in Article 39 of the Treaty of Rome, the first of which was to achieve parity between agricultural and non-agricultural incomes, and the second to ensure that supplies reach consumers at reasonable prices.

The common agricultural policy has achieved a great deal in its fifteen-year history, and at all events its record is better than its reputation. Through application of the basic principles, it has developed quite remarkably, in both quantitative and especially qualitative terms.

There is no need to stress what an advantage it is that Europe should now be able to maintain secure food supplies to its consumers, at a time when dependence on external suppliers of new technology and energy products is seriously jeopardizing the future of the Old World.

I should like to say, ladies and gentlemen, that I am bemused by all the shibboleths and misplaced comments and statements that one hears on the subject of the common agricultural policy. Such conditioning of public opinion may not amount to a fundamental challenge to green Europe, but it certainly creates a climate in which new approaches, although much needed, are conspicuous by their absence.

In the light of the Community's budgetary constraints, the Commission has brought forward proposals for reform of the common agricultural policy. Let us therefore seize the opportunity afforded by this debate to gain a better understanding of the factors that have led the Commission to submit these proposals and the potential effects of such reform.

The Community has seen changes in the patterns of production and consumption over recent years. The availability on the market of substitute products, third-country exports of oils and fats and nitrogenous products onto a saturated market, and the usurpation of Europe's traditional markets by other countries, such as North America, have caused the development of structural surpluses. Abandonment of the principle of Community preference is therefore part of the reason for structural overproduction, since the same marketing guarantee is extended to agricultural products made from imported raw materials as to those of European origin. Would it not be more logical, therefore, to begin by eliminating the causes of structural overproduction? A more positive interpretation of the principle of Community preference would mean that priority was given to development of the natural resources available within our Community.

## Goerens

I therefore consider that Europe would be wiser to import only what it needs. All the experts are agreed in pointing out that Europe is falling further and further behind in the general field of new technology, so that it could be said to have a surfeit in one area and a dearth in the other. It is common sense that what we should be importing is not *matières grasses*, but *matière grise*.

As for the potential consequences of reform of the common agricultural policy, ladies and gentleman, allow me to draw the attention of the House to the following points. First, under the proposed reform, the bureaucracy at present concentrated in the Berlaymont building in Brussels would be extended to agriculture and the sectors downstream from it. Secondly, as the negotiations on reform of the common agricultural policy demonstrate, power is being shifted from Ministers for Agriculture to Ministers for Finance. Such developments are certainly not conducive to creation of a political and economic environment in which the legitimate needs of young farmers and those whose holdings have scope for development will be taken into account.

I therefore invite the Commission and the Council to think hard on the implications of their decisions on the common agricultural policy. Europe's farmers expect the people in charge of the common agricultural policy to tackle the real causes of the present situation.

In conclusion, I invite those responsible for the common agricultural policy to open up new prospects for the farming world, prospects based on its real potential for development. At least some progress towards solving the problems that the Community faces currently could be made by a positive response to the farmers' legitimate claims and by a more appropriate interpretation of Community preference.

**Mr Vgenopoulos (S).** — (GR) Mr President, I agree that the need for a review of the CAP is urgent, not just because of the surpluses and the difficulties connected with the Community budget, but also because applying the same regulations to all cases uniformly has resulted in exacerbating the initial inequalities. The way the CAP has functioned up to now has served a political concept that favours large-scale enterprise, since the definitive factor in the system of prices and interventions is the volume of production.

However, the economic crisis has started imposing a new dimension on agriculture. Criteria of social policy, such as maintaining rural employment and protecting the incomes of small producers, are constantly growing in importance. For example, the present Greek Government, faced by the problem of unemployment, regards agriculture as extremely important because it now occupies 28 % of the coun-

try's working population. For us, a review of the CAP does not under any circumstances mean any curtailment of expenditure for the purpose of achieving some monetary-economic aim. The Commission's efforts to restrict the Community's overall agricultural production by means of horizontal cut-off measures for all products and for every producer, in order to achieve drastic savings, can only meet with our opposition. The financial basis on which the Commission is relying in its review of the CAP goes contrary to the Treaty of Rome, which considers the securing of self-sufficiency in food supplies to be a factor in the Community's independence, and that of satisfactory agricultural incomes to be one of the Community's obligations.

Of course, we share the concern over the existence of structural surpluses that place a burden on the Community's budget. However, the arbitrary horizontal restriction of expenditure does not make it easier to formulate a fair and effective agricultural policy. Since neither productivity, nor agricultural incomes, nor the conditions of production are the same for all the regions, the means available must be utilized with discrimination.

The prices policy should take into account support for low agricultural incomes, the problems of inflation in some countries, and the continually improving position of large-scale producers in the Community, who are those mainly responsible for the increased surpluses and, by extension, for the increased expenditure. The Commission would do well to examine which regions and which enterprises account for the largest proportions of production and are responsible for the surpluses.

A study of this kind would lead to useful conclusions. The guarantee thresholds and co-responsibility are meaningless measures when they relate to products that are deficient in the Community, or to small producers. For example, there is no sense in imposing a production limit on dried grapes, because this is a product in which the Community is deficient by 50 %.

Today, Mediterranean production bears the brunt of the EEC's political choices in relation to trade and foreign policy. We all know that the conclusion of special preferential agreements with third countries is the main reason why from time to time there appear artificial surpluses of Mediterranean products in which the Community is in reality deficient. Preferential agreements will have to be accompanied by measures to compensate the losses occasioned by circumventions of Community preference, especially for small producers and disadvantaged regions.

Mr President, we agree in principle with the Curry report, partly because it comprises several positive features, some of which we submitted to the Committee on Agriculture as amendments, which

## Vgenopoulos

were accepted, but also because it is a collective and largely successful attempt to guide the CAP along the right lines in its new impetus towards the actualization of its new philosophy.

**Mr Clinton (PPE).** — Mr President, I was one of those who voted against this report in committee, I regretted having to do this, but I felt I had no option, because I cannot accept limitations and quotas being elevated to the status of principles of the CAP and, as proposed by the Commission, being imposed regardless of their impact on individual Member States or regions of the Community. Even the very limited and inadequate exemptions are qualified.

That said, the report is a good, broad statement of the principles and objectives to be followed in any desirable adjustments of the CAP. I regret, too, that the report could not be a more specific and definitive response to the Commission's proposals. I fully realize how difficult it would be to do this: an assessment is quite impossible owing to the large number of measures proposed, the indefinite extent to which these measures might be used and the uncertainty as to which combination of them might eventually come through for any particular product or, indeed, as an overall compromise package.

Farmers' incomes and flight from the land do not seem to worry the Commission. In its introduction to its proposals, the Commission talks about the importance of equitable distribution of the charge between the different Member States, but completely ignores this statement when it proceeds to give blanket application to the super-levy on milk, regardless of its effects in some Member States as against others. If this attitude is followed through to the Council of Ministers, then some Member States who have never attempted to use the veto, and who do not want to use the veto, will have no option but to use it on this occasion.

This sort of provocation should not take place. Nothing but harm can be done by creating totally unacceptable situations. To say to a country like Ireland, where the GNP is about half that of the Community average, there can be no exemption for you, is simply ludicrous. To say to a country producing only 2.5 % of the total agricultural output of the Community, and 4.5 % of the milk, you must freeze your production at 1981 levels, is even more ludicrous, especially when we know that a recent survey has shown that 50 % of our farmers have incomes of 2 000 Irish pounds, or less than 1 600 sterling. In addition to this, when it is known that 70 % of our total agricultural output is accounted for by milk, cattle and beef — milk alone 30 % — and that this production takes place largely on the basis of

home-produced feed, how can Mr Tugendhat and some of the Commission officials come to Ireland and say that there can be no exemption for Ireland? In my view, they have no right whatsoever to do this. At this stage these are nothing more than proposals on the table, and to give the impression that they are anything more is only to create unnecessary problems and disturbance for everybody.

Since we joined the Community we have kept the rules of the club. We have never tried to renegotiate our Treaty of Accession. We have joined the EMS and suffered a considerable loss as a result. We have kept our side of the bargain, and we expect the Community to do the same. Is the Commission aware of the special protocol we received with our Accession Treaty stating that all the institutions of the Community would be fully utilized to align our standard of living with that of the original Six? We are still at 50 % and are being told in effect: you stay there, convergence is out for you. How can any minister return home to his people with this story, especially with almost 16 % of our people unemployed already? If the Community proceeds in this way, it will collapse as sure as night follows day.

I fully accept that all reasonable savings possible should be made, but the Member States that are really causing the problem are those that are importing 16 million tonnes of grain substitutes and using high-yielding cows as factories to convert this into milk, milk powder and butter, creating the large surpluses that we know to exist. These same countries have the advantage of strong currencies that give rise to further distortion of trade within the Community. I fully support the Commission's proposals for the elimination of the MCA system. There can be no common market as long as they exist. There can be no common market until national aids are removed and until money is available at the same rate of interest throughout the Community.

The contribution of the dairy and associated cattle industry to final agricultural production is almost twice as great in Ireland as the Community average. The contribution of the dairy sector to GNP is over 5 times the Community average. I am sure the Commission knows this and refuses to acknowledge it. In all the circumstances, is this fair play, or has the whole philosophy of the Community gone down the drain? The UK had an unacceptable situation at 0.5 % of its GNP and got this reduced to a quarter. If we had to go back to the 1981 levels of milk production, we should immediately lose 1 % of our GNP. Has the Commission no concern for inequities?

What we are saying is simply this: allow us to get strong enough and we will carry our share of the load.

*(Applause)*

## IN THE CHAIR : MR VANDEWIELE

*Vice-President*

**Lord O'Hagan (ED).** — Mr President, I applaud all those in this Parliament who have already declared themselves against an oils and fats tax: the Liberal Group for the right reasons, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for the wrong reasons, and Mrs Castle, as part of a declaration in what was otherwise an empty and bitter speech. She knows that I was going to comment on what she said, and I am grateful to her for returning to listen.

If we are going to attempt to modernize the common agricultural policy we cannot run down the false road which leads to a dead end; which is what the introduction of a margarine tax would imply and would bring. There are a number of reasons why we must set ourselves firmly against this margarine tax, both as a parliament and as a group of people anxious to bring the common agricultural policy up to date.

There is a strong possibility that any such proposal would be outside the normal budgetary procedure and without any proper legal basis. Almost certainly the unilateral adoption of this step by ourselves, without consultation, would be against the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, and is likely in any event to be opposed to its principles. Whether we did it with agreement or not, it would almost certainly lead to retaliatory action, first from the United States, where Secretary Block has already made a public statement, and subsequently from others. Whatever Mr Bocklet says about such action, we cannot live in an isolated and insulated world. We are part of the trading community outside Europe as well as in Europe, where we operate as a food-producing community.

Such an action on our part would break our Lomé obligations. That is something which would have serious consequences to all of us who value our trading links round the world. An action of this sort would be more than difficult to apply, and because of the mixed character of the imports of oils and fats — some animal-based, some not — it would end up with absurdities, with cases being taken to the Court of Justice and leading to complicated and probably unenforceable judgments.

Finally and this is the most important point the introduction of the margarine tax would considerably raise the cost of food to consumers. I am sure Mrs Castle's list is fairly comprehensive, and others of us in this Parliament could add to it. It is the taxpayers, who pay for the policies of the Community to whom we have to justify its common agricultural policy. Mr Curry's

report is a step on the road towards that modernization which most of us seek, and a tax of this nature would make the task that he has been seeking to help us with all the more difficult.

I do not want to speak too quickly because I think that the translators in this Parliament have a difficult time and the interpreters need a rest from time to time. If I finish before my time is up I shall sit down.

However, I do want to say this. I was brought up in a Somerset village much of whose post-war farming prosperity depended on the work of the late, great Tom Williams, the Labour Minister for Agriculture after the War. It is an indication of the extent of the intellectual and political bankruptcy of the modern Labour Party that their spokesman here comes along with a proposal which recent questions by me in the British Parliament show would cost more than £ 2 billion a year to the British taxpayer. We have had quotas in the United Kingdom called standard quantities, and we took them off. They can be removed.

It is unfair, as a member of a committee of this Parliament, for Mrs Castle to come here and attack the chairman, acting as rapporteur, when she knows he was here as a rapporteur. She was on the committee that drew up the report even if she did not like it. Let us have some positive views from this Parliament. I commend Mr Curry for his activities as a bi-partisan chairman. I think this debate has, on the whole, been useful, and apart from the speech I have referred to, I am sure we have helped the Community.

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*

**Mr Kyrkos (COM).** — *(GR)* Mr President, the CAP is central to the discussions concerning the Community's future, and, as Mr Charalambopoulos said yesterday at the summit meeting in Athens, this problem will be faced in combination with the budget and the potential for new policies. There is an outcry against the CAP in powerful circles within the Community, who maintain that it absorbs 65% of the budgetary appropriations and are calling for curtailment of the sums involved, supposedly because of the demands made by the fight against unemployment.

It is quite true that the CAP absorbs large sums. However, we should ask where these sums go. Can we possibly do other than take a look at their distribution? The Commission's official analyses show that the CAP has benefitted the wealthier countries and enterprises. Butter and milk mountains are formed, while Mediterranean products remain without analogous protection. This finding should be the starting-point for any subsequent guideline. If we cut the grants indiscriminately and horizontally, ignoring the consequences, we shall ruin farmers in Mediterranean

**Kyrkos**

countries such as Greece. Who would dare choose that path? We do not need a patched-up CAP, but a new CAP in the light of the experience we have all accumulated. Millions of farmers all over Europe join in this aspiration. There are signs of this view in Mr Curry's report, which we commend for its global view and which we will vote for despite certain important reservations.

We have submitted amendments to the report, which embody our view that the problem should be approached not on the basis of accounting criteria, but of socio-economic criteria with a view to developing poor or middle-income households and the less developed countries, propping the European market against its competitors, and fighting unemployment and the dissolution of villages, especially mountain villages. Thus, we agree that there should be some restrictions on the production of milk; but how can we do other than allow Ireland a lengthy period of adaptation, since its economy depends so much on this product and how can we not encourage milk production in Greece or Southern Italy, which are short of fresh milk? Does this not mean that those regions should be exempted from the measures in question? By all means, let us determine quotas to limit the generation of surpluses. At the same time though, let us not hesitate to support deficient crops such as Greek tobacco or dried grapes. Let us assist in reorientation towards alternative crops and contribute towards the conversion, to ensure the long-term absorption of the products and enable surpluses to be disposed of as aid to the Third World countries and to famine-stricken areas. Besides, we should vigorously oppose the influx of American agricultural products, animal feeds and fats and oils onto the European market, and not hesitate to support measures, in any case approved by Parliament, such as the Vgenopoulos report on oil, intended to reinforce both the oil-producers and the Community's economy. Finally, we should clearly recognize the need to put the Guidance Section of the EAGGF to effective use in restructuring Europe's agricultural economy, to contribute to the implementation of Mediterranean programmes, and we should not ignore the fact that the variety of inflation-rates must be reflected in any pricing policy.

Colleagues, our debate on the CAP raises important problems that affect the Community's prospects as a whole. There is much in the Curry report that can turn our thoughts along the right lines.

**Mr Nielsen (L).** — (DA) Mr President, to begin with I should like to express my thanks to the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture for the work he has done as rapporteur. I think it was an exemplary performance. Mr Curry even tried out what one might call a novel method of arriving at the right positions to adopt by setting forth a series of alternative possibilities which could be considered in the Committee on Agriculture. Mr Curry's speech yesterday also bore

witness to this devotion to his task as Chairman of the Committee, and I pay tribute to him for it before the House.

But, having said that, I must echo the warnings we have heard in this debate against a weakening of the common agricultural policy, that keystone of the Community which is in fact suffering from the lack of a common policy in other areas, particularly the economic area; we have seen the result of that in the monetary field. While regulatory measures are needed, the question whether we can support them will depend on what kind of measures are involved. If it must be — and I think it is something we all have our misgivings about — it is because there is so much regulatory activity in the economy as a whole and because there is intervention all over the world in agricultural policy. But, Commissioner, is it not possible — I have raised this question before, and I do so again — to incorporate consideration of quality production and sales performance into the common agricultural policy? These two things are, after all, closely interlinked. Also I consider it important not to abandon those farmers — often the younger ones — who have closely followed the Community's structural policy and with Community support have built up modern and efficient systems of production, which will also benefit the consumers in the long term. It is precisely these farmers who have suffered under the very high interest-rates we have had, and because of the lack of a common economic policy — to which I have referred — this interest burden is particularly heavy in some countries. Few have made such a major pioneering contribution — also in order that the consumers can enjoy cheap supplies of good food in the years to come — as these farmers. Now there is a risk that they may encounter further difficulties as a result of what is currently happening in the Community. I therefore appeal for a recognition in the Community of the need to remember precisely these people, who have been encouraged in this way to expand their production, when certain changes are to be made in the agricultural policy.

I warn against experiments along the lines of turning the agricultural policy into a social policy. This has to be regarded as something completely different. The Community could perhaps introduce a special policy for specific farming sectors, but that is something quite different. It could be a healthy move in a world in which there is an unhealthy tendency towards the concentration of populations in the cities, where they then have great difficulty finding work. I think there is scope for action here, but it is something which must be regarded as completely independent of the common agricultural policy. The common agricultural policy has helped to carry the Community forward. If we fail to secure its further development, the Community will not only stagnate but will go into decline, which is why we have a very strong commitment to applying the right agricultural policy.

**Mr Davern (DEP).** — Mr President, while we are talking about a tax on oils and fats in this Community, why can we not have some honesty from some of the Socialists on the far side? We know that what they are really talking about is the lobbying of Unilever, not what the consumer is paying. A tax on margarine will not matter. Mr Hord is shaking his head. We know it. The British are the best lobbyists in this House, but they are in the pay of some of the best lobbyists too. We are here to talk about Community preference. There is Community preference for farmers in every other community except the European Community. There is no tax on American farmers and none on New Zealand imports, yet the farmers in this Community are the one who are being asked to pay. So much for Community preference!

I come from a small country that has a very high dependency on milk, with 46% of our exports depending on it. We negotiated to enter this European Community. Other countries — Britain and Greece — have since twice renegotiated their positions. We have never renegotiated ours. Now we find that suddenly the rules have been changed. I find the Commission's role in this, to say the least of it, Machiavellian. I suspect the Commission of causing a further furore last week, though I agree with what it said about the British contribution. It has been taking the wrong attitude, but at last it has accepted 42% as the proper figure to put on the cost of the agricultural policy. At the same time, we now have the threat that there will be no agreement in Athens in December. Therefore, we shall have no prices to put forward. It could be next June before this Parliament will agree on prices, so that the Commission can then go ahead at that stage. That is how serious the position, will be. I wonder whether this is a ploy by the Commission. Is it so Machiavellian that it would even dream of trying that type of ploy? I hope not.

We accept that there is a serious problem of surpluses in the Community; but it is not caused by the smaller farmers of this Community. It is caused by farmers in some countries and in some regions who are farming without soil or sun. It is not being caused by the small family units. Today during this debate I have heard Members, including Lord O'Hagan, say that we must stop production at the present level. That means that the big guy stays big, but the small guy has no hope of holding on to his position. That is what this Community is coming to: the rich are getting richer, while the poor are getting poorer. The saying applies to countries in this instance. Fortunately, there are other alternatives. We can have a production limit on our own farmers, provided that we can explain to them how we allow 86 000 tonnes of New Zealand butter to come in with no tax whatsoever on it and how a New Zealand minister can say that he is guaranteed for the next 10 years that these exports will be allowed to continue. Does the new import of

American soya this year, together with the sales of American wheat, mean that we are going to be flooded on the world market again next year? That is the sort of answer the Commission is not giving.

At the present moment confidence in farming is gone. There is no confidence in its future, particularly amongst the smaller farmers. Our hearts are supposed to be wrung by the crocodile tears from the alleged consumer groups here. If they are depending on imports from the world markets, they may very well find themselves caught out. They have a guaranteed supply of food in this Community, but this is something they do not seem to appreciate.

**Mr Marck (PPE).** — (NL) Mr President, the adjustment of the common agricultural policy, as indeed of any policy, is a constant task for the European Community. It is important, however, to avoid throwing out the baby with the bathwater and interfering with the basic achievements of this policy. The only completely integrated policy the Community has must not be blamed for the absence of other common policies. The common agricultural policy has made an essential contribution to the supply of ample high-quality foodstuffs to the European consumer and to the adaptation of the agricultural community to new economic requirements. Without this policy, concealed unemployment, and therefore concealed poverty, in agriculture would have been very high.

The central feature of this common agricultural policy is the price policy. If farmers and their families are to be assured of reasonable incomes, the price policy must continue to be the main instrument. I am glad to see that Mr Curry's resolution stresses this basic fact three times.

But there are adverse effects too. Strange to say, they are the outcome of affluence, the affluence of nature, which produces rich harvests, the affluence that is due to the high level of productivity the farmers have achieved, and the affluence which goes with a wide range of products and so offers the consumer too much of a good thing. The dairy sector in particular has produced structural surpluses that weigh heavily on the markets and expenditure. These structural surpluses must be eliminated without the dairy farmer's living standards being affected.

The Committee on Agriculture has opted for a quota system for a limited period, while the problems continue, and that seems to be a basic and important condition to me. It also calls for flexible application in the case of small and hill farmers and underprivileged areas.

Mr President, I have endorsed the compromise and also agreed to this exemption and flexibility. But personally I would find it a pity if the final result were a series of exemptions, especially exemptions of a general nature. To be specific, I advocate that over-



**Marck**

production should only be permissible in the case of individual producers, such as young farmers who have only just taken over a farm, or farms which have only just begun to implement a development plan and have therefore made substantial investments, or farmers who have to work under particularly difficult conditions. But I should not like it if exemptions applied to whole areas or to specific types of farm. Mr Davern has just said that certain types of farm should be excluded, and I consider that a very dangerous precedent. Farmers must not be excluded because they are working efficiently.

Limits on production in the Community must, however, be accompanied by limits on imports of competing products, preferably by means of international agreements, which must result in balance in the world markets.

In this connection I would say, however, particularly to the Commissioner present for this debate, that the Community must not confine itself to punitive action. It must also give encouragement. The consumption of dairy products can be improved. More resources must be made available for this purpose, and the Commission is not doing enough in this respect.

Finally, there is an urgent need for a procedure to make the system of monetary compensatory amounts into a transitional arrangement after currency fluctuations. But I believe this is a subject that we can discuss in greater depth on the basis of future reports. I shall therefore be voting for the motion for a resolution.

**Mr Battersby (ED).** — Mr President, this is a serious debate and I personally deplore the personal election campaigning and the polemics embodied in the declaration of Mrs Castle, which was, I think, deplorable. The fact that she is not here now and is giving a press conference on those empty words she uttered is rather indicative. I also deplore the cheap, mean and unfounded comments of Mr Davern. They do not become him.

We, Mr President, are the world's largest trading unit. We are one of the major agricultural exporters. We are one of the major industrial exporters, and if we are to encourage third countries to buy industrial goods from us, and our services, we must import what they have to sell, even if the only goods that they have are agricultural. Agricultural protectionism may in the short term help cushion the agricultural sector, but it can only have a negative impact on our overseas overall balance of trade in the long term. And as my colleagues Mr Provan and Lord O'Hagan have said, it can only lead to retaliation and the destruction of the common agricultural policy. We must import if we are to export, and both our import and export trade must be better planned and organized on a long-term basis: I address this particularly to the Commission.

As a major trader, we must act responsibly and honour our historical obligations to other nations; to coun-

tries such as New Zealand, which, Mr Davern, is a land of small farmers like Ireland, a country which more than any other depends on the export of dairy products and sheepmeat, a country which imports far more from the Community than it exports. It imports much of its advanced technical equipment from France, and how does France think New Zealand generates the cash to pay her and to provide jobs for her industries? The Community is three-quarters self-sufficient in sheepmeat. New Zealand covers the winter shortfall in lamb and maintains lamb demand throughout the year to the long-term benefit of our sheepmeat producers. And where else could we find high-quality winter lamb in the Community?

Another country, Mr President, is Thailand. We import over 5 million tonnes of manioc every year from Thailand, and this trade plays an integral role in the Thai economy. We want Thailand to remain a free democratic State in ASEAN with an expanding economy which provides a natural market for our industrial goods. Now this trade must continue. Manioc helps to keep our livestock feed prices down, to the benefit of the consumer, and it helps the Thai nation to survive.

But perhaps the main agricultural nation which must concern us, Mr President, is the United States. Good relations with the States are vital for the survival of the common agricultural policy. There is no agricultural export future for either the common market or the United States if we fight each other for and in agricultural export markets. The only beneficiary in such a fight is the Soviet Union. We must cooperate and we must plan together; we must plan with the other major producers, such as Canada or Australia — and many others — we must plan together with them and not fight them. We must plan a combined approach to agricultural markets.

Obviously, we must accept the threshold approach for cereals. This is essential for our pig, poultry and other livestock producers. We must bring our prices closer to world price-levels, but the world level must be an agreed level acceptable to the farmers. We have to take into consideration wages and import costs; we have to give our farmers a reasonable livelihood, because without our farmers we — and that includes Mrs Castle — would starve. Our farmers are the backbone of Europe. Let us not destroy or weaken them or force them away from the land for reasons of short-sighted and cheap political advantage or by agricultural policies which have not taken into account the fact that farmers, whether they be in Britain or Ireland or in Greece, have to survive if Europe is to survive.

*(Applause)*

**Mr De Gucht (L).** — *(NL)* Mr President, agriculture is a sensitive issue with the public, as is clear from the attendance for this debate. I have the impression that

**De Gucht**

quite a few of the statements that have been made have been inspired by the rank and file and do not necessarily offer any hints as to how the problems might be solved. I do not personally think it is a good idea to lie to the farmers. They may derive some benefits in the short term, but it is not in their interests. It is better to tell the truth: in the next few years the money available for farmers will not be increased by one franc, adjustments will inevitably have to be made within the existing margins, and they must even reckon with a downward trend. The Community is increasingly seen by the consumers as the Community of the milk-lakes, butter-mountains and so on, as the Community of cheap butter for the Russians and expensive butter for Europeans. There is a great deal that is untrue about these slogans, and they bear witness to a convenient form of poujadism. But it must be realized that this anti-propaganda is not helping the farmers and that they expect a different answer.

The report of the Court of Auditors also reveals the difficulty of regulating markets, which very quickly leads to a deplorable state of affairs. There must be clarity and also greater transparency if the baby is not to be thrown out with the bathwater.

But now to the matter in hand. In view of the budgetary difficulties, the structural surpluses of certain products and the criticism of its management, and adjustment to the common agricultural policy is unavoidable. Restrictions on quantities produced and the prices guaranteed are unavoidable. It must be possible for the modern medium-sized family farm to go on earning a reasonable living. If it cannot, the CAP and the Community itself must be overhauled, and that is surely not the intention. But small farms will also face problems, even in Flanders. If we are going to do anything for this large group of people, mostly middle-aged and older, we must have the courage to tell them that, in a climate of strict economies, they will depend on direct income subsidies if their incomes are not to decline each year.

Economic crisis, Mr President, is always accompanied by the spectre of protectionism. And the lessons to be learnt from the past, that the protectionist spiral was partly to blame for the great depression of the thirties and that we owe the golden sixties to the success of the Kennedy Round, are all too quickly forgotten. A tax on vegetable oils and fats is being considered. The Flemish Liberals are absolutely opposed to this. Some sort of justification is, of course, advanced for this idea. It is now being said that the United States must also make a contribution to the reorganization of the common agricultural policy, that European farmers cannot be expected to be the only ones to make an effort. The most important thing to be remembered is that the introduction of import taxes is a decisive step in the protectionist spiral and will be followed by retar-

liation by the other side. We can then forget all about steel exports. It is a decisive step towards a real freeze on world trade, where there is already a downward trend, and also a decisive step towards continuing recession. We are therefore opposed to this measure, Mr President.

**Mrs Gredal (S).**— *(DA)* Mr President, I should like to add one or two comments to the Curry report on changes in the common agricultural policy. The Danish Social Democrats, given the present financial situation in this sector, can support the introduction of a so-called superlevy in the milk sector, but at the same time we recognize that such a levy might freeze the structure in this sector. We therefore think that the levy should be an interim measure, and I would also stress that an interim levy should be combined with a very cautious price policy.

In the cereals sectors, the Commission proposes a freezing of the price of grain, hoping to bring about an adjustment to the American level. We can also give our full backing to this. We have always thought that the big grain producers and grain merchants have been favoured by the common agricultural policy for far too long at the expense, in particular, of the smaller, newly-established animal-product farmers.

On the other hand, we cannot accept the Commission's proposal for a fat levy on imported vegetable fats. To begin with, it could easily lead to a trade war with the United States, and secondly, a levy of this kind places the burden on those at the bottom. Certainly, it is the big multinational corporations which produce margarine, for example, but they will, of course, pass the fat-levy on to the consumers. And, as margarine is a basic product, this price increase will hit the weakest consumer groups in the first instance. We feel that the fat-levy is socially undesirable, and we must oppose it. Then there is the fact that a fat-levy is in reality a new 'own resource' for the Community, and we want new own resources to be collected through the VAT system and not by way of occasional levies.

As my last point, I should like to comment on the Commission's proposal for a ceiling on agricultural expenditure. The Danish Social Democrats fully understand that savings need to be made on expenditure in this sector, but we cannot accept that this should be done by means of a quite arbitrary ceiling. This could do a great deal of damage. Instead the Commission should examine each market regulating measure in isolation and pick out the undesirable elements in that way.

**Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE).**— *(GR)* The subject of reorganizing the CAP we are concerned with in Parliament today is of direct interest to, and will have major consequences for, millions of our fellow-citizens belonging, at least in some countries, to the lowest-in-

**Papaefstratiou**

come classes. The rapporteur, Mr Curry, and the Committee on Agriculture have undoubtedly put together an important work in which they have tried to compromise between frequently divergent views.

I think the Presidency was quite right to include in today's debate the question I submitted on behalf of my colleagues and fellow European Members of the New Democracy concerning aid to farmers in countries that are facing special problems. These problems led us to propose special measures for the support of agricultural incomes in countries with high inflation rates, i.e., substantially higher than the average inflation rate in EEC countries. We also propose strict application of the principle of Community preference, because we believe that Community markets have great potential for the absorption of the Community's agricultural products, at least such as are not characterized by huge surpluses like those of dairy products. In addition, we propose that special provisions should apply to Mediterranean products, to reduce the difference between the incomes of farmers in the north and in the south. Finally, we propose that increases in the prices of agricultural products should take into account whether the products in question are in surplus or in short supply within the EEC countries.

More specifically, Greek agriculture, which is undoubtedly underdeveloped because of the small size and poor quality of the holdings and because of organizational problems, could be effectively supported if the Council of Ministers were to decide to equalize the prices of Greek agricultural products with prices elsewhere in the Community by curtailing or abolishing the transitional period. It is also necessary to accelerate the increases in economic aid for olive oil production, the market penetration of citrus fruit, hard grain and other Greek products. We also propose that the EEC should subsidize the interest payments on low interest loans to Greek farmers and farmers in other countries in the Community whose incomes are comparably low. Finally, Mr President, we believe that it is fair to subsidize means of production such as fertilizers, machinery, plant medications animal feeds, olive-gathering nets, etc.

**Mr Welsh (ED).** — Mr President, I understand that the House was entertained this morning by the rhetoric of the right honourable lady, the Member for Greater Manchester North; and I must say that such occasions are always exciting. However, it would be a great deal better if the honourable lady would, perhaps, concentrate on persuading her own group, who are here in such vast numbers as usual, of the justice of her case. They are the biggest group in the House, and if the Socialist Group were actually to produce serious proposals to reform the CAP, it would be very interesting for all of us. Unfortunately, she has not been able to do that, because whereas it is very easy to call for reforms of the CAP, one then has to

point out what reforms one is actually calling for. This is something that the right honourable lady has never been able to do, because she does not understand the thing in the first place. And that presumably explains her total lack of influence over her own colleagues in the Socialist Group.

We on this side of the House are a little different. We have to deal with the unpleasant and difficult problems. It is to one of those more esoteric matters that I wish to address myself this morning. It is the question of MCAs. Monetary compensatory amounts represent an entrenched distortion of the market. Of course, like all entrenched distortions, once entrenched they are extremely difficult to get rid of, because people come to depend on them. I have always believed that if there is any logic in an economic community, it must be that the various Member States are allowed to develop their comparative advantage. The parity of one's currency is a part of comparative advantage, either for good or ill. If you try to change that by artificial means such as monetary compensatory amounts, what you are doing is saying that although this product is very expensive, we are going to pretend it is cheap, and equally although this product is rather cheap we are actually going to manipulate our parities to try and make it rather more expensive. It is that basic fiddling with parities that is at the core of the MCA problem.

It would probably have been a great deal better if they had never been introduced. Now we have them, and people have come to depend on them. Therefore, one must question whether the Commissions' proposal of a rigid timetable for the dismantling of all MCAs is actually practicable. Past experience would suggest that although the Member States may undertake, in political terms, to do this, the price of their doing it — anybody who listened to Mr Davern this morning will have a good idea of the size of the price he has in mind — is likely to be very expensive in the form of other distortions of the market which will simply perpetuate the same problem but in another direction. Everyone will want a special deal.

There is another suggestion that positive MCAs should be removed by agreeing to fix prices on the basis of the strongest currency within the parity grid. That may suit some Member States, but it has two intrinsic problems. The first is that it will be highly inflationary. We all know, because we listen to Mr Ortoli here, how very important it is to keep inflation under control. The second thing is that a tremendous amount of discipline will have to be exercised by the weaker currency countries if they are not to succumb to temptation and give their own producers a special deal by undercutting the price again by artificial means. So I have to say that from our point of view, none of the proposals so far put forward to dismantle MCSs are particularly attractive.

## Welsh

What can we do? It seems to us that the dismantling of MCAs must be part of a far wider package. That package must consist of a strengthening of the EMS. There are two Member States who can make a positive contribution, and it will be interesting to see if they are prepared to put their money where their rhetoric is. Germany can agree that the ECU should have an official currency status, because they have resisted that up to now, and my own country could join the system in a wholehearted way. Personally, I very much hope that they will do so soon. That is the way we shall then be able to look seriously at the problem of monetary compensatory amounts. Unfortunately, it cannot be looked at in isolation.

**Mr O'Mahony (S).** — Mr President, there are a number of substantive criticisms of the report which I would like to make. Before I do so, however, I would like to refer to a number of positive aspects to which I believe should have our support.

Paragraph 3 calls for studies of the impact of the Commission's proposals on farm incomes. I think this is critically important. It defies logic that such studies have not yet been carried through, because the impact of the Commission's proposals differs for farms of different size and income as well as for different regions. I think it is absolutely critical that we have these studies carried out immediately, that they be published and that we see clearly what the impact of the Commission's proposals will be on farms of different size and on regions with different levels of dependency on agriculture.

Paragraphs 5 to 7, which contain proposals on the need to preserve farm incomes in situations where inflation rates vary, are also crucial and must be taken on board by the Commission and Council when working through solutions over the coming months.

Paragraphs 15 to 18 suggest that it is appropriate to increase the Community's own resources as a matter of right and that this should not necessarily be linked to a solution to the farm problem. That seems to me to be perfectly logical. All of us agree that CAP expenditure cannot continue to increase at its present rate, but that does not mean that, pending a solution to the CAP problem, we have to stand back from developing policies in all of the other areas where we wish to see progress made. I think this is something crucial which must be dealt with now. This Parliament has been demanding for many years — and certainly in the several months that I have been here — new policies for industry, energy, research and development, technology. Yet we refuse to make the funds available to initiate policies in these areas simply because we have not been able to cope with the CAP problem. That seems to me to defy logic.

These, therefore, are some aspects of the report which I can support. However, I must say that, on the critical

question of how one deals with the problem of surpluses and particularly milk surpluses, the report seems to me to contain contradictory suggestions.

Paragraph 34 appears to suggest that a quota system should be applied to the milk sector, while paragraph 36 appears to suggest a graduated co-responsibility levy as the correct approach. These clearly are contradictory suggestions and must be reconciled before we take final decisions.

Finally, the most critical aspect of the Commission proposals on the superlevy is that they are grossly discriminatory against my own country. They do not take into account our very high level of dependence on milk production and on agriculture generally, and in this sense they contradict completely and quite clearly the principle Community solidarity. They are grossly discriminatory, and, in my view, our country would have no option but to present the strongest possible opposition when the time comes.

At this late stage I appeal to the Commission to act on the basis of Community solidarity and to appreciate the reality that milk production and agriculture have significantly different importance in our economy from that in all others. Nine percent of our GNP is based directly or indirectly on milk production. It defies logic, it is grossly discriminatory and it is outrageous that the Commission does not take this into account, and neither, apparently, does the Council at this stage.

**Mr Stella (PPE).** — *(IT)* Mr President, it saddens me very deeply that a problem of such importance should become a matter of almost absolute indifference: it is not good enough only to remember agriculture when we sit down at our tables to eat, or when there is an election campaign in full swing!

Having said this, I should like to make a few brief points. As we know, the plan prepared by the Commission for reducing expenditure in support of the agricultural sector — which absorbs the greater part of the financial resources of the Community budget — aims primarily at regulating the milk and meat sectors, which jointly constitute the thorniest, most dramatic crux of the European agricultural problem.

The EEC is drowning in a sea of milk, and is choking beneath mountains of milk powder. These surpluses, which the Community is obliged to buy in so as to guarantee fixed, stable prices to the producers, have reduced the coffers of the EEC to a critical condition. The same is true of meat, especially beef and veal, of which there is more available than the markets can absorb, with the result that the storage centres run by the Community intervention authorities in Italy, for example, are bursting their sides with unsold goods.

Stella

The Commission, with its reform policy, proposes to make drastic cuts to reduce the size of these surpluses that are so costly, and, in order to achieve its aim, does not hesitate to hit, severely, countries also such as Italy with no responsibility whatever for the formation of milk and meat surpluses — we produce very little more than 50 % of our requirements. Because we produce less than we need, other nations are discharging rivers of milk into our country, helped by grossly unfair export bonuses such as compensatory amounts, and bringing our cattle-raising industry to its knees. Originally, the Community founded its policy on the common agricultural policy. There were, and there still are, today, category A countries and category B countries, including Eire, Italy, and Greece, and the strength of this important sector was above all to have been founded on solidarity, fairness, and justice in distribution. In reality, the situation is very different.

We are told that prices must be restricted. We always talk about prices at source, but never prices to the consumer. Do we ever hear any talk about enormous increases in production costs? To give an example, in 1983 in Italy we had an increase of 18.5 % in labour costs alone, which represents the highest rate recorded in Italy compared with the other categories; machinery, seed, fertilizers, fuel oil, and insecticides. Nor must we forget the enormous risks that agriculture runs; disasters, floods, hail, fog, drought, plant or animal disease, which are always in the offing. And in addition to all this, the level of income in the farming sector — and the figures speak for themselves, even if, as we are told, statistics should be taken with a pinch of salt — is only half what it is in the other sectors.

The price paid by the agricultural world for the civil, social and economic growth of the whole world is considerable. It has to be said that the peasant civilization has never betrayed its high purpose, and that the growth of the civilized world is due above all to the contribution made by the agricultural sector.

I will conclude, Mr President, by saying that, as the majority of world public opinion is prepared to acknowledge, it is a part of society that we can think of as guaranteeing the defence of irreplaceable values — the family, education, school, work, and faith, for a more humane and Christian life — and which can make a contribution to the solution of problems that affect millions of genuine workers.

*(Applause from the centre)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

*Vice-President*

Mr van Aerssen (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to begin by echoing two of the Commission's primary tenets: first, its commit-

ment to maintaining the rate of increase of agricultural expenditure below the growth-rate of the Community's own resources. This principle must be adhered to unswervingly. Secondly, I welcome the Commission's decision to urge the Council to implement a special decision-making procedure in the event of Council wishing to derogate from the Commission's price recommendations in the agricultural sector.

I am speaking here on behalf of numerous colleagues from my group who have to deal with external economic issues and who are utterly opposed to the introduction of a Community fat-tax.

I would advance the following arguments to substantiate my case. First, the fat-tax is purely a means by which money can be tapped and we fail to see how it can be introduced under Article 43 of the EEC Treaty. It is designed to surmount difficulties which have arisen in a specific sector — the milk sector: one cannot simply link the problem posed by the milk sector to the introduction of a fat-tax and attempt to justify the latter under Article 43 of the EEC Treaty. The introduction of such a tax can, in our opinion, only be justified and made legally non-controversial under Article 201 of the EEC Treaty.

Secondly, customs duties and levies on fat imports are regulated by GATT. If we started to raise a special tax here, we should be confronted with untold external economic difficulties. This issue has already been raised in the debate. I can only strongly reiterate that the United States would counter such a fat tax with appropriate action.

Thirdly, the numerous fat-producers in the Community would render the administrative formalities associated with such a tax well nigh insurmountable, and indeed the Commission has not yet drawn up suitable proposals for resolving this aspect.

Fourthly, the Community consumer would have to bear an unacceptably heavy burden. There is no logical justification for the consumer having to bear the expense of resolving a political problem in the milk sector when alternative means are available. The Commission itself has made suitable proposals.

Fifthly, and to reiterate in unambiguous terms: the problem of the milk and butter sector cannot be resolved at the expense of margarine and related products. It must be resolved within the butter and milk sector rather than foisting it on to another sector.

Commissioner Dalsager, if you enter into bilateral negotiations with the United States, pursuant to the Council decision, I am afraid you will go away empty-handed, for United States legislation makes no provision for such legally binding commitments in the export sector. There is no alternative to a sensible institutional dialogue within the framework of GATT with a view to consolidating the problem; a fat tax will not

van Aerssen

do the trick. I would therefore call upon the House once again to refrain from undertaking such a measure.

**Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission.** — (DA) Mr President, it is clear that we are debating questions of great importance here. It is also reflected in the list of speakers, which, according to my count, numbered 51 honourable Members.

I should like to compliment the Committee on Agriculture — and especially its Chairman, Mr Curry — on this report. It is important for us not to get completely bogged down in day-to-day problems but to deal as well with the Community's policy as a whole and in the longer term. I occasionally find myself obliged here in Parliament — with all courtesy, of course — to oppose the reports put forward by Parliament's Committee on Agriculture. Today I am happy to say that I can associate myself almost fully with the excellent report which Mr Curry and the members of the Committee on Agriculture have put forward.

I am very happy that we are in agreement on a great many points. Of course, I cannot comment on all the points in Mr Curry's motion for a resolution, but I note the 6 main points on which Mr Curry and his colleagues in the Committee on Agriculture have voted a clear 'yes' to the plan which the Commission put forward in June, and I should like to say something on these points.

To begin with, there is the central point in our plan for adjusting the market regulation mechanisms, the fundamental message we have been trying to put across now for two years, that unlimited price guarantees for production of unlimited size is no longer tenable and that guarantee thresholds must be set for certain products. I am very glad that the Committee on Agriculture supports the Commission's view. I also think that it is the only sound basis for our agricultural policy in the future.

Secondly, this principle should be applied in the milk sector by means of a quota system in order to secure better control of production. Here too, the Commission on Agriculture has said 'yes' it even supports quotas in sectors other than the milk sector. Many views have been put forward on the quota system proposed by the Commission, at yesterday's and today's sittings. I readily admit that we should not believe that it will be an easy solution to the problem, and this also emerges from some of the things which have been said here. If the quotas are to be acceptable and to function properly they must apply throughout the Community, and there can be no general exemptions. The quotas are based on a realistic guarantee threshold, which the Commission has set at about 97 million tonnes. This is already well above the Community's consumption and constitutes a wide margin with respect to the present situation on the world

market. Finally, I think that the quotas must be accompanied by a restrictive price policy, at least for the first few years.

I would also remind the House how urgent it is now to take action in the milk sector, and that every single week of delay makes the problem more difficult to solve. The Commission's experts have calculated that milk deliveries in 1983 will probably rise by 4 % because of the good weather conditions in the autumn, and that is a new European record. I do not think anyone can pretend that a particular trade in a given country can save its own and its country's economy by continuing to produce a product which no-one — either inside or outside the Community — wants to buy and which can only be stored. This, quite simply, is the situation in which we find ourselves; the increase in production is only used for storage, and we must, of course, get this situation under control.

I might perhaps also add that Mr Kirk said to me that the Commission had twice insisted that the milk problem had now been solved in the Community: the first time when we introduced the co-responsibility levy, and the second time when we introduced the guarantee thresholds. On neither of those occasions did the Commission which did not go far enough, partly because Parliament and the Council did not take the necessary decisions on the Commission's proposal. Something on the lines of the proposals we present today was first put forward in 1979 and for the second time in 1981, and on neither of those occasions did we get support from Parliament. The Commission has in fact had the problem under review for some considerable time but has been unable to get support for any attempt to solve it. We are therefore very glad that this support is now forthcoming.

Thirdly, there is the question of the monetary compensatory amounts, which must be dismantled as soon as possible. Here, too, the Committee on Agriculture gives its unreserved support to the Commission's proposal.

Fourthly, there is the question of the levy on oils and fats other than milk fat. It is the Commission's intention that the differences between prices for milk fat and the competing products should be levelled out to some extent. I must say that we are concerned here with a levy which is imposed on our internal production as well as our imports. It is not therefore an import levy, but a levy on the consumption of all oils and fats, irrespective of whether they are produced in the Community or outside.

Fifthly, action must be taken on external trade. The Community must not only contribute to the eradication of hunger in the world but must also try to play a bigger role as an exporter of agricultural products on a sound economic basis. Here the Commission's prop-

**Dalsager**

osal for guarantee thresholds will help us. Satisfactory observance of the Community preference must be maintained, and in this area we have proposed a number of measures on grain substitutes, butter, beef and sheepmeat, which will help to stabilize our markets and secure better conditions for the sale of Community products.

The sixth and final point is the question of the budget. There is a need for the agricultural budget to be scaled over a period of years in order to maintain a reasonable rate of growth. Here too, I am happy to say that the Committee on Agriculture has supported the Commission's view. My summarized comments on Mr Curry's report show that the Commission considers it to be a very encouraging mark of support for its guidelines on the reform of the agricultural policy. Perhaps the members of the Committee on Agriculture will forgive me when I say that, in their endeavour to take a positive line in this report, they perhaps even run the risk of making it look as though the problems concerning farm-product markets, trade, budgets, incomes and the regions can be solved in such a way as to satisfy all those involved without anyone having to make a sacrifice. I am afraid that that is, of course, not possible. Difficult decisions have to be made; at times it will hurt and, the longer these decisions are put off, the more difficult they will be. I hope therefore that the Heads of State or Government, after the Council's preparatory work in Athens last week, will reach a successful conclusion in December.

In this connection, let me reply to a specific suggestion in the Curry report. The Commission is invited to undertake a very rapid evaluation of the economic and social effects of the Commission's proposal, especially on farm incomes. I can give a single answer, which unfortunately is not an exhaustive or an entirely satisfactory one. It is very difficult to assess future developments in farm incomes, because they depend on a number of imponderables which we cannot legislate on in Parliament, the Commission or the Council. First and most important is the question of inflation: the various rates of inflation still play a role in some of the Member States. There is the question of weather prospects and harvest yields, and there is of course the question of prices, over which we have a certain influence. I can say one thing: compared with what would happen if the Commission's proposals were not adopted, these proposals will have a very positive effect on agriculture. I think that we can all imagine what would eventually happen, and the prospect is not very far off. We must realize that we do not have the financial resources to meet our expenditure, and we must therefore cut back on expenditure across the board, including the agricultural policy. I merely ask the House to think for a moment of what would happen if the well-coordinated plan, which we have put forward here for the improvement of the agricultural policy, were not adopted.

With regard to the question of incomes for Community farmers, we can perhaps form an idea of how

these will develop. The trend in farm prices this year or last year, for example, shows an average increase of 7% on prices under the common agricultural policy, and that gave our farmers an additional income of 10 000 million ECU. At all events, we cannot expect such trends for the future, unless we make adjustments to the policy.

We should also think for a moment of what choices we have in the milk sector, a sector in which 1.5 million farmers in the Community earn their living. If we do not introduce an effective quota system, what is the alternative for these farmers? I believe the alternative is simply as follows: a reduction of at least 12% in milk prices next year, a reduction which would cut these milk producers' incomes by as much as 3 000 million ECU. I do not think that any honourable Members would support such a policy.

I should like to say finally on this point that the Commission, after presenting its general ideas on the common agricultural policy in July, put before you in September and October a number of detailed implementing provisions, proposals on which Parliament has to take a decision. We shall therefore have other opportunities for debating all these matters in greater detail at forthcoming sittings of the whole House, so I shall not raise these points today.

There are two questions included on the agenda under this item. These are the questions by Mr Antoniozzi and Mr Sutra, and I should like to take this opportunity to give them an answer. Mr Antoniozzi put an oral question concerning olive oil. I can assure him that the Commission has no wish to increase the price of olive oil to the consumers. What has happened is that the price of the competing oils on the world market has risen and that means that the support for measures to promote the consumption of olive oil can and should be cut back. I hope that the questioner agrees with me that the Community taxpayers should not be expected to pay amounts to support olive oil which exceed what the market situation justifies.

Mr Sutra and others have put an oral question concerning wine. I readily understand the problem they have raised — namely, the difficulties experienced by wine exporters in connection with exports to the British market. The Court of Justice of the European Communities, in its Judgment of 12 July 1983 in Case No 170/78, confirmed certain protectionist effects of the present British duty on wine. In addition, the Council and the Commission have repeatedly pointed out that the high duties on wine must be reduced. In its last communication of 1983 to the Council on the adjustment of the common agricultural policy (COM 500), the Commission repeats that it is necessary to reduce the duties on wine in certain Member States in order to promote consumption and compensate for falls in consumption in traditional wine-producing countries.

**Dalsager**

I have already had much to say on butter and milk. However, I understand that Commissioner Andriessen has told you that I shall give an answer here in Parliament on the latest decision on Christmas butter. The Commission has already had an opportunity to explain to Parliament why there was no decision to present proposals on a Christmas butter campaign at the close of this year. The Commission has not changed its mind on this point. The Commission thus sticks to its view and is convinced that such a campaign, even adopting the formula proposed by Parliament, would not be sufficiently profitable to constitute a reasonable way of using Community resources. The Commission considers that the very high costs in relation to the additional quantities which would be sold cannot be justified in a period of very scarce budgetary resources. In addition, such a campaign only has a limited effect on the size of stocks. The Commission is of course aware of the very alarming situation on the butter market; public and private stocks together today account for about 880 000 tonnes, and these stocks may increase still further in the course of the coming spring. These very large stocks are the result of the Community's milk production and are quite out of step with market demand. Milk production is already 7.25% higher than it was in 1981, and a further increase is expected in 1984 if the necessary measures — including the proposals being debated today — are not taken. It is therefore essential that we find a lasting solution to these problems, and the Council must as soon as possible decide to limit production in line with the proposals put forward by the Commission. Only when effective production controls have been implemented will it be possible to achieve a lasting reduction in stocks. A reduction in stocks can be achieved with the aid of various measures on sales which already exist, together with additional arrangements which are under consideration in the Commission.

Once the measures proposed by the Commission have been adopted and milk deliveries have been reduced, stocks can be rapidly reduced through the normal marketing arrangements. The supplementary marketing arrangements, which the Commission is at present discussing, are more cost-intensive than the existing measures, but they are at the same time considerably more cost-effective than, for example, a Christmas butter campaign. These new measures include an extension of the social butter regulation, which at present is only applied in Ireland. They also include the manufacture of butter-oil to facilitate competition on certain export markets. In addition, we envisage an extension of the existing programme of support for the use of butter in industry and food-processing. Such programmes will run continuously in the future, but they will, of course, be cut back when surpluses have been reduced to a more reasonable level.

There are certain problems regarding the financial aspects which have also been raised, and perhaps I

should say a few words on these with regard to the Commission proposal COM 500. Adoption of all the proposals for improving the agricultural policy which are contained in the Commission communication will bring about considerable savings in the EAGGF (Guarantee Section). If these measures are applied from the coming production year, their effects will make themselves increasingly felt during the course of the following production year, so that agricultural expenditure will be gradually brought back to a level which is lower than it otherwise would have been. These savings are estimated for the production year 1985/86, for example, at about 3 400 million ECU, of which about 3 000 million ECU relate to the common market arrangements and about 400 million ECU arise from winding up the monetary compensatory amounts. In view of the many factors which have an influence on agricultural expenditure and the uncertainty which notoriously affects forecasts in this sector, these are, of course, rough estimates. The savings of about 3 000 million ECU on expenditure for the common market arrangements can be broken down as follows: dairy sector, approx. 1 400 million ECU; fats sector, 700 million ECU; grain sector, 450 million ECU; other sectors, 470 million ECU. The level of the savings on milk is thus particularly high, accounting for approximately half of the combined savings on the common market arrangements. They arise mainly from the effects of introducing a supplementary levy of 75% of the indicative price of the quantities delivered which exceed the deliveries in 1981, increased by 1%. The effects of this single measure will thus be of the order of 1 200 million ECU, which is 85% of the combined savings in this sector.

As far as the fats sector is concerned, the savings arise mainly from the introduction of a levy on fats other than butter. The proceeds from this levy, increased by the savings it renders possible in conjunction with the measure on support for the consumption, for example, of olive oil, which will become more competitive, will thus be in the region of 600 million ECU. The bulk of the balance is due to the application of a guarantee threshold for rape and sunflower seed.

In the cereals sector, the savings will result from the important interlinking of grain substitute stabilization and the application of guarantee thresholds. The effect of these measures on expenditure for the production year 1985/86 is estimated at approximately 300 million ECU. These savings will be considerably increased, moreover, by a price policy aimed at reducing the difference between Community prices and the prices of competing and the difference between the reference price for common wheat and the intervention price.

It is estimated that the savings in the other sectors will be around 470 million ECU. These will flow from various agricultural policy measures in the beef and



**Dalsager**

sheepmeat sectors, the wine sector and the fruit and vegetables sector. These measures will consist mainly in a change in the various support arrangements applying to these sectors and a removal of arrangements which are no longer economically justified. These savings for the individual production years cannot be assigned to a particular accounting year without further ado. As everyone knows, the Community has stocks, large stocks of many products. The savings resulting from a cutback in the production of agricultural surpluses will only be fully felt when these stocks are reduced to a more satisfactory level.

Mr President, I have taken up much of Parliament's time, but I also think that the problems we are dealing with are very important ones.

**Mr Sutra (S).** — (FR) Mr President, I rise very briefly to thank Mr Dalsager for his reply and the Commission for having on its own initiative brought the action against the United Kingdom which led to the judgment of 12 June, which gives us partial satisfaction.

However, I have to hand the English version of my question, in which I find that the term '*droits d'accise*' has been translated as 'customs duties'. It is stated at the end of my question — and I worded it in this way deliberately after checking with you, Mr Dalsager, in the Committee on Agriculture so that I would be sure of my facts — that these '*droits d'accise*' are collected in the United Kingdom before customs clearance. The Court of Justice was therefore right to find that the United Kingdom was guilty of protectionism in charging much higher duties on wine than on competing beverages such as beer for instance, but it did not go far enough, since the protectionism does not merely take the form of duties which are too high and should be reduced but of actual customs duties charged before clearance, which are in direct contravention of the Treaty of Rome.

I have raised a specific question, concerned with the problems of a cooperative, 'les vigneron occitans', but I give notice that I shall now be tabling a general motion for a resolution on this subject with representatives of several groups and several countries with whom I have spoken. If I had the right as a parliamentarian, I would also bring the matter before the Court of Justice to obtain a ruling going the rest of the way, confirming that the maintenance of actual customs duties within the Community constitutes a breach of the Treaty. It should be made clear who the protectionists are.

Mr President, I shall follow this through to the end. I intend to win because I believe that this is a just cause, because I believe that the United Kingdom is in breach of the Treaty of Rome. I should like once

again to thank the Commission for taking the initiative of bringing the United Kingdom before the Court of Justice, and I am counting on its support so that we can carry on until this matter is settled in the clearest possible terms.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at tomorrow's voting-time.

#### 4. Structural fund — Agricultural structures

**President.** — The next item is a joint debate on

— the report by Mr Davern, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-990/83), on

the communication from the Commission to the Council on ways of increasing the effectiveness of the Community's structural funds, especially that of the EAGGF (Guidance Section) (Doc. 1-646/83 — COM(83) 501 final);

— the report by Mr Patterson, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment (Doc. 1-906/83), on

the proposals concerning the European Social Fund contained in the report by the Commission on ways of increasing the effectiveness of the Community's structural funds (Doc. 1-646/83-COM(83) 501 final);

— the report by Mr De Pasquale, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning (Doc. 1-930/83), on

the proposals on the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) contained in the Commission's report on ways of increasing the effectiveness of the Community's structural funds (Doc. 1-646/83-COM(83) 501 final);

— the report by Mr Thureau, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on new guidelines for the Community's structural policy in the agricultural sector (Doc. 1-923/83).

**Mr Davern (DEP), rapporteur.** — Mr President, on 20 July 1983, the Commission adopted two communications which are extremely important for the Community's future. One is the proposal we have just been discussing on the common agricultural policy and the other is on ways of increasing the effectiveness of the Community's structural funds. The latter communication, which pays particular attention to the situation of the EAGGF (Guidance Section) in the proposals made by the Commission, is the subject of this report.

The Commission's document contains many positive features; at the same time, some deficiencies can be pointed out which I feel should be examined. The approach adopted by the Commission in its communi-

## Davern

cation is realistic in that it has not attempted to create a super-fund for structures. It has, on the contrary, sought to make funds more effective by making their activities more complementary and more convergent. On the other hand, the Commission has not made a clear distinction between the funds which are financial instruments and the actual measures which it is their task to finance. The result of this confusion is to hinder an overall approach to the problem of structures — that is to say, the implementation of genuine, integrated regional development programmes. This applies not only to agriculture but also to structures in other sectors.

Here I might add that the integrated approach is of particular importance to the peripheral areas of the Community, which particularly suffer severe structural problems. It must be pointed out that the existing integrated development programmes such as those for south-east Belgium, the Western Isles of Scotland and the future Mediterranean programmes are superimposed on horizontal measures such as the 72 socio-structural directives, which were subsequently modified by another directive in 1975, not to mention the many regional measures contained, in particular, in the Mediterranean package. There is a lack of information generally in regard to regional policy *vis-à-vis* structural policies where they can overlap. Certainly, I would like to compliment the Commission on their knowledge in the structural sphere and the EAGGF and the way they deal with the money for these spheres, but there is serious doubt whether the regional funds are being spent properly.

The result of all this is that the integrated development programmes proposed by the Commission are not genuinely integrated and developed. This is regrettable as regards both the agricultural structure policy and the regional policy, where there is great potential.

The first step which the Community should take is to fix objectives in agreement with and with the support of all those concerned — Member States, regions, local authorities. In the interests of the Community, these objectives should be defined on the basis of Community criteria so as to make the jungle of measures at present implemented by the Community coherent and clear. Once these objectives have been defined and genuinely integrated development programmes have been drawn up, the coordination of funds which are financial instruments will occur of its own accord. It goes without saying that the integrated development programmes should be not only a structural policy instrument, particularly in the agricultural sector, and that horizontal regulations may prove necessary in order to attain Community objectives. Examples of this are the financing of family farms, the establishment of young farmers, forestry, which is of great importance for byeland that cannot be used for any other purpose, fisheries and aquaculture gener-

ally. In this respect the creation of a European Guidance and Guarantee Fund for fisheries and the marine sector should be proposed, as adopted by the Committee on Agriculture in connection with its amendments for the 1984 draft budget. May I also remind you that the setting up of such a fund is provided for in Article 40(4) of the EEC Treaty. Furthermore, it is essential that such a fund be administered specifically by the director-general responsible for fisheries, thereby concentrating all decisions for this important sector within one directorate-general.

It may seem paradoxical to propose the creation of a new fund when coordination of the existing funds is difficult; but it is justified inasmuch as the common fisheries policy established on 25 January — insofar as it is a common fisheries policy — must not remain the poor relation of the common agricultural policy.

Once objectives have been defined, the Commission must make Community interests prevail so that the application of Community measures by the Member States does not run counter to those objectives. The Community's structural fund should, in the first place, be used to diminish regional disparities without, however, becoming financial redistribution mechanisms in aid of the theory of fair return. The results of Community structural policies should not be judged on the basis of that criterion but on the basis of Community objectives. Community action should not be a substitute for national action, but should supplement it in the pursuit of the Community's objectives and interests. It should, in a manner of speaking, provide added value to national measures.

I hope, therefore, that the Commission will gradually correct the agricultural structural policy, in the light not only of the observations made in this report, but also of those contained in the excellent report by Mr Thareau.

**Mr Patterson (ED), rapporteur.** — Mr President, it would have been nice if all the Commissioners responsible for the structural funds had been here to listen to the debate, but I suppose that goes for most Members of this Parliament as well, so we cannot be too critical.

My report on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment was, as you will see, adopted unanimously, which is quite unusual and perhaps lends additional weight to what we say. It naturally concentrates on one of the structural funds covered by the Commission document — namely, the European Social Fund — though the Commission does not in fact say very much on this subject. This is not a criticism, because the basic regulation of the fund had not been adopted when the Commission document went to print and was, in any case, subject to conciliation between Parliament and the Council. The outcome of this conciliation is to be the subject of a later debate this week.

### Patterson

First, however, I would like to say something on the structural funds as a whole. My committee agrees entirely with the three basic principles which the Commission enunciated. The first is that the funds should not be mechanisms of financial redistribution between Member States, but should improve the social and economic structures of the Community. Here I am quoting from an amendment by Mrs Maij-Weggen on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, which I accept, as I do all her other amendments.

The second is that they should act in pursuit of objectives defined by the Community itself, and the third, which follows from the second, is that spending should not be automatic; there should be a principle of conditionality. (This, I may say, is one of the first bits of jargon with which this Commission document is unfortunately riddled, at least in the English text.) This in turn, however, raises one fundamental question: who determines these objectives?

Likewise, my committee supports the Commission in believing that the structural funds should be entered in the budget under a multiannual indicative programme. What they say is absolutely true about the unpredictability of resources undermining the funds, and this is particularly true of the Social Fund, as I shall mention in a moment. It is, therefore, clear that a multiannual programme would introduce an element of predictability into it. I do, however, have a question for the Commission, and maybe one of the other Commissioners can answer it in Mr Richard's absence: multiannual programmes do presuppose that there will always be a budget every year, and I should like to know how they would be affected by the system of twelfths, for example, if a budget were to be rejected. Another question is, as in the case of Community priorities, who draws up these multiannual programmes.

There is a criticism of the Commission document which my committee would like to make, and that is that there is only one mention of Parliament throughout the entire document. It comes at the very end, where it hopes that Parliament will be associated with the drawing up of the multiannual plan as part of the budgetary authority. I have to say that this is not good enough, because after all Parliament, as an elected body, should play a much greater part in determining Community priorities. For that reason we are very happy that Parliament has been consulted on the guidelines for the Social Fund, which is one of the happy outcomes of the conciliation procedure. Indeed, we have had a very fruitful meeting this morning precisely to discuss the guidelines for 1984. Likewise, as I say, we should like to play a much more constructive part in drawing up any multiannual plans than the Commission appears to contemplate — particularly (and I remind the Commission) as Parliament is one part of the budgetary authority and, ultimately,

has responsibility for voting the money for these multiannual programmes.

My committee also gives general support to another principle enunciated by the Commission: complementarity, another bit of jargon, which becomes even worse later on — synergy. (I take complementarity and synergy to be the same thing in the document.) I have to note that each structural fund does have its own vocation. The Social Fund is not just the training section of the Regional Fund, or of the Agricultural Fund for that matter; it has in the Treaties the object of promoting geographical and occupational mobility — in other words, of concentrating on people, on men and women, rather than on particular areas — that is what the Social Fund is about. In the discussions we had this morning on the guidelines, it was quite clear that we should like to make qualitative criteria as important as geographical criteria in the allocation of money from the Social Fund, so that while it may certainly be complementary in some circumstances to regional and agricultural spending, in many cases it is not. The classic example are migrant workers, who require assistance in the prosperous areas to which they move rather than the non-prosperous areas from which they come. That is purely logical. So, we support the basic principle of the new regulation that 75 % of the fund should go to youth, 40 % to the priority regions, but we would also point out that the handicapped, migrant workers, women, for example, are special categories which may not fit in entirely with the idea of complementarity or synergy.

Now I come to the management of the fund, and here it is quite clear that the management of the Social Fund, certainly this year, is open to criticism and no doubt will be criticized by the Court of Auditors when the time comes. In 1983, the Social Fund was massively oversubscribed — I think to the extent of 80 %. Yet we now learn that 320 m ECU are being carried over to 1984, plus another 64 m from Chapter 100, and perhaps other funds which we do not know about, all of which will produce a massive carry-over from one year to the next. This is partly the fault of those of us in the budgetary authority, both Council and Parliament, and although the present President-in-Office of the Council was not responsible, it is nevertheless the case that both Parliament and Council, whether deliberately or by accident, neglected to observe the Social Fund regulation when they adopted the 1983 budget. This has produced practical difficulties in the administration of the fund for the Commission, for which they are not to blame, and it has also been partly responsible for the 320 m carry-overs, from 1983 to 1984. In my report I point out that, *mea culpa*, never again should the budgetary authority vote a budget which is not in accordance with the regulations, because that produces a sort of financial mismanagement of which the carry-overs are a part.

**Patterson**

The Commission, to its credit, has undone some of the damage by decommitments and recommitments, but this sort of complication is no substitute for sound management. It is quite clear from the Court of Auditors' report and others that there are far too many cancellations of commitments and far too often repayments of advances become necessary to say that the Social Fund is being properly managed. Indeed, I support entirely, and so does my committee, the opinion of the Committee on Budgetary Control that interest should be paid on advances which have to be repaid when a project for which money has been granted does not go ahead. That seems perfectly logical. Mr Aigner, no doubt, will make the same point later.

We also agree with *ex ante* assessment on a cost-benefit analysis basis — again the opinion of the Committee on Budgetary Control. We agree with the economic assessment of Social Fund projects *ex post*, and we also agree with the Committee on Budgetary Control that there should be a strengthening of the Commission's staff in the form of a flying squad which would go around to make sure that the appropriations from the Social Fund are actually spent on the purposes for which they were voted.

Mr President, my conclusion is this: all these problems can be solved, in part, along the lines, suggested by the Commission in its document.

Certainly, problems in management should not be an excuse for neglecting the target of doubling the structural funds in real terms, which the Commission outlines. Indeed, the five-year period suggested by the Commission is far too long. The need for retraining as an answer to one of the problems — the problem of youth unemployment — is a problem for here and now, and not for five years' time. That is why my committee is proposing that two years should be the scale for doubling the Social Fund and not five years. Of course that all depends on what happens at the Athens Summit regarding the resources available. But assuming that everything goes properly and that the VAT base goes up to 1.4 %, we maintain that the Social Fund and the other structural funds should be doubled in two years, as one of the answers to the Community's current problems. That is the message, we send not just to the Commission, but particularly to the Council of Ministers, and also to the European Council shortly to meet in Athens.

**Mr De Pasquale (COM), rapporteur.** — (IT) Mr President, as the result of a rather questionable decision by the Bureau, our Committee was obliged to restrict its own opinion to that part of the document in question that relates to the Regional Fund.

The decision to divide the opinion of Parliament into three separate parts prevented overall consideration of problems concerning the efficiency of the Community's structural instruments, and made it impossible to draw up proposals to fill the striking gaps that are present in the Commission's document in this connection.

It was not a question, on this occasion, of examining the way the individual funds themselves function. The real question that we should have been tackling was the effective coordination of the instruments which the Community at present has available. Unfortunately — and I say this again — that was not possible.

The extent to which Community funds can have a greater structural impact depends almost exclusively on their capacity to act jointly, to plan jointly, to decide in unison in an intense, meaningful relationship with the national authorities, and through a new approach in regard to the regional and local organs.

Bearing in mind the disappointing experience of past years, it is now clear that the problem can only be resolved by introducing cogent regulations and operating structures that are very different from the present task force; structures, that is, with the power to oblige the Funds and the Bank to act together with programmes that are territorially defined and agreed, and that are binding.

There is no trace of any of this in the Commission's document, which does nothing more than formulate vague indications and hopes of a general nature, that make no difference whatsoever. In effect, therefore, we can expect that everything will continue as it was before, and that the Funds will continue to be managed under the present inflexible system, with its jealous separation of sectoral responsibilities and fields of competence, embalmed in sclerotic, bureaucratic systems of administration.

If, as we profess, we want a Community structural development policy that will meet priorities laid down by the Community, rules and adequate structures will be necessary which do not now exist and for which there are no proposals. We clearly cannot look to the goodwill of organs and people that still cling, like limpets, to an automatic operating system and the principle of transfers and reimbursements, which is anyway out of date.

We, for our part, had hoped that these rules would be introduced as part of the reform of the Regional Fund, and we are still convinced that the right thing is to make the organs that run the Community's regional policy responsible for coordinating the funds.

As far as the Regional Fund is concerned, our Committee again puts forward the proposals already formulated way back in April 1982, which I had the honour personally to present to Parliament, which approved them by a very large majority. As you will

## De Pasquale

recall, there can be no misunderstanding the essence of our conclusions. In our view, if it is to be really effective, the Regional Fund should do more than distribute partial repayments almost exclusively for infrastructures; it should have the necessary powers and resources for promoting a development programme, and relaunching production and employment in weak areas.

We therefore support, in broad outline, everything in the Commission's document that is in line with the decisions duly taken by Parliament, particularly with regard to the conditionality of measures, the financing of programmes through programme contracts, and multiannual financial planning.

But the Commission's report seemed to us too general and, in several parts, ambiguous. The unrelenting opposition of some Governments to concentration, for example, induced the Commission to propose national quotas once again, using a less rigid system — the brackets system. But what is the practical scope of this proposal? Does it perhaps mean that the Commission is giving up the use of Community criteria for identifying weak regions? Objective criteria, which are indispensable for concentrating action in those areas with the lowest levels of employment and production, thus avoiding waste.

If they are wide, will not these brackets create, year after year, a paralysing source of dispute and arbitrary decisions? It is also proposed to abolish the distinction between quota and non-quota. That might even work. But, in the absence of clear, solid guarantees, is there not danger that this will change the nature of the Fund, removing what has so far been, for better or worse, its essential characteristic as an instrument designed essentially to correct structural imbalances, and not to cushion difficult situations that arise from time to time? And again — the two aims allocated to the Fund — the structural development of backward regions and the conversion of industrial regions in decline — are they both placed on the same level? Or is it proposed to maintain — as would be right — a difference in the intensity of action, as between the first and second of these aims?

The concentration of structural measures in economically backward areas that still require developing is no mere whim or fancy: it is a driving necessity for the whole Community, if we are to tackle the crisis and develop integration.

Does the Commission accept, or not, the changes introduced by Parliament to give real support to small and medium-sized firms in the weaker regions? Does it intend to make full use of the role of regional and local communities, or is it proposing to remain entrenched in the present bureaucratic, top-level relationship between Commission and Member States?

To none of these questions, and others besides, does the Commission's report provide an answer, and that is why, since we are unable to assess in detail the intentions of the Commission and the Council, we must withhold our verdict until the procedural proposals are presented to us.

We have just learned that the Commission has recently adopted a new draft procedure, not only without awaiting the outcome of this debate but also without discussing it with us first, as was the practice on previous occasions. We can only express our bitter disappointment at the fact that the Commission appears to wish to abandon an informal practice that made it possible to have an exchange of views on measures prior to their being put into effect, and which proved very useful. At all events we shall get to the bottom of it, but let us say here and now that it is useless to expect Parliament to allow its views to be disregarded, or to hope that Parliament will be prepared to go along with whomsoever in sudden changes of front or, worse still, to allow itself to be bypassed by secret agreements between the Commission and the Council.

I should like to say a further word regarding the Council's behaviour. It would be boring to repeat the protests that we have always made, but now the situation has become downright paradoxical. The Council asks for proposals designed to increase the efficacy of the Regional Fund, and at the same time it has for over two years refused to discuss and take decisions on proposals that have been laid before it and which, if accepted, would have already increased the Fund's efficiency.

We therefore have the impression of being faced with a confused, unconstructive set of vague intentions, and that is why, Mr President, the motion for a resolution that we are submitting to Parliament sets out, on the one hand, to re-emphasize what in our view are the indispensable points in any reform of the Fund worthy of the name and, on the other hand, declares our readiness to consider any changes that will improve the Commission's proposals or at least bring them into line with our positions, which are not the outcome of improvisation but are the results of thorough, detailed collective consideration, and a responsible vote of this Parliament.

**Mr Thareau (S), rapporteur.** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, what a way we have come since 1957, when the founders of Europe embarked upon a common agricultural policy! Then it was a common market made up of six countries whose economies were expanding vigorously and which needed at the time to develop their food production in order to eliminate shortages. Industry needed labour, and was offering employment opportunities to people leaving the country for the towns.

## Thareau

The early 1970s brought a drastic change in the situation and the Community, having been enlarged to nine Member States (and subsequently 10) was faced with the problems of a worldwide economic crisis and unemployment. The reign of the dollar, which had become the currency of international trade, created and accentuated imbalances between Member States' currencies, making for greater inequality between one country and another in the process. Structural surpluses developed in a number of products, the cause being the use — on a quite excessive scale — of imported raw materials. On the other hand, shortages of many agricultural products remained. Thus it is that we are now using 10 million hectares beyond Europe's frontiers at a time when more than half the world's population is underfed. In a context in which runaway growth has been followed by uncontrolled crisis, farmers' average incomes have fallen and inequalities between countries, between products and between farmers have been accentuated.

The Community has directed its efforts at reducing imbalances and improving productivity in agriculture. The period of the Mansholt plan saw the adoption of 63 directives or regulations aimed at these objectives, the first dating back to 1964. These measures, which vary in importance are due to expire either on 1 January 1984 or on 1 January 1985. This is why the Committee on Agriculture has proposed to Parliament an own-initiative report, in conjunction with four other, specific reports concerned with marketing, the 1972 socio-structural measures, less-favoured regions and the establishment of young farmers respectively.

The prevailing circumstances are favourable to a necessary review of these policies, and we are adamant that they should be extended for the minimum necessary period. The Commission has itself recently made its own analysis and drawn up a report. We are pleased to note that we are at one in our findings on the overlapping of measures, the unevenness with which they are applied, the cumbersomeness of administrative procedures, and the lack of flexibility concomitant with uniformity and excessive codification, which collectively account for the fact that some appropriations, even though too modest, are not fully utilized.

The main reason why the structural measures lack effectiveness is to be found in the failure to establish direct liaison between policy on markets and prices and structural policies. A further factor is the insufficient convergence between the three funds: the EAGGF Guidance Section, the ERDF and the Social Fund.

Granted that there are shortcomings, it would be very unfair to draw the conclusion that no useful purpose has been served by the measures adopted; on the contrary, despite the lack of adequate funding, they have helped to avoid even further accentuation of the

disparities between farmers in different categories. Now, however, we can and must do better.

We are accordingly commending to the House the following guidelines: first, we must commit ourselves to a strong farming industry in Europe, to ensure self-sufficiency in food. Europe's agriculture, which is a major employer, and the associated agrifoodstuffs industry play their part in providing jobs and maintaining rational use of rural areas. If we wished, it could play a much more significant role in a policy on trade agreements with the developing countries.

Within the EEC, agriculture can reduce its imports, thereby improving our trade balance, as long as we are prepared to modify our models for the development of farm holdings. In short, it would be reprehensible to be actuated exclusively by a constant fear of surpluses when it is both necessary and possible to improve the guidance of production.

Secondly, the structural trend is determined by market and pricing policy. We cannot improve our structural measures without correcting the shortcomings in economic organization.

Thirdly, guidance of production according to Community and international requirements can be achieved by taking account of consumer's qualitative and quantitative needs, by controlling development more efficiently, by reducing imports, by making structural aid more selective, by encouraging the production of crops which are in shortage or grown on a small scale only, and by developing forms of production other than crops intended for human consumption, such as wood, tobacco, etc.

I for my part believe that the extent to which prices are supported should be varied according to volumes delivered. However, this is not as yet the majority view of the Committee on Agriculture.

Fourthly, structural schemes should extend beyond the farm holding as such. They should include measures in support of producers' organizations, the most common form of which is the cooperative.

Fifthly, we must reduce inequalities between regions and between farmers, to which end European measures should be adjusted to the wide variety of circumstances in which they have to be applied.

Sixthly, agriculture needs specific funding and specific measures, but it cannot develop and farmers cannot lead fulfilling lives unless there are integrated economic and social facilities, with access to skilled craftsmen, teaching, leisure, infrastructure etc. This necessarily entails convergence of the three Funds. We need to establish Community resources with which to take action aimed at improving the balance, since the future depends on it. The 5% of the EAGGF budget allocated to the Guidance Section is far from sufficient. With rationalization of CAP

## Thareau

expenditure, especially through more appropriate application of Community preference, it should be possible to raise the proportion of EAGGF expenditure allocated to structural measures to the 25% envisaged by the founders.

The review of the inherent efficiency of EAGGF Guidance Section aid is of fundamental importance in this connection. The 'horizontal' acts should be reduced in number as well as adjusted. Farm modernization plans should be accessible to all farmers as long as they fulfil the single condition of producing a forward study demonstrating that aid would enable them to improve their incomes and working conditions.

We are proposing the abolition of lower limits and the maintenance of ceilings (taking account of all amounts received) beyond which no aid may be granted.

This will ensure that aid is directed towards farms run by families or small partnerships. Young farmers are finding it increasingly difficult to establish themselves. The number of 64 000 advanced by the Commission falls far short of what is necessary. If borne out by events, it will mean that rural depopulation is bound to continue at a rapid rate. There can be no solution to this problem without regulation of land resources.

We therefore consider it necessary to keep the acts concerned with young farmers, natural disasters, forestry and fisheries in force.

Regarding the various other measures, greater coherence needs to be achieved by means of regional programmes, and this calls for consistency of action on the part of the three Community Funds and close involvement of the people concerned in the regions and States in the interests of clearer definition of specific schemes, their priorities and coordination between them. These regional programmes should gradually be extended throughout the Community.

For its part, the Community should draw up an outline regulation, having formulated clearer definitions of the various possible forms of aid in the light of market conditions, land utilization planning requirements and the employment situation. Then a proper contract setting out the conditions under which a programme is to be applied and monitored could be entered into between the Community and the State concerned. We are taking our lead here from the approach adopted in integrated programmes. The proportion of financial costs to be met by the Community should be differentiated from one region to another, being inversely proportional to the wealth of the region in question and taking account of the number of workers concerned.

Our Community of ten — and eventually twelve — Member States is extraordinarily well endowed with natural resources. Whereas it would be very wrong to

yield to the temptations of malthusianism, it is no longer possible for us to go on producing whatever we choose wherever we choose in whatever fashion we choose. We must have guidelines. The eight and a half million farmers and their successors, of whom too few are coming forward, deserve to expect secure incomes, shorter working hours and better working conditions. Why should they not be entitled to expect these things in the same way as other workers? Their interests are not in any sense incompatible with the long-term interests of consumers.

This report, ladies and gentlemen, invites you to help to improve the quality of rural life.

*(Applause)*

*(The sitting was suspended at 1.05 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)<sup>1</sup>*

## IN THE CHAIR : MR PFLIMLIN

### *Vice-President*

Mr Protopapadakis (PPE), *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Budgets. — (GR)* The structural funds make up that part of the Community's budget which is distributed to the Member States not as a subsidy, but as the means with which those concerned may fulfil their function and improve their productivity. We have a saying that if we give a man a fish, we feed him for a day, but if we give him a rod and line, we enable him to feed himself for life. The resources of the structural funds must be used in the way implied by the second half of the saying. When the opposite happens, this is the fault of the bureaucratic hierarchy that manages the funds, because it did not take the trouble, before distributing the appropriations, to inform and convince those concerned that structural changes in their cultivation or other activities would benefit them. Indeed, the responsibility of the bureaucrats is often even greater, because the changes they call for are damaging to the citizens, as has happened in cases when cultivators were asked to destroy their crops without any proposal for proper compensation. Thus, there is room for improving the working of the structural funds, not only in the field of information or the correct choice of targets, as I said, but also in the entire organization of procedures as proposed by the Commission in its statement that we are debating today.

This debate on improving the structural funds is particularly topical in relation to the implementation of integrated Mediterranean programmes. People living in the Mediterranean Member States want to be sure that the money to be spent on those programmes will be used correctly and profitably.

<sup>1</sup> For the item relating to the agenda, see the Minutes.

### Protopapadakis

The only weakness I see in the Commission's statement is that no specific measures are proposed for closer supervision of the way the resources are used. In other respects the proposals make sense. However, one can only wonder why the Commission has not applied some of these measures on its own initiative, at least in what falls within its competence. Coordination of the actions of the funds, organization of mechanisms, definition of targets — these are things that the Commission could already have set in motion without waiting for Parliament's blessing. Nobody is, or ever has been, standing in the way.

As for the matter of appropriations, the Committee on Budgets is awaiting Council's approval of the increased sums proposed by Parliament at the budget's first reading. Concerning the appropriations proposed for the future, let me just say that these seem a little optimistic. I do not think that appropriations amounting to so much can be distributed unless the Community's own resources are first increased.

A point on which I would like to lay particular stress is that changes in the way the structural funds operate require study and prudence. If we embark upon ill-considered and fragmentary actions, there is a danger that the change may lead to dissolution, as has happened with other changes as well. For this reason, we impose the condition that actions intended to improve the effectiveness of the structural funds must not result in reductions of the financial grants to regions and sectors whose need for intervention is greatest.

With these conditions fulfilled it is certain that the operation of the structural funds will improve. However, if they are to perform as we would like them to, then throughout the hierarchy of the services that manage them there must develop a spirit of creativeness in contrast to the spirit of least effort that is usually encountered in administrative organizations. Only then will interested citizens get the message that these appropriations are productive and not consumer-related. They are appropriations that will burden those who receive them with responsibilities, hard and perhaps exhausting work, and not a reward for past effort entitling the recipient to relax from responsibilities and pains.

With these thoughts, the Committee on Budgets proposes the adoption of all three proposed resolutions under discussion.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — (DE) Mr President, for quite some time this House has called for an integrated Community structural policy. I consider the Commission communication on ways of increasing the efficiency of the structural funds to be an important step towards attaining such a goal but one which has not been recognized as such by many Members of this House. The Commission has decided that aid provided to Member States under the three Commu-

nity structural funds should be contingent upon the Member State programmes complying with Community criteria. The Commission wishes to be involved as a partner of the Member State government departments at the planning stage. The mechanisms which have evolved in the course of the regional policy can be brought into play: project financing, project contracts between the Commission and Member State governments, and integrated projects. In view of the negative experience with the proposed reform of the Regional Fund submitted to the Council, it is beginning to dawn on the Commission that its goals can be partly achieved without having recourse to a Council decision but rather by linking grants from Community funds to specific criteria.

The development of a common structural policy will not therefore take the usual legal form but, rather, pragmatically in the shape of a large number of individual measures, financing decisions, more flexible application of existing rules and regulations and with a minimum of alterations to existing administrative regulations; that is to say, the legislative cemetery which we know as the Council of Ministers will be called upon as seldom as possible. An example is provided by the Regional Fund's regulation. The Commission gauges the progress of Council deliberations. The qualitative reform recommendations are largely approved of by the Council. There is therefore nothing to prevent the Commission from adhering to them when funds are being approved. Plans to adjust the quota percentages have failed to meet with Council approval. The Commission reacts with new proposals which in reality boil down to modifying the importance of the quotas. Perhaps this proposal will also come a cropper, but even this would not be so serious, for if one compares the actual division of Regional Fund resources with the legal quotas one discovers permanent divergences on such a scale as to render the quotas no more than guidelines.

Furthermore, this House considers that regional quotas have by now become legally obsolete.

Now imagine, if you will, that the Commission allows its contributions from these three structural funds to be guided by an approved general structural plan. How would this House be able to recognize and evaluate this? Certainly not on the basis of Council decisions. We have the Commission's formal proposals concerning the Fund regulations, which we debate; in addition there are pilot proposals, integrated operations, the second *tranche* of quota-free measures, integrated Mediterranean programmes, etc; furthermore there are Commission memoranda, Commission communications to the Council — like the one we are now discussing, on ways of increasing the effectiveness of the structural funds — and programmes will be agreed upon between the Commission and individual Member State governments.



von der Vring

But, Mr President, where does the Parliament fit into all this? That is what I would like to know. This is a joint debate encompassing three specific reports. What becomes of the Parliament-Commission dialogue on the methods and content of the joint structural policy which is in the process of elaboration? Particularly as such a development, which corresponds to our own wishes, should be welcomed by us. In the light of the Council's incapacity to govern, we ought to encourage the Commission to pursue a more resolute course and use its budgetary executive powers to implement Community structural policy on its own. At the same time Parliament's role is problematical in this area. Hence, Mr President, I would urge you and the Bureau to pay particular attention to parliamentary collaboration and control with regard to the emergence of such an integrated Commission structural policy.

**Mr Colleselli (PPE).** — (IT) Mr President, I am speaking on this subject, which is one of the major problems of the Agricultural Policy and vital to the satisfactory resolution of its difficulties, in the awareness that if, through the proposals we are discussing, we are successful in achieving concrete reform, the common agricultural policy itself will derive greater credibility.

Agricultural structural policy is a subject that has often been discussed, since 1979, in the Committee on Agriculture. Today we have before us proposals for changes, for updating — I would say, for modernization — from the Commission, that we appreciate very much.

Before expressing specific agreement and, above all, support for the motion for a resolution by Mr Davern, I must summarize the main, fundamental points of the entire package of proposals, bearing also in mind certain points and criticisms made by the rapporteurs in illustrating their reports.

There are several what I would call 'cardinal' points that can really promote the concrete growth of these initiatives. First, an increase in interest rates, for the purposes of a genuine new structural policy, which presupposes more credible, concrete steps to increase own resources. If this is not done, *tertium non datur*: without an increase in own resources, it will be difficult to take the necessary steps to achieve these fundamental objectives.

Secondly, I think it right to emphasize that the programmes proposed by the Commission have a Community sense and spirit about them, regardless of everything that has prevented the structural policy from achieving better results. In this Community spirit, the programmes are also of a multiannual character. It would in fact be difficult, especially having regard to the situation in the weaker agricultural sectors, not to have multiannual development programmes.

Finally, we are providing here for the geographical extension of the measures to Spain and Portugal. The foundations have been laid here for the solution of special situations when these two countries join the Community, which solution of course depends on this initiative for the reform of structural policy.

In the general context I should like once more to emphasize the indispensable nature of the link not only between the Commission and the Council, but also between the Commission and individual Member States, always under the control, stimulus and pressure of Parliament.

With regard to the specific content of the Davern report, it should be pointed out that, especially as regards the use of EAGGF funds, the proposals are designed to make these funds more effective, to make them be used to better account — to the extent of the increases that are planned — in aiding mainly the less favoured regions which, far from having benefitted from the structural policy pursued so far, have in the majority of cases seen themselves only further disadvantaged in comparison with the other regions.

The proposals for revision of the EAGGF Guidance Section thus fall — according to the indications given by the Commission — within the framework of the reform of the common agricultural policy and the economic recovery of the Community, which was decided on at the Stuttgart Summit and was previously emphasized in this House by the President of the Commission.

What are the new tasks? The restructured EAGGF — Guidance Section must be able to strengthen investment in the following directions:

- the conversion of agricultural concerns on modern lines, especially in those countries where ownership and fragmentation today represent a serious obstacle to agricultural development;
- more effective forms of transformation and marketing of agricultural products;
- the rationalization of the use of rural space, protecting this so as to ensure its use not only for immediate agricultural returns but for forestry, for example, and other uses;
- increasing the agricultural income in the less-favoured regions.

Fundamentally, this new outline agricultural structural policy is in line with the guidelines for helping the less-favoured regions, in the context of the integrated Mediterranean programmes; the measures must look to the future, the medium and long-terms, and must be many-sided. In essence, therefore, the new lines of action are designed not only to remove once and for all the structural backwardness of some regions of the Community, but also to promote more satisfactory rates of development, through selective action and concentrated measures.

## Colleselli

The valuation of this initiative should not however be made subordinate to the will or the need to reduce the agricultural budget so as to make room — legitimately — for new policies. On the contrary, we have to harmonize these two trends, and I think that we shall in this way render the common agricultural policy a real service, bringing it up-to-date and giving it greater credibility.

**Mr Hutton (ED).** — Mr President, the members of my group, generally speaking, welcome the Commission's document on structural funds, its contribution to breaking the log-jam that has arisen in the revision of the European Regional Development Fund. I do not think that the Council representatives here today would deny that the approach which the Member States have shown in that revision is feeble and nationalistic. It is a 'we are here for what we can get out of it, and the devil take Europe' approach. I think it is an approach which the members of this group will heartily deplore.

However, Mr President, it is our belief that in the Commission's document they have only done half a job. It is disappointing that the document touches only on the European Regional Development Fund, the Social Fund and on the guidance sector of the EAGGF. There is no mention in the document of the integrated Mediterranean programmes, of the programme for transport infrastructure, or for that matter, the special measures for Greece. These are all structural funds of one kind and another, and as I understand the Commission's document, the whole idea is to promote the coordination of funds and not their fragmentation. That, unfortunately, is precisely what is happening to the Community's structural funds now. There are too many separate little pockets being opened up with their own sums of money — and not all of them are little sums of money either. Some of them are demanding very substantial sums of money, and I cannot believe that all of them will not go on demanding even more substantial sums of money.

Surely the whole point of encouraging the convergence of regional economies in Europe is to promote greater efficiency in that coordination in the Community. One way to guarantee that you will not promote efficiency is by proliferating the funds and fragmenting them. If I might say so to the Commissioner, since he has done us the honour to come and listen to our debate, perhaps the Commission might want to take an even more radical approach to this problem and instead of allowing these funds to mushroom, he might take the very radical step of actually reducing the number of structural funds which the Community possesses.

His own document names two principal aims. One is to deal with the economically depressed areas — those where industrial regeneration is needed — and

the other is to deal with the underdeveloped regions — the sort of rural areas which Mr Dalsager has to deal with. Now those two aims could be dealt with, I think, perfectly adequately with two instruments. The people dealing with those would all be together. We would not need to set up special machinery to promote coordination. They would be already coordinated. If the Commission is really serious about spending its money on the problem rather than spending its money on creating instruments and bureaucrats for coordination, it needs to step back and take an even more radical look at the way it tackles the problem.

**Mr Flanagan (DEP).** — Mr President, first of all I would like to congratulate Mr Thareau on an excellent report which is clear, precise and virtually complete.

Because of my membership of the special economic committee I was not able to be present during the Curry report this morning, but I did see on the monitor Irish names coming up regularly, and I am sure it was not lost on the Members of this House that there was virtual unanimity of view among them. A difference in nuance, yes, but no difference in basic approach, and this afternoon you will be hearing Mr McCartin and myself on another aspect of the same problems affecting Ireland, particularly the west of Ireland. The fact remains that even after 10 years of membership of the Community Ireland in general and the west of Ireland in particular lag very far behind the more developed countries of Europe. This is particularly so as regards structures in the west of Ireland, which of course, is a severely handicapped area.

Our farmers have proved, I think conclusively, and especially our young farmers, their willingness to work hard, to invest and to do their best to progress. But because they were so far behind, and still are, they must have massive help from the Community if they are ever to reach the level to which they are entitled by continued hard work in future years. Because of the focus of European agricultural development in recent years, the exigencies of the time forced most of the small farmers of the west of Ireland into milk production. Whatever one may think about the Commission or the Council, I do have great respect for the ultimate good sense of this Parliament, and I believe that they will ultimately accept the validity of the case that has been made almost *ad nauseum* on behalf, in particular, of the very poor handicapped parts of my country.

We do not come here to say that we are not prepared to work. We are prepared to work very hard. Over the last 25 years or so, despite the fact that there has been a continuous drop in the number of people engaged in agriculture in Ireland, there is still a viable, vital rural community, and the social aspect of the fact that they are there cannot be over-stressed. I have the figures here. In 1960 there were 390 000 full-time

## Flanagan

farmers in Ireland. In 1972 it was 183 000 In 1982 it was 120 000 and at the moment it is something less, but I hope not significantly less.

The fact that all of us have stressed over and over again the special position and therefore the need for special measures, in particular for our smaller badly-structured farms, should bring home what is an undeniable fact of our position.

I said earlier that I had confidence in this Parliament and I believe that, if Parliament does accept our viewpoint, we shall have done something useful and perhaps helped both the Commission and the Council to face up to the realities and, perhaps, to their obligations as well.

I have been disappointed with the Commission because too many of the Commissioners appear to me to be mere extensions of the national governments and are therefore not discharging the responsibility which they, as Commissioners, undertook to discharge when they took office. As for the Council of Ministers, words fail me to describe their squabbling at a time when Europe and its institutions are in ruin or rapidly on the way to ruin. Perhaps the last chance will be the meeting of the Council of Ministers which is coming up at the end of this month followed by the Athens European Council.

Europe cannot afford to stay the way it is. We either go forward or we disintegrate.

**Mr Chanteric (PPE).** — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, improving the effectiveness of the structural funds of the European Communities is one of the four main items on the agenda for the meeting of the European Council in Athens. Early this year Parliament approved the Commission's proposal that structural fund expenditure should be doubled in real terms and a number of reforms undertaken to increase the effectiveness of these funds. The financial resources available for the European Communities' structural measures must not be underestimated. In 1982, they amounted to 4200m ECU in subsidies and a further 4200m ECU in loans.

It is nonetheless a fact, Mr President, that fund measures have so far been closely linked to national measures. In some cases, the only function the funds perform is to contribute to the financing of national policies, with no sign of value added by the Community. And this is one of the important aspects of the reform: the funds must contribute to the achievement of the aims the European Communities have set themselves.

My group, the EPP Group, therefore fully endorses the idea that the structural funds must be instrumental in development and structural adjustment rather than channels for the redistribution of financial resources, as they are today. The Community and the Member States concerned must therefore agree on the priorities so that there may be a Community approach.

Structural activities with an added European value will be possible if the financing of individual projects is abandoned in favour of programme contracts which include a multiannual financing programme and are commensurate with the Community's strategy. These principles also apply to the reformed Social Fund, of course. The changes that have been made by Council decision on a proposal from Parliament will certainly result in the simplification of the structure of the Fund, an improvement in the procedure for the submission and approval of applications and also an improvement in the disbursement procedure. This will also enable the Commission to play a more active role.

I must point out, however, that the EPP Group still places the same emphasis on the need for Parliament to have a greater say, particularly in the setting of priorities for the Fund in the guidelines which the Commission draws up every year. These guidelines in fact form the selection criteria for applications for Fund aid.

My group believes that Parliament's involvement in the drawing up of the guidelines is not only 'particularly desirable', as the Commission puts it, but also indirectly linked to Parliament's budgetary powers, which give it the last word on non-compulsory expenditure. The revised administration of the Fund must, on the other hand, ensure that payment appropriations for which provision is made are actually disbursed, to prevent a recurrence of the present paradoxical situation: it has not been possible to approve half of this year's applications and yet, at the end of the year, it is found that a significant proportion of the appropriations are left unspent and will have to be transferred to the next budget, the 1984 budget in this case.

I wish to emphasize in this Parliament once again that the Community's first priority is and remains the fight against unemployment. The Community can and must make a genuine contribution in this respect. The European Social Fund is one of the most important instruments here. The Commission proposes that the share of the budget going to the structural funds should be doubled over five years. We approve this plan but, where the Social Fund is concerned, we urge that this be achieved within two years. This Fund is after all playing an increasingly important part in the granting of aid to create employment. In global terms, the Commission's proposals will result in greater effectiveness and so make a major contribution to the convergence that has been demanded for years. My group thus supports Mr Patterson's report, while hoping that he will be able to approve the three minor amendments my group has tabled. They do not affect the essence of his report. I will therefore conclude by saying once again that we shall support the Patterson report on this subject.

**Mr Provan (ED).** — Mr President, I am going to address myself mainly to the Davern resolution, but, first I should like to refer briefly to the Thareau report. I would like to apologize to Mr Thareau, because my group feels at the present time that his report has lost touch with the initial hopes and aims that we had for it in the committee since the Commission has come forward with its new proposals for restructuring and that type of thing in the agricultural sector. Mr Davern's report, on the other hand, is, I hope, going to get my group's support.

We in the European Democratic Group accept the need to increase resources in the structural funds, especially for the less-favoured areas, now that agriculture expenditure as a whole has been pegged to the level of the Community's own resources. This, I think, Parliament now accepts. We do not, however, believe in blanket aid, and we hope to be able to achieve some form of graded payments depending on comparative disadvantage. Parliament may recall that last year proposals were put forward in my own name for the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, which is a severely disadvantaged area in my own part of Great Britain. There are severe problems there, and it is perhaps wrong to treat the less-favoured areas with blanket aid when we should have some form of graded payments — which would be fairly easy to administer, I would submit — depending on the disadvantages that these areas have to face.

We have two amendments to the Davern report. The first one, to paragraph 16, was tabled because of our conviction that the Commission needs to find some teeth so that it can police properly any national measures that might be taken in the structural field just as much as in the Guarantee Section.

The second amendment to which I would like to draw Parliament's attention is for a new paragraph 22a, which would complement what Mr Hutton has just said from his longer-term view. We feel that in the meantime it is highly necessary to get proper coordination between the Social Fund, the Regional Fund and the EAGGF through the establishment of a coordinating directorate within the Commission. I believe that this was not properly understood when we discussed it in committee, and I hope that the rapporteur and Parliament will accept it as a result of this debate.

**Mr Vgenopoulos (S).** — (GR) Mr President, everybody agrees that the policy on agricultural prices and markets, i.e., the Guarantee Section of the EAGGF, has helped the development of enterprises and regions that showed a degree of dynamic potential from the start. The organizational policy which later supplemented the CAP has unfortunately been unable to secure a fair distribution of agricultural production and incomes between the Community's various regions. On the contrary, it has widened

regional inequalities, and this because the Community's organizational measures are not balanced and are inappropriate for dealing with the special characteristics of the Member States. Their orientation is wrong, and most important of all, they do not form part of a global and integrated Common regional development policy.

The very general nature of these measures renders them inapplicable, for example, in Greece or even the south of Italy, regions which face special problems, as pointed out in the excellent report by our colleague Mr Thareau. The horizontal organizational measures and uniform pattern for modernizing the various enterprises have made the various organizational directives pointless for small producers, since the criterion of comparable income was defined on the basis of incomes in the developed regions.

Another problem that has arisen is that in the organizational directives the support system is based on the subsidization of interest payments. This means that the high interest-rates in some countries make it more difficult to implement the directives and farmers do not wish to take up loans, because even if their loans are subsidized the interest they will have to pay is very high. Besides, it is often the case that for the financing of a programme to be approved, the economic and technical studies required are so elaborate that countries and regions with weak structures are unable to carry them out and promote them.

We believe that a decisive factor in creating a more cohesive Community, a fairer Community in which the goal of economic convergence will stand a better chance of being achieved in the future, is aid for regions that have an immediate need for it. This entails setting up differentiated criteria according to which each Member State and in some cases a region within it may be assigned to a category reflecting the acuteness of its problems, and providing different incentives for each case. The part played by the Community in the cost of financing and subsidizing interest payments should be differentiated according to the category to which each region belongs, and the procedures for access to the structural funds should be simplified.

The planning and coordination of efforts to deal with the special characteristics of each region should be paramount in drawing up the new organizational policy.

**Mrs Boot (PPE).** — (NL) Mr President, at its meeting in Stuttgart, the European Council instructed the Commission to investigate the efficiency of the structural funds and to put forward proposals for their more efficient use. The most important aspect was to be closer coordination of policies, with the object of avoiding overlapping and the duplication of expenditure and achieving greater budgetary discipline.

## Boot

The efficiency of structural measures can be seen as the central issue in the investigation requested by the European Council. The first thing that strikes us is that, in its interpretation of efficiency, the Commission has not confined itself to accountancy-type problems but has indicated ways of at last establishing a concept of European structural policy. Broadly speaking, the Commission wants to pursue a 'policy of conditions'. In other words, it not only wants fund utilization to be subject to the special criteria and standards, but also and above it wants all the structural measures to be commensurate with the Community's general objectives. This means that, rather than suggesting that (a) the resources available to the Community funds should be used largely to finance national policy measures without any guarantee that these measures will make a genuine contribution to convergence as is at present the case, and (b) the present system of spreading the limited resources used to achieve Community objectives should be continued, the Commission has drawn up proposals for the structural development and adjustment of the funds with a view to adopting a Community policy that complies with the priorities which have been set by the Community and is pursued with all the structural funds and the Community's other financial instruments.

Mr President, referring principally to the European Regional fund, we welcome the fact that the Commission has now come forward with proposals which, as my colleague Mr von der Vring has said, make it possible for more extensive proposals for a genuine structural policy to be drawn up without the risk of Council sabotage. We welcome the proposal to abolish the distinction between the quota and non-quota sections, not only because this will really make for a more European approach but also because it conforms to the idea proposed by the Committee on Budgets in the past that the quota percentages should be indicative in nature. This idea is reflected in the Commission's proposal that a margin or bracket should be introduced.

In view of the integration to which this may lead, my group proposes that the three policy committees which now deal with the three separate funds should achieve a measure of integration through the setting up of an integrated, umbrella policy committee. Secondly, to give this greater strength at national level, it is to be recommended that the same kind of integrated committees be set up at this level to assess the effect which the plans of the national governments will have on the Community.

**Mr Barbagli (PPE).** — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, almost everyone has pointed out the positive aspects of the Commission's proposals for increasing the effectiveness of the Community's structural funds. I believe, however, that it is necessary to remind ourselves of the objectives that we wish to achieve with these Community structural funds. Some

members have emphasized that the European Social Fund, in its role as assigned by the Treaty, is an eminently structural fund. However, we cannot overlook the fact that, in addition, it has been given another function — a surreptitious one, if you like — that of providing aid in particular political situations that are unconnected with clearly defined technological conversion programmes, in order to create new jobs and new opportunities for employment.

Some members have furthermore pointed out that Parliament should play a part in defining or in making the Commission define the criteria by which the Fund is to be managed. I think that the Commission should be the supreme organ where the definition of criteria is concerned, since it is responsible for the management of the Social Fund. Parliament, on the other hand, must be able to play its part in defining the legislative instruments — which is what it tried to do, amongst other things, with its call for concerted planning, though I have unfortunately to admit that, perhaps because of the weakness of the Parliamentary delegation, the objective was not achieved.

But let us consider the agricultural structural funds. I think it appropriate to recall what is laid down in Article 39 of the Treaty, in which one of the aims of the common agricultural policy is given as the improvement of the living conditions and income of the agricultural populations concerned. I think that, today, we must all acknowledge the fact that the CAP has fulfilled its role of creating self-sufficiency in agricultural food products for Community consumers. If that is so, we must also assign to agriculture the fundamental role in the relaunch of development in many rural areas, through structural policy, with a view to promoting *in loco* better conditions for the development of these typical local products, creating thereby the conditions for an upturn in employment and putting a stop to the mass exodus that has taken place from these large rural areas. But, to do this, it is necessary not only to restore the original ratio of one third between the Guidance Fund and the Guarantee Fund, but to go a great deal further.

Of course, agriculture cannot do the job of restoring territorial balance and developing these large rural areas on its own. Parallel measures are needed in other sectors better suited to the task of developing these territories, such as tourism, agritourism, craft industries and — why not — the exploitation of the countryside, the cultural assets and the architectural heritage of these areas. The question of agriculture can only be linked to a global territorial development policy. I think that some of the approaches and initiatives embodied in the Commission's proposals are along these lines, and as such should be valued and approved. A great effort is required from Parliament to enable it to achieve that level of political agreement that is necessary to ensure that, in a decision along the lines of an increase in own resources and a Commu-

**Barbagli**

nity structural policy, it will play a leading role, in support of a policy that is starting to look different from what we have had in the past.

**Mr Griffiths (S).** — Mr President, there is a commitment in the Treaty of Rome to reduce regional disparities, and the Council of Ministers has over the past decade gone out of its way to declare its support for reducing these disparities. Yet, in fact, absolutely nothing has happened. None of the Community structural funds has been able to reserve this process of regional disparities — they have grown worse. The Council has done precious little to solve the regional crisis. Nineteen months ago, the European Parliament delivered its opinion on the Commission's reforms of the Regional Fund, and we are still awaiting the Council's decision. The attempt to reduce regional spending for 1984 is nothing less than a betrayal of the people in the regions who are out of work, on short time, in temporary employment, or in work for which they receive but a pittance. All these categories are over-represented in the regions, from the rural parts of Southern Italy, such as Campania, to regions of de-industrialization, as South Wales.

Even when the Council has a straightforward proposal in front of it, like the second round of non-quota proposals, which the European Parliament approved five months ago, it dilly-dallies over making a decision. Yet this proposal is nothing but a slightly extended version of the already approved first round of proposals. There is one new programme for textile crisis areas, for example, and in the steel programme a few new districts, such as Ogwr in my own constituency, have been added to those qualifying for aid. The local authorities in the area concerned are anxious to get to work and help provide urgently needed jobs. But the Council is guilty of loitering with intent to drive people in our regions into unemployment and poverty. I implore the Council to approve the non-quota proposals before the end of this year.

What estimate should we make of the Commission's efforts to tackle these grave problems? In charity we can say that their approach has been limited by the view *they* have of what the Council might accept. Their Athens proposals are not likely to reduce the cost of food to the consumer or release new resources to create jobs in the dying regions.

The European Parliament has played a Jekyll and Hyde role. On the one hand there is a majority to increase further the effectiveness and size of the structural funds; on the other hand, they were prepared to vote even bigger price increases than the Commission wanted or the Council approved. So I appeal, Mr President, to all institutions — and especially this Parliament — to face this crisis realistically. If the Community sets its face against the necessary far-reaching changes in the CAP and the massive development of non-agricultural policies, then its unbending attitude

will mean self-destruction. If, however, the Community meets the challenge of wasted agricultural spending and of reviving the regions, then we shall be able to offer new hope to our people in a Community which has economic and social justice as a hallmark of its policies.

**Mr Kaloyannis (PPE).** — (*GR*) I agree in principle with the reports that concern the more effective performance of the Community's structural funds. However, I would like to make some general comments on the structural funds, speaking both for myself and as a representative of my country.

To begin with I support the doubling of resources available to the structural funds within the framework of an indicative system of programmes covering several years. I also support the replacement of the present system of national quotas by a system of indicative cut off levels, with the proviso that these are not to be calculated on the basis of the quotas of 1981, but using objective indicators of the social and economic development of each Member State related to the average level within the Community. I support the increase in the proportions by which the structural funds are to be strengthened, and think it necessary that basic infrastructural programmes should be financed. The system of regional programmes must become established in place of the present system of isolated projects. The Regulation concerning integrated Mediterranean programmes must be approved at all costs by the end of June 1984. Community action must be undertaken to provide positive support for national activities. The participation of the funds in development programmes must be coordinated, and supervision of the supplementary resources must be ensured. The structural funds should be used to achieve the Community's aims, particularly that of reducing regional differences and inequalities. The Guidance Section of the EAGGF should be used to promote investments for the modernization and conversion of agricultural enterprises and for the processing and marketing of agricultural products. We must also find better ways of using unproductive agricultural land and improving agricultural incomes in disadvantaged regions. The EAGGF should be more effective in poorer regions of the Community, such as Greece, Ireland and Italy. In view of its role, there is an absolute need to increase the resources of the Guidance Section in view of the forthcoming enlargement embracing Spain and Portugal.

In conclusion, I applaud the proposed resolution to set up a European fund for guarantees and orientation in the sector of fishing, the sea and hydroponic cultivation.

**Mr McCartin (PPE).** — Mr President, we are seeking in this Community to build a genuine consolidated community with equal opportunity and, as far as

**McCartin**

possible, equal standards of living for everybody. We boast that through the common agricultural policy, which we say is the only developed policy that we have, we have achieved common objectives. Well, I think we have achieved some common objectives in that we have satisfied the needs of the consumer, I believe at a reasonable price, and the industry has continued to expand over the years. But, nevertheless, I think that even in agriculture we are quite a way from achieving the objective of common standards of living and financial solidarity between the various regions of this Community.

If there is any product in this Community that can be said to have a common Community régime — and I do not want to go back over the Curry report but I want to make this point — it is, of course, milk, on which we spend one-third of the finances of this Community. It is supposed to be one product for which there is a genuine Community régime and yet, if you look at the difference, say, between a peripheral region like Ireland and the Federal Republic of Germany: between MCAs; the difference in the cost of money for investment; the difference in distance from the market, you have a difference in profitability which could be marked in hundreds of percentage points, not just a modest difference like 10 or 20 %.

We have not achieved any sort of convergence in that area. We have not achieved it in agriculture for many reasons: because of the difference in infrastructure; because of the cost of money; because of the different rates of inflation. Contrary to what most people believe, I think we have come as close to common policies in industrial development as we have in agriculture, I think we have a completely free market, an equal market for everybody, but naturally there are not equal opportunities, for the different regions of the Community. Again because of interest rates; because of infrastructure; because of the traditional skills which areas have; because of the hidden subsidies, different taxation régimes.

If we are ever to achieve a common consolidated market, a Community that shows equal concern for the citizens of the different regions and different areas, I think we need a common currency. The ECU must be our currency; we must have something approaching a federal bank; we must work within the framework of a common economic and social strategy which will be applied throughout this Community. We can have all the directives we like — and we have had a lot of them in recent years. Many directives which we berate the Council for not adopting, which the Commission proposed, which Parliament gave its opinion on, reflect very often the needs of the stronger parts of this Community. Most of those directives — I do not vote against them in this Parliament, I generally am happy to discuss them at the committee stage and vote with my group, however the majority decides — reflect the needs of the better

developed areas, of the trade unions and of the consumer, and the environmental and transport needs of those areas, rather than the peripheral regions, and they tend to make more difficult the coming together of the economies of the different parts of the Community. I would look to the various structural directives and re-echo the things that Mr Hutton said I get concerned over the proliferation of ideas that come up particularly at budget time; the writing in of all sorts of pious ideas and responses to so many pressure groups and political interests, the greatest joke being the budgetary line with the good intention written on it and no money at all to support it.

I do not want to go into the technicalities of the social and regional and agricultural structural funds, but I do want to say that those funds must have the common object of building up the peripheral regions of this Community, because they are the only instruments that we have at the moment for doing so. I do not want to see a proliferation of ideas, of civil servants, a morass of further administration, of which we have too much in the national parliaments already, building up around too many schemes: I want those structural schemes to be a reflection of the will of this Community to transfer genuine resources that will create equal opportunity for the various regions of this Community.

**Mrs Fullet (S).** — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I propose to confine myself to a few observations on the European Regional Development Fund, although the problem of efficient use of funds also concerns the EAGGF and the Social Fund.

Evidence of the need for structuring of the Regional Development Fund is to be found on several planes. On one level, there are the shortcomings in the selection of subsidized projects: the aims of the Fund and the conditions governing eligibility for its subsidies need to be clarified. Indeed, the Court of Auditors has found that the Commission, having examined the programmes submitted by Member States, was unable to identify the priority areas for the Fund's operations. No criterion had been defined for selection from among the various eligible projects.

The Commission's communication deals with this problem by applying the concept of conditionality to projects, so that compliance with the rules will no longer be treated as sufficient grounds for bringing Community action into play. The Commission is anxious that projects should be discussed between itself and the State concerned, so as to ensure that they are in keeping with the Community's specific objectives and meet the requisite conditions as regards efficiency. Organization of such discussions, assuming that they were considered appropriate, should not have the effect of leaving the final decision with the Commission, since that would amount to a right of veto. We should therefore take a cautious view of this idea.

## Fuillet

It is clear, however, that the idea that the Funds' objectives should be specifically *communautaires* in character deserves support. Projects should no longer be geared to purely national objectives, since otherwise the Funds will be no more than instruments for redistribution of resources.

On a second level, we are all aware of the need for concentration in terms of geographical coverage and concentration of the Fund's objectives, especially in the light of the priorities adopted by the Community. The same applies to concentration of financial resources, and coordination of these resources, which means complementarity of operations and the elimination of duplication or overlapping of financing. We must bring out all the potential for synergy between the Community's structural funds and between them and other national and Community instruments.

On certain points, the Commission intends to confirm the October 1981 proposals already voted by this Parliament. These are concerned with coordination of national regional policies, contractual financing of programmes, support aimed at bringing out regions' endogenous potential, and promotion of integrated schemes. The Commission sees the priorities of the ERDF as being directed towards the development and structural adjustment of backward regions and the redevelopment of declining industrial regions.

All these proposals need to be sanctioned by an agreement, and we for our part are very much in favour of that. We are nevertheless disappointed that this text takes no account of the problem of industries in an undeclared state of crisis.

It has also been proposed to us that the present quota system should be abolished. There would be general guidelines in the form of a bracket figure indicating the upper and lower limits of the share that each Member State could expect. Drawing on quotas should no longer be regarded as an automatic process by Member States.

I should like to conclude with two points: first, we confirm our approval in principle of the Commission's initiative; secondly, we attach particular importance to the additionality and transparency which should be characteristic features of regional schemes.

**Mrs Duport (S).** — (FR) I shall be referring exclusively to the European Social Fund, although I must stress that we are firmly committed to coordination of the use of the various funds with a view to establishing an effective Community policy.

It is important that the Social Fund's structural role should be strengthened, and we already have the basis for this since 40% is being allocated to the top priority regions, the six least-favoured regions in the Community.

An integrated regional programme is undoubtedly the best, most effective use of the Fund. Simultaneous schemes to improve the housing, infrastructures and economy of a region, coupled with social measures, offer the most effective basis for action.

This leaves the 60% which has not been earmarked for these priority regions. This part of the Fund is to be used in support of national policies promoting employment, with priority given to those sectors which suffer abrupt job losses as a result of the rationalization or collapse of dominant industries, something seen in many regions in the various Member States.

An interesting aspect is the fact that 75% of the Fund is going to be used for the benefit of young people aged under 25, who include 45% of the Community's unemployed among their number. However, care should be taken not to overlook the other social groups for which specific assistance is essential. These are the most vulnerable and threatened groups, for whose members the difficulties of finding a place in active life are most difficult: women, migrants, and the handicapped. They must continue to benefit from the Social Fund.

It would not be reasonable to revert to a form of redistribution based on national lines, allocating this 60% of the Social Fund according to geographical criteria which, apart from their other shortcomings, are not easy to determine. The available statistics are not reliable and there is an urgent need for the Community to intervene in situations where acute employment crises arise, thus following up the priority objective that it has set itself, as approved by a majority of Parliament in Brussels. However, I stress that it is essential, although not easy, to find ways of continuing to support the most vulnerable social groups, since this is the true meaning of the social aid that can be provided through the Fund.

**Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission.** — (DA) Mr President, my colleague Mr Giolitti, who is also present, will comment on some of the points which have been raised concerning the Social Fund and the Regional Fund. I will certainly say something on the agricultural problems, which are of major significance to the question of our Structural Fund.

First, on Mr Davern's report, I should like to start by saying that I am glad Mr Davern shares the Commission's view on the matter of the main objectives to which the agricultural policy gives priority. I also noted that Mr Davern takes the same view as the Commission with regard to the various forms of action needed within the framework of the EAGGF (Guarantee Section), i.e., the introduction of horizontal measures for implementation throughout the Community and of integrated development programmes in regions where measures in other economic sectors are



## Dalsager

also required. All this coincides very neatly with the view the Commission holds. Of course, we must also remember that there are regions in which certain structural deficiencies exist in the farm sector, without any special problems arising in connection with economic development in general, and there is thus also a need for special measures to remove these problems.

Mr Davern makes some comments on the lack of cohesion in the application of horizontal structural measures in the various parts of the Community. It is recognized that difficulties arise in certain regions and even in certain Member States related to the extent to which the horizontal measures are applied. There may be many reasons for this, but the Community has done everything possible to ease the application of these measures. We have fixed higher support amounts and higher refunds from the Community to the less-favoured areas, and we have also introduced special arrangements with higher refund rates to certain of these regions. If Mr Davern thinks that a doubling of the allocation to the Guidance Section over the next five years is not sufficient, I can only reply that this arrangement in the prevailing circumstances nevertheless represents a very large contribution on our part, and by increasing the available resources in this way we shall be in a position to intensify intervention under the Guidance Section.

Finally, the Commission feels, as I have already pointed out and as I explained in the Commission communication, that the available resources should be concentrated on certain tasks carrying priority. This does not mean, however, that I accept the claim that there is a lack of consistency and clarity in our policy, or that a multiplicity of texts has in the past resulted in a dissipation of the Community's performance in the structural field.

I turn now to the Thareau report, and I am pleased here today to be able to contribute a few comments to the debate on Mr Thareau's report on the Community's structural policy. I must say that the views presented in this report and in the Commission's new proposals on agricultural structure policy coincide to a striking degree. Although the Commission cannot perhaps entirely go along with the rapporteur's analysis of the results of the present policy, I think we can safely say that the conclusion we arrive at is, by and large, the same — namely, that the agricultural structure policy must be adopted on the basis of the experience we have already had in tackling the problems with which we shall be faced over the next 10 years.

When the Commission drew up the guidelines for a new policy, it set four main objectives: firstly, improving the effectiveness of the agricultural policy; secondly, restructuring production in line with market demands; thirdly, maintaining employment in agriculture; and fourthly, improving the incomes and standards of living especially of disadvantaged farmers.

Although the rapporteur in some instances lays the emphasis on different aspects and makes a different choice of words, he has broadly speaking set the same objectives, and there is thus no fundamental disagreement between us in regard to the general aims of future policy.

I wish to concentrate on what I consider to be the most important part of the report, since it would not have been possible in the time available to comment in detail on each individual proposal.

First of all, I should like to say something on what in the Commission we call selectivity — in other words, the question which farmers should get investment aid from the Community and which should be excluded. It is proposed in the report that investment aid should be expanded so that it applies to a broader section of farmers, and that that should be done by abolishing the income criteria and by making the rules on operating plans more flexible. The Commission can go along with that in broad terms, since it coincides in principle with what we have put forward in our proposal; but a procedure of this kind must be based upon a number of basic requirements which the farmers must meet. We consider it reasonable that, in order to receive aid, the farmer should have the basic professional competence which the work requires.

We also think that he should keep simple accounts and, in particular, we think it right that the farmer should show by means of a plan that the investment is worth undertaking and that it will lead to lasting economic improvements in the business. In our view, these conditions constitute absolutely the right balance. On the one hand, an excessively restrictive procedure would exclude many farmers who genuinely desire and need to improve their businesses. On the other hand, an excessively easy-going procedure would open the floodgates to a flow of unprofitable expenditure, and that is surely something we must avoid. We must ensure that the projects to which aid is given are viable and that we are not wasting money on unprofitable plans.

Concerning the question of selectivity, it is proposed in this report that the new policy should support the family farm. As you know, this designation does not appear at all in the Commission's proposal. By concentrating the aid on those farms which fall below the comparable income level which we have proposed and by setting limits to the volume of investment which can be assisted per employee and per undertaking, we nevertheless ensure that the measures provided under the new policy do benefit the smaller holdings, and these are precisely the undertakings we think of as family farms. There may of course be slight divergences in what is considered to be a family farm in the various regions of the Community.

I shall leave aside the question of what type of business would receive aid and instead say something on the types of investment which could be assisted. On

**Dalsager**

this point, I can only say that the rapporteur and the Commission in actual fact seem to be in complete agreement with one another that these investments should only apply to improvements in product quality, cuts in production costs, conservation, the improvement of living and working conditions and energy savings.

I will now say a little about the types of production which might be assisted. Here, too, there is broad agreement between the rapporteur's suggestion and the Commission's view. We are agreed that the new structural policy should entail a restructuring of production such that there is a move away from those forms of production which give rise to structure-related surpluses, while at the same time taking into account certain special regional factors. The new structural policy must, in other words, take market policy into account.

I should also like to draw attention to the regional aspects. I think we can say that the Community's structural policy has been increasingly concerned with the problems of the disadvantaged areas. In 1975, we adopted Directive 75/268 on mountain regions and other disadvantaged areas in the Community.

Since then, we have introduced a number of measures to solve special problems in particular areas. In the past few years, we have implemented integrated trial projects in areas where agriculture is closely linked with economic development in other sectors. In this last connection, the Commission has put forward its proposals on integrated Mediterranean programmes, and there are 3 points in our latest proposals which are of relevance to the least favoured areas.

To begin with, we propose that the provisions of Directive 75/268 should be given greater scope. Secondly, we have proposed a system under which the Council can adopt measures designed to assist in the solution of special regional problems. Thirdly, we have proposed certain measures for forestry which will be of special importance to disadvantaged areas. All this means an even development towards a procedure under which structural reforms in agriculture would be approached from a regional point of view and emphasis laid in certain cases on integration and on agricultural arrangements accompanied by corresponding measures in other sectors.

Although our position and the rapporteur's recommendations can be construed as differing on some points, I do not think they are irreconcilable with one another.

**Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission.** — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentleman, all of the many speeches that have made references to the group of three structural Funds, which is the subject of the Commission's report and, in particular, to the Social and Regional Funds — because my colleague Mr Dalsager has spoken on the EAGGF Guidance

Section — should really have a specific, precise answer, point by point, which I obviously cannot give them, because of time restrictions. I shall therefore only make a few observations of a general nature.

First of all, I should like to say that I fully agree — and this is also the Commission's view — with the preliminary observation made by Mr De Pasquale, when he expressed his regret that this Parliament should have in fact split up by sectors the discussion on the Commission's report regarding the Funds. Parliament has in fact presented three reports — one specific report for each of the three Funds — whereas the intention behind the Commission's report, in response to the Stuttgart Council and with the Athens Council in mind, was precisely to present an overall picture as the basis for a structural policy. Because of this separation, however, something of this has been lost. At all events, I want to make it clear now that the Commission's intention, despite everything, is still as I set it forth: increasingly close coordination, aiming at the achievement of real integration of the three Funds, so as to make them the instruments of an organized, systematic structural policy.

Some of the speakers have gone so far as to criticize the Commission for not proposing, in its report, the merger of the three Funds and the creation, from their remains, of a single fund for structural policy. I frankly feel that it would have been a mistake to take that path, because it would have been an extremely long one. In the meantime, whilst waiting for a new structural Fund to be created — and, as we know, it takes years to get the Council to agree to modifications, even in part, to just one of the Funds — we should have had to freeze the existing Funds without making any reforms, since they would have been destined to disappear with the creation of the new Fund. Bearing all that in mind, I once again defend the position adopted by the Commission regarding the line it has taken, which maintains a fair balance between caution and boldness, so as to obtain concrete results. The solution of having one single Fund may be an objective — it cannot be a starting-off point.

No specific observations were made regarding the Social Fund, but there was an important question of a general nature put by the rapporteur, Mr Patterson, to whom I should like to give a precise answer because it also concerns inter-institutional relationships, particularly with regard to the budget. In a reference to multi-annual programming, Mr Patterson asked what that involves in relation to the annual nature of budgets, and hence in relation to the powers that are exercised by the Council and Parliament when each year's budget is considered.

As the Commission sees it, when we speak of multi-annual programming we mean indicative programming that will guide the decisions that, every year,

**Giolitti**

have to be taken by the budgetary authorities. But, in so far as this multiannual programming tends to grow in scope and in extreme cases become even binding, clearly Parliament's involvement must be increasingly incisive and active. It must not be limited simply to consultation, but must be exercised in the form, and following the procedures, of 'conciliation', as it is called.

Mr Patterson referred to certain criteria of a general nature mentioned in the Commission's report, where it speaks of 'conditionality' and 'complementarity'. That this is jargon — as the honourable Member stated — I agree: it is however jargon full of content which I think, moreover, is explained sufficiently clearly in our report. Behind these words, which express very precise concepts, lies the will to ensure an active role for the institutions of the Community in the use of these Funds; an ability to select and hence, for that reason, an element of conditionality and complementarity.

And since I have referred particularly to Mr Patterson and his report, and to the observations that were made on the subject, I should like, before going on to deal with the Regional Fund, to make two further points clear.

In paragraphs 4 and 5 of the motion for a resolution emphasis is laid on the participation of Parliament in determining the priorities of the Fund. As part of the procedure of conciliation between the Commission and the Council the guidelines for managing the European Social Fund are to be drawn up by the Commission in close collaboration with Member States, taking into account the points of view expressed by Parliament, and the Commission intends to facilitate the procedure for consulting Parliament.

With regard to paragraph 13, I should like to give an assurance that no payment has been blocked as a result of the failure of the budgetary authorities to comply with Article 9, paragraph 2, of Council decision 71/66 concerning the re-examination of the European Social Fund. Advance payments against authorized programmes have been made in the normal way; however, there was delay in authorizing some operations.

*(Mr Giolitti's speech was disturbed by the arrival and talk of Members called into the Chamber by the voting-bell)*

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, would you please take your places quietly and so allow Mr Giolitti to continue speaking.

**Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission.** — *(IT)* And I come quickly, Mr President, to the observations that were made regarding the Regional Fund. I note, in the first place, the very general agreement in regard to the Commission's proposals. I must however reply to Mr De Pasquale's criticism of the Commission — and hence of me also — with regard to the consultation of

Parliament and his Committee on Regional Planning, which he considers to have been unsatisfactory and too late. I should like to remind him that, on the contrary, there was prior consultation; during two meetings of the Committee on Regional Planning — on 21 and 28 September, to be precise — I not only set forth the proposals of the Commission but also listened to the observations made by the members of that Committee. Furthermore, the proposals put forward by the Commission following the report represent the consistent development of both the proposals that it had already presented in October 1981 and the content of the report that we are now discussing. The main new feature of the Commission's proposals — as Mr De Pasquale has himself pointed out — is the introduction of the method of financing programmes instead of individual *ad hoc* projects, and it is precisely — and I would emphasize this fact to the rapporteur — by having programmes that we are able to bring a concentration to bear, in accordance with clearly defined priorities, of both Community and national objectives at one and the same time, suitably coordinated. And I can give an assurance that within the framework of these programmes, the Commission intends to pay particular attention to investments carried out by small and medium-sized firms, and to the role which the Regional and Local Authorities are called upon to play. That is stated in particular in the section dealing with the exploitation of the potential of the Regions.

Finally, I should like once again to confirm that, obviously, at the same time as the activities of the Fund are being extended to regions hit by industrial decline, the priority assigned to the problems of structural underdevelopment remains unchanged. With regard to two points in the motion for a resolution, points 18 and 19, in which the Commission is called on to do two things, I should like to make the two following observations, and give the two following replies: the Commission already presents to the Council and the European Parliament every year a report on the Community's activities in granting and taking up loans, and with that same report the Commission informs the European Parliament every year of the activities of the EIB, ECSC, the so-called NCI, Euratom, EMS subsidies, and the special 'earthquake' loans that concern Italy and Greece in particular.

In addition, with its report and proposals regarding the means of increasing the effectiveness of the Community's structural funds, the Commission has presented the main results of the Community's structural policies, and the guidelines for possibly improving the structural funds. Depending on the outcome of the debates on those proposals, the Commission will consider whether in future it should prepare other reports of this kind, but we consider that what we are already presenting satisfies the essential need for information.

## IN THE CHAIR : LADY ELLES

*Vice President*

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

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman (ED).** — Madam President, I would like you to apologize to Commissioner Giolitti, who has done us the courtesy to sit here throughout this debate and whose closing remarks were quite incomprehensible to anybody. Can Members not do him the courtesy of going quietly to their seats instead of holding conversations in the aisles? He did his best to answer every point, but he was speaking against a flood of conversations. He is entitled to courtesy and he is entitled to an apology from this Assembly.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I think Commissioner Giolitti will have heard from the reaction of the House to Mrs Kellett-Bowman's point of order that she is fully supported in thanking him for his statement. We regret that his statement was not fully heard owing to the noise made by Members.

**Mr Nikolaou (S).** — *(GR)* Mr President, I wish to make a protest. The political group to which I belong put me down as a speaker on all four of the reports we have debated. However, I was involved with the Bureau and the enlarged Bureau, and did not see my name on the list of speakers.

In view of this, I ask that the text of my speech should be included in the verbatim report.

**President.** — Mr Nikolaou, your comments will be recorded as requested.

**Mr Bombard (S).** — *(FR)* Madam President, like Mrs Kellett-Bowman a moment ago, I wish to say that I am ashamed that a Member of the Commission should have been treated in this way. I was even wondering whether there was anyone in the Chair to keep order. This spectacle was a disgrace to Parliament.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Mr Bombard, you will be aware that only the House can keep itself in order. I hope that the comments that have been made will be heeded by Members who have been making a great deal of noise and stopping the speaker from being heard. The Commissioner has already heard the apologies of the House and, I am sure, has taken them on board.

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — Madam President, further to that point of order, may I point out that your predecessor in the Chair did call for order. He called for order very clearly in French, and no one took the slightest bit of notice, the reason being that unless you headphones headphones on you cannot understand what the Chair is saying. Could I ask the Bureau to

examine very carefully how a President can keep order when Members are not listening on their headphones to the interpretation? It is a matter of having a gavel or something like that. Commissioner Giolitti was making some very precise statements in response to the debate; and it was impossible to hear what he was saying even with headphones on. That was a disgrace.

**President.** — I do not want to pursue this point anymore. I regret to say that it is not only when you speak in French that Members do not hear. There are enough English-speaking Members and they never hear any comments even in English.

*(Laughter)*

**Mr Dalsass (PPE).** — *(DE)* Madam President, just a brief comment with regard to the Rules of Procedure. The Chair has acceded to Mr Nikolaou's request to have his speech recorded in the report of proceedings. I am already aware that written explanations of vote can be printed in this way, but are we now to assume that the same treatment may be given to other speeches which were not delivered from the floor of the House? If so, I would ask you to quote the relevant Article from our Rules of Procedure.

**President.** — Mr Dalsass, I understood from Mr Nikolaou that he was asking for the comment he made to be recorded. No speech which is not made on the floor of this House can of course be recorded, except an explanation of vote. I understood that Mr Nikolaou was requesting that the comment that he was not able to make his speech should be recorded in the report of proceedings. This is as I understood his comment.

#### 5. *Topical and urgent debate: Objections*

**President.** — In accordance with Rule 48 (2), second subparagraph, of the Rules of Procedure, I have received the following objections, justified in writing, to the list of subjects proposed for topical and urgent debate tomorrow morning.

*(The President read out the objections)*

I would remind the House that the vote on these objections will be taken without debate.<sup>1</sup>

**Mrs Castle (S).** — Madam President, I wish to move an amendment to the list. I wish to move that we replace the motion on the Lebanon by the motion in my own name and that of a number of my colleagues, on the threat to the Athens Summit, which has nowhere appeared on the list of recommendations for urgent debate. I do it on two grounds: first, there are always far too many foreign issues on our urgency lists. I agree that the Grenada issue is urgent. I agree that the Turkish issue is urgent; and that the Cyprus issue is urgent. But to

<sup>1</sup> See the Minutes.

## Castle

add the Lebanon as well when we are always discussing the Middle East in this House, and to leave out a motion pointing out that the Commission's sudden change of calculation over the British contribution threatens the Athens Summit — something urgent and domestic — is to suggest that it is not even regarded as worth mentioning in this House. I therefore wish to move that we substitute the motion by myself and my colleagues on the danger to the Athens Summit in place of the debate on the Lebanon. Let us give some more attention to our domestic affairs which are really at the heart of our activities!

*(Applause from the left)*

**President.** — Mrs Castle, I cannot of course go into the substance of your statement, but I very much regret that the second sub-paragraph of Rule 48 (2) clearly lays down the way in which an objection can be raised when the list is read out in the House. The rule is that a political group or at least 21 Members may oppose the decision in writing, stating their reasons, and move that Parliament abandon a topic or have it included. The vote on the objections shall take place without debate at the resumption of the sitting, and this is what we are doing now. I therefore regret, Mrs Castle, that whatever reason you may have for putting this forward to the House, a reason which I am sure is shared by many, we are not able to consider your request.

**Mr Enright (S).** — Point of order, Madam President. Under Rule 57 you are perfectly entitled, as President, to accept that motion. It is up to you to accept or reject it.

**President.** — I am sorry, Mr Enright, I do not wish to have an argument with you — an expert on the Rules of Procedure — but we are dealing only with Rule 48. There are special rules which deal with topical and urgent debates; Rule 48 covers only these, and this, of course, what Mrs Castle was referring to.

**Mrs Lizin (S).** — *(FR)* Madam President, the list of subjects for topical and urgent debate includes a request to the Commission concerned with an earth tremor in a region which I know well: Liège.

The Commission has now decided to grant aid to that region. I accordingly propose that we thank the Commission for this and let the matter rest there, since a satisfactory solution has been found.

*(Applause)*

### 6. Votes<sup>1</sup>

*Barbi motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1014/83/Corr.: Deployment of missiles):*

**Mr Barbi (PPE).** — *(IT)* Madam President, before voting commences I should like to point out that the Italian translation of the resolution presented by our four groups is incorrect, and is likely to cause

serious misunderstandings. At point B of the resolution, where the German text speaks of 'Beschwichtigungs politik', the French of 'd'une politique d'apaisement' and the English of 'appeasement', the Italian translation is given as 'pacificazione', which is exactly the opposite. I therefore ask that this translation be corrected so as to make proper sense.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Barbi. We will therefore vote on the English and German texts.

**Mr Mommersteeg (PPE).** — *(NL)* Madam President, the same can be said of the Dutch translation of recital B, which refers to a 'policy of concessions' rather than 'appeasement', the original text fortunately being in English. Negotiation is, of course, always a process of concessions and counterconcessions. This is consequently a mistranslation of 'appeasement'. In my opinion, the word 'appeasement' could be left untranslated in the Dutch version, because it is a set term. Otherwise, a correct translation must certainly be found.

**President.** — Mr Mommersteeg, I think by now the word will have been translated into all the languages, we hope properly, and we shall in any case be voting on the English and German texts.

**Mr Haagerup (L).** — I beg an apology, Madam President, but it so happens that I am the principal author of this particular motion, and it seems that in all languages except English this word 'appeasement' has been translated wrongly — very wrong in the Danish language as well.

If we could simply accept that there is a wrong translation of that particular word, then I think it will be easier for all languages.

**President.** — Mr Haagerup, when we come to vote on that motion for a resolution I will remind the House of the translation of this particular word.

I have a considerable list of explanations of vote, but it is quite clear that I cannot attach any particular explanation to any one resolution, because the names have been submitted on the subject as a whole. I propose that we take the whole list of explanations of vote and then vote on the motions for resolutions before the House.

**Sir Peter Vanneck (ED).** — I appreciate the dilemma of the Chair, but it does seem to me positively Alice in Wonderland, if that translates adequately, that we should listen to explanations of vote on the motions for resolutions by Mrs Focke, Mr Jaquet, Mr Fanti and Mr Boyes. If, in fact, the motion for a resolution by Mr Barbi is passed, then, of course,

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 1.

**Sir Peter Vanneck**

the others fall. This really does seem a waste of time, of which we are desperately short in this House. I do not suggest any other *modus operandi* than that which you have suggested yourself to the House, but perhaps somebody could look into it so that we do not get into this situation again.

**President.** — Of course, Sir Peter, it is very regrettable, when we have had three hours' full debate yesterday, that people should still have to make explanations of vote today. Nevertheless, this is the rule of the House and I must follow it.

**Mr Boyes (S).** — I think that was a terrible statement from the Chair, regretting that people have to make explanations of vote. I might remind you that explanations of vote are a very valuable right in this Parliament and should be defended, no matter how much they may inconvenience some people.

*(Applause)*

You should not make remarks like that from the Chair, with respect.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Boyes. Nevertheless, whatever anybody says in this House, I have to ensure that the Rules of Procedure are followed. There will now be explanations of vote from whoever has put their name down, and at the moment I have 27. If we could please proceed with these explanations of vote, I should be very grateful to the House.

I would ask, before the explanations of vote begin, that those who do not want to sit and listen to these explanations should leave the Chamber now and carry out their conversations outside rather than inside. It is not to the honour and prestige of this House if you continue, as Mr Boyes has said, during a very important matter to carry on conversations and not listen to the explanations of vote.

*After the explanations of vote on the Barbi motion for a resolution and the motions for resolutions on the Geneva negotiations*

**Mr Boyes (S).** — Madam President, first of all I think that you should call any Member when he asks to raise a point of order. Secondly, I think that your chairmanship this afternoon has been biased. I have noticed that when people from the left, anti-nuclear people, have been speaking, there has been a barrage of noise from reactionary backwoodsmen on the right and ...

*(Loud protests from the right)*

... there has been no attempt to control them. Earlier in the day you even mentioned my friend Enright by name when he was shouting. Yet this reactionary man here was shouting louder than anybody has ever shouted in this Parliament, but not a word came from the Chair. If this forum is to be conducted properly,

then we cannot afford bias in this place against those of us who are fighting for peace against the people over there who are trying to destroy everything that many of our forefathers have built over the years.

*(Mixed reactions)*

**President.** — Mr Boyes, I hope you enjoyed that intervention. The Chair is not biased. I have listened to a great deal of unseemly noise from all sides of this House today, which I think has been a shame for this Parliament.

**Mr Simmonds (ED).** — Madam President, my point of order is merely to congratulate you on your chairing of the meeting this afternoon.

*(Applause from the centre and from the right)*

**Mr Collins (S).** — Madam President, I was trying to listen with a great deal of attention and interest to what Mr Boyes was saying, but owing to the noise I could not hear. I wonder if it would be in order for you to ask him to repeat it for us.

*(Laughter)*

**President.** — Mr Collins, Mr Boyes has had his point of order and I think that is enough for once. You will be able to read it, in full, in the verbatim report of proceedings tomorrow.

*Arndt report (Doc. 1-856/83): Future financing of the Community:*

**President.** — I now wish to put to the House the problem of voting on the Arndt resolution. It was decided at 3 p.m. that this would be the next item on the agenda. I must, however, point out that it is now 6 p.m. There are about 95 amendments, which means that we could not possibly finish this vote until 7 p.m. This would mean, if the Commission were agreeable and the House is agreeable, that we would take Question time to the Commission between 7 p.m. and 8 p.m.

*(Parliament agreed to this proposal by the President)*

*Proposal for a decision*

*After the fourth recital: Amendment No 73*

**Mr Arndt (S), rapporteur.** — *(DE)* Madam President, the Committee on Budgets has tabled a whole series of compromise amendments, to a particular passage of the motion, wherever such exists.

**President.** — I am sorry, Mr Arndt, I have a different instruction on my information sheet. Would you be very kind and repeat that again because I have a different instruction here ?

**Mr Arndt (S), rapporteur.** — *(DE)* After the last debate and the first vote-taking, the motion was sent back to the Committee on Budgets, which then proposed Amendments Nos 73 to 84 as a compromise

## Arndt

*vis-à-vis* the former position of the House. Pursuant to Rule 74(4) of our Rules of Procedure, compromise amendments may be put to the vote first, and all other amendments are then deemed to fall. Consequently, may I request the President to apply Rule 74(4) to Amendments Nos 73 to 84 when we reach them (I will point this out in each case)?

**Mr Forth (ED).** — Madam President, I would invite you to read the text of Rule 74 (4). I see no reference there to taking compromise amendments first. No reason at all. I would have thought that it was entirely up to your discretion as to how you take compromise amendments. We must really not be misled by anyone into supposing that the rule says what it patently does not say, at least not in the English text.

**President.** — Mr Forth, I must tell you that Rule 74 (4) states that the President shall obtain the agreement of Parliament in putting such amendments to the vote. If I have the agreement of Parliament I can do so. If I do not have the agreement of Parliament, I cannot. I hope you will accept that.

*(Parliament adopted the proposal)*

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — *(DE)* Madam President, would you kindly, in connection with Amendment No 74, ask the rapporteur whether Amendment No 32, which, I understand, complies with the wishes of the Committee on Budgets, would fall as a result of the vote on Amendment No 74, or if Amendment No 32 may be put to the vote subsequently as an addition?

**President.** — Can we please have the view of the rapporteur?

**Mr Arndt (S), rapporteur.** — *(DE)* I wanted to suggest later that compromise Amendment No 74 be put to the vote simultaneously with the last sentence of Amendment No 32. That was the original intention. For the moment, however, we are still left with the question of Amendment No 45, which remains to be put to the vote.

*Article 3 (3), Amendments Nos 46, 86 and 76: After the adoption of Amendment No 76*

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — *(DE)* Madam President, here, too, there was a supplementary instruction by the Committee on Budgets that Mrs Nikolaou's amendment should be incorporated.

**Mr Arndt (S), rapporteur.** — *(DE)* I was about to clarify this. The last sentence in paragraph 1 of Amendment No 86 envisages special provisions governing the application of this criterion to Member States having a below-average GNP in which agricultural employment accounts for an above-average percentage, in accordance with our earlier decision concerning the recitals.

I would propose, therefore, that this addition, as contained in Amendment No 86, be incorporated here.

**President.** — Mr Arndt, we cannot split amendments like that. You put a proposal to the House that we take the compromise amendments first. If this was the decision of the Committee on Budgets, and since it is now the decision of the House, I do not think that I can go back on that decision. I think that if we were going to have extra amendments, despite taking the compromise amendments, this should have been clarified beforehand.

**Mr Arndt (S), rapporteur.** — *(DE)* The reason was that we incorporated into the amendment only matters which were compromises. It is our belief that there is no need to find an additional compromise for matters on which the House was almost unanimous the last time. Nevertheless, we ought to put it to the vote given that the amendment in question is an additional amendment; it does not alter the amendment of the Committee on Budgets, it is an addition. I specifically informed the Committee on Budgets of my intention to present it in such a manner to the House.

**President.** — But Mr Arndt, I understand that the whole of Amendment No 86 is not totally compatible with Amendment No 76. Therefore, what are you asking to be voted on?

**Mr Arndt (S), rapporteur.** — *(DE)* To repeat: Amendment No 86 supplements, but does not in any way alter, Amendment No 76. The first paragraph contains an addition concerning the special provisions for Member States with a below-average GNP in which agricultural activity accounts for an above-average percentage.

**President.** — I am sorry, Mr Arndt, but as I read these two amendments — I am sorry to have to go into this, because this is going to take up the time of the House — Amendment No 76 seeks to replace Article 3 (3) with a new text. We have voted on it and it has been adopted.

But I also see Amendment No 86, which seeks to replace Article 3 (3). You are therefore seeking to replace the same text with two separate texts. There is nothing in the amendment before me which seeks to add something to Article 3 (3). I therefore find myself in difficulty in view of the way in which these amendments have been drafted. If you are going to propose to change the normal method in which amendments are taken in this House, they must be properly drafted in order that Members can understand what we are doing and then we can vote on them. Have you any comment, Mr Arndt?

**Mr Arndt (S), rapporteur.** — (DE) Let me try again : Article 3(3) is laid out in the way it was proposed by the Committee on Budgets. However, an additional sentence must be added to the first paragraph and the Committee on Budgets has absolutely no objection, for it was carried unanimously on the previous occasion. That is what I am proposing — the mere addition of this sentence, for Mrs Nikolaou's amendment in no way alters the amendment of the Committee on Budgets.

**President.** — What you mean, I think, Mr Arndt, is that you are proposing that we should vote on the last sentence of the first paragraph in Amendment No 86 as an addition, and I think if this had been explained first, we might have saved a great deal of time.

**Mr Forth (ED).** — Madam President, are we now to take it that each of us can find a sentence we like in any of the amendments and propose that they be voted on separately? It seems that we are rather moving away from the established procedures in allowing someone, even as eminent as the rapporteur, to pick out what he likes, or what he believes his committee likes, and put it to the House separately. This surely is a very dangerous road to pursue, but if we are going down it, I would like to reserve to myself the right to pick sentences. I like, and ask the House to vote on them as well.

**Mr Kellett-Bowman (ED).** — I wonder, Madam President, whether Mr Arndt would explain to the House and to the Committee on Budgets when the decision to add these short wordings was agreed. It was not part of the compromise, and I have a feeling that he agreed this in a subsequent meeting with people behind him. This only makes acceptance of the compromise much more difficult, because it was open to the rapporteur to put these down as amendments from the Committee on Budgets on Monday night. He has not done that. He is now making the position very complicated.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — Madam President, I would ask you to consider two things. First, I sought permission to speak as soon as the rapporteur had finished, in order to say this, but you did not accede to this request, but rather proceeded to take a vote.

Secondly, I would point out that this procedure was very much a rushed affair and of course it is not correct. I would therefore propose, indeed I ask you to consult the House on the admissibility of this vote-taking.

**President.** — Two points, Mr von der Vring. First, you asked for the floor, as I understood it, when we were already in the middle of the vote. Secondly, I put it to the House whether to accept Mr Arndt's proposal or not, which was to go first through the compromise

amendments, and this is what I am trying to do. But of course, each time I put the proposed amendment, there always seems to be something added to it which was not proposed by the author of the motion and I therefore, of course, find myself in a difficulty. I think I must follow what was decided by the House, that we vote first on the compromise amendments — Nos 73 to 84.

**Mr Nikolaou (S).** — (GR) To make things easier for the House, I think that since we have already voted in favour of Amendment No 32, it follows logically that Article 3 should include exactly what we voted for Amendment No 32. In this sense I support Mr Arndt's proposal to include only that section which corresponds to Amendment No 32, which we have already passed.

**President.** — No, Mr Nikolaou, I am sorry. The House has decided, on the proposal of Mr Arndt, that we take Amendments Nos 73 to 84 as compromise amendments, and this is what I shall proceed to do and conclude.

*Before the vote on the draft decision*

**Mr de la Malène (DEP).** — (FR) Madam President, forgive me, but I have had some difficulty in following the procedure proposed to us.

I would ask you to explain why it is, when the old amendments had been announced, that Amendment No 46 has not been put to the vote. I do not understand why there has been no vote and should like to know the reason. If you give me a valid explanation, I shall of course be satisfied, but I find it hard to understand a procedure disallowing a vote on a properly tabled amendment.

**President.** — Very well, Mr de la Malène, you have now made a proposal. We had taken the proposal of Mr Arndt, which was to take first the compromise amendments on the text. If they are not incompatible with any other amendments, of course these can now be taken, and I shall therefore ask the advice of Mr Arndt as to which of these amendments are not incompatible with the compromise amendments.

**Mr Arndt (S), rapporteur.** — (DE) Madam President, after the various compromise amendments had been adopted, all other amendments fell. Only Amendment No 72 remained to be seen to, and this you correctly put to the vote. All amendments to the Commission's draft decision have now been dealt with, and you now, quite correctly, come to the vote on this draft decision as a whole.

**President.** — Mr Arndt, I understand, from what you have said, that Amendment No 46, by Mr Woltjer, falls because it has been replaced by a compromise text.



**Mr de la Malène (DEP).** — (FR) Madam President, I apologize for intervening, but the procedure that we have been following for some weeks now for the examination of this report, the manner in which it was referred back to committee and reconsidered by the committee, and the procedure proposed to us today do not, with respect, seem at all satisfactory. I of course have no intention of standing my ground to prevent Parliament from voting, but I will say that I am calling for a very serious examination of the way in which this matter has been dealt with, both in plenary and in the Committee on Budgets, because I want to state firmly that we have been prevented from expressing ourselves clearly. This being the case, I do not wish to obstruct the business of the House and therefore simply ask for an inquiry into the procedure followed.

**President.** — Mr de la Malène, I was very reluctant to accept the proposal, but I naturally am the servant of the House. We put Mr Arndt's proposal to the House to accept the compromise amendments and to vote on them; and this I have done as requested and as voted by the vast majority of this House. Therefore, the compromise amendments have replaced any other amendments, and the other amendments fall.

**Mr O'Mahony (S).** — Madam President, before we make a final decision on this, we have already accepted Amendment No 32. It is necessary, therefore, to accept Amendment No 86, so that the matter is dealt with properly. That amendment, I think, Madam President, cannot fall.

**President.** — No, Mr O'Mahony, it was wrongly drafted so as to replace the whole text. If it had been presented as a separate addition to the text it could have been taken, but as it was so placed and as Mr Arndt asked for the compromise amendment to be taken first, I cannot accept it.

**Mr Sutra (S).** — (FR) Madam President, I do not believe that it can be the prerogative of the rapporteur alone to declare that an amendment falls when another is adopted. This Parliament has a long-standing tradition according to which the President decides after reading the amendments. In my personal view, it is incorrect that adoption of Amendment No 76 cancels out Amendment No 46. Amendment No 46 remains admissible and I think that we should vote on it, despite the adoption of the amendment from the Committee on Budgets.

**President.** — Mr Sutra, I think this is a lesson for the House, that unless the amendments are properly prepared and presented to this House it is extremely difficult to conduct a sitting in an orderly fashion. I hope very much that this way of proposing compromise amendments but not being absolutely clear about which amendments they replace does not

happen again. I hope that this is taken on board by all committee chairmen. I have acted as a servant of the House today on the proposal which, again I repeat, was voted by the vast majority of this House. May we now proceed with the business?

I would point out that with regard to Amendment No 46, tabled by Mr Woltjer, the proposal was to delete Article 3 (3). By an overwhelming majority a new Article 3 (3) has in any case replaced that one. So, the discussion on Amendment No 46 is in any case totally irrelevant and is taking up a great deal of time of this House.

**Mr de la Malène (DEP).** — (FR) If I have understood correctly, you are saying that the House has voted on Amendment No 46 and that it has been adopted. That is what I understood...

**President.** — No, Mr de la Malène, we voted on compromise Amendment No 76, which put in a new text for Article 3 (3). Mr Woltjer's amendment was to delete Article 3 (3). The amendment by Mr Woltjer was therefore inoperative, because the old Article 3 (3) in any case disappeared by the substitution of a new text. I hope that that satisfies Mr de la Malène.

**Mr de la Malène (DEP).** — (FR) Madam President, in that case I would ask you to answer my question. The House voted a few days ago on an amendment, Mr Wolter's amendment. It adopted it. No parliament has the right to disregard a vote which has been taken. Mr Woltjer's amendment has been approved, so that the House is bound by it until such time as it votes otherwise.

**President.** — Mr de la Malène, I am sorry to disagree with you, because the report was sent back to the committee and what is before the House today is the result of referring it to committee.

Now I would request no more points of order so that we can get on with the vote. We have not got the time and we are keeping the Commission waiting.

**Mr O'Mahony (S).** — I do apologize for taking up the time of the House again, but I think there is a real difficulty here. If we accept, as we have, Amendment No 32, we put a certain point into the recital. In order to make that effective, as I understand it, we should put the same point into the articles. It is as simple as that. I think, Madam President, there is no difficulty in this matter.

**President.** — I am sorry, Mr O'Mahony, I must go by the judgment of the rapporteur: he has given guidance to the House and we have voted on it. May we please continue with the vote.

**Mr Simpson (ED).** — On a point of order, Madam President. Somebody in the public gallery is photographing in the Parliament. I do not know whether

## Simpson

this is in order or whether that person is a member of Parliament's staff and authorized to do so, but it is certainly something which I don't think should be encouraged.

*Motion for a resolution Paragraph 32: Amendments Nos 20 and 62/rev.*

**Lord Douro (ED).** — Madam President, may I point out that, as the House approved Amendment No 78 to the Commission's proposal, Amendment No 62 to the resolution is purely a logical conclusion of that earlier vote.

**Mr Arndt (S), rapporteur.** — (DE) I repeat that I am unable to go into this, for everyone can construe it to suit themselves and if I, as rapporteur, were to attempt to make a recommendation I should find myself in an untenable position.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — (DE) Madam President, whether the controversial points are consistent or not is a question of linguistic interpretation. The French and Danish versions are, at any rate, both consistent and identical.

**Mr Langes (PPE).** — (DE) Madam President, I would ask you not to allow Members of the House to reduce a discussion on matters of importance to such a casual level, as Lord Douro and Mr von der Vring are doing. There are real differences of opinion, not just linguistic differences, and the rapporteur has indicated clearly his refusal to give an opinion. Accordingly we ought to proceed to a vote.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Langes. That is exactly, I hope, what I was saying to the House, namely, that the House must decide which view it will take and whichever language they care to think, speak or read in.

*Paragraphs 36 to 83: Amendments Nos 31, 43, 21, 59, 92, 60 and 69*

**Mr Arndt (S), rapporteur.** — (DE) The House has taken a clear stand on the Commission's draft decision, and the amendments now coming up essentially go in the opposite direction. Hence we shall have to reject them, for otherwise, we shall be contradicting ourselves.

**President.** — In accordance with the Rules of Procedure those amendments which are incompatible with the way in which we have voted earlier fall automatically. So if these amendments are incompatible with what has been decided earlier, they do fall. May I ask the rapporteur's opinion whether they are incompatible with everything that has been voted beforehand.

**Mr Arndt (S), rapporteur.** — (DE) Amendment No 31 is incompatible with what the House has just adopted.

So is Amendment No 43.

Amendment No 37 would be compatible, since it merely deletes the paragraph. This would have the

effect of leaving the report without any recommendations. We shall have to put it to the vote, but I would recommend rejection.

Amendment No 59, while compatible with the House's earlier decision, is nevertheless incompatible with a previous resolution adopted by the House. I must therefore recommend rejection.

Amendment No 92 should be dealt with later on account of paragraph 40 and so does not belong here. Consequently I would recommend its rejection at this juncture.

Although Amendments Nos 60 and 69 would be eminently compatible, since they would merely delete the paragraphs concerned, I am in favour of rejection here too.

**Mr Forth (ED).** — Madam President, I am at something of a loss to understand why the rapporteur is saying that Amendment No 43 is incompatible. I would have thought that it is an eminently sensible statement of what has gone on both in the Commission and in this House. Perhaps he could enlighten us further as to what he finds so difficult about Amendment No 43.

**President.** — In that case I think it is better if we vote on each of these amendments, so that Members can make up their own minds on what is incompatible and what is not.

*Paragraph 39: Amendment No 44*

**Mr Woltjer (S).** — (NL) I do not understand the procedure. We can say in the resolution something that has been differently formulated in the decision. Otherwise, there is no point at all in voting on a resolution. You can perfectly well indicate in a resolution that you find a particular tendency less fortunate, and I feel that the rapporteur should therefore not deal with this in this way. Parliament can surely decide that for itself.

**President.** — You have put a proposal to the House, Mr Woltjer, that we should vote on your amendments. I therefore put Amendment No 44 to the vote. The House has heard the rapporteur's opinion on this.

*After the vote on all the amendments and before the explanations of vote*

**Mrs Ewing (DEP).** — My point is that we had an announcement today that Question time would be held from 7 p.m. It is now 7.10 p.m. Could we have a ruling from the Chair as to whether Question-time will now go on for an hour once it does start?

**President.** — The Commission have very kindly said that they will be prepared to go on with Question-time until 8.15 p.m., which would give us practically

**President**

an hour of Question-time. But in the meantime I must try to find out what the views of the staff are, whether they will be agreeable to continuing this sitting until 8.15 p.m. I hope to give you an answer very quickly.

*After the adoption of the resolution*

**President.** — I think the whole House would like to thank Mr Arndt for the work he has done and the Committee on Budgets.

*(Applause)*

I am now able to announce, and I thank both the Commission and the staff of this House, that we can have Question-time until 8.15 p.m.

### 7. Question-time

**President.** — The next item is the second part of Question-time (Doc. 1-1015/83): questions to the Commission.

Question No 44, by Mr Bord, and Question No 45, by Mr Israël, will be taken in December.

As the author is not present, Question No 46 will be answered in writing.<sup>1</sup>

## IN THE CHAIR : MR NIKOLAOU

### *Vice-President*

**President.** — Question No 47, by Miss Quin (H-300/83):

When will the Commission introduce a directive, to supersede the 5th Shipbuilding Directive, in order to provide effective measures for European shipbuilding to survive the present crisis, as was requested by the European Parliament in its debate on shipbuilding at the February part-session of the European Parliament?

**Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission.** — *(NL)* The present directive on shipbuilding was adopted on 21 December 1982 and will remain in force until 31 December 1984. This means that the Commission still has plenty of time to consider how, given the situation in the shipbuilding sector, the policy should be continued or amended. The Commission intends to adopt its position this year or early next at the latest and will then, of course, inform the interested parties, including the European Parliament. The Commission will certainly ensure that Parliament has enough time to deliver its opinion on any new proposals the Commission may have. When assessing the action which needs to be taken after the expiry date I have mentioned, the Commission will obviously make a careful analysis of the current situation in the shipbuilding industry and attune such action to this situation as far as possible.

<sup>1</sup> See Annex II.

**Miss Quin (S).** — I must say that I am disappointed with the reply, because action is so urgently needed to help the shipbuilding industry that I do not think the Commission has got time and it should do something straight away.

Does the Commission agree with me that the EEC ought to decide on a level of shipbuilding capacity below which Europe should not fall, and will it therefore produce immediately proposals to encourage the placing of a much greater number of EEC shipbuilding orders with European shipyards, particularly in those regions which are hardest hit?

**Mr Andriessen.** — *(NL)* The Community's strategy for the shipbuilding industry has repeatedly been discussed in this Assembly. I believe it is extremely difficult to fix a level of shipbuilding activities in the Community in view of the diversity of this sector and the world competition the Community faces.

How owners should be encouraged to place as many orders as possible with Community shipyards is a question that is not so easy to answer. It must be ensured, on the one hand, that existing international agreements are not breached by excessively rigorous measures and, on the other, that owners are not encouraged to sail their ships under the flags of third countries. In other words, I am certainly not saying that the Community could not take any action in this area, but I do believe that all the aspects involved must be considered.

I believe that, once the present directive has expired, we must also give these aspects careful thought.

**Mr Ewing (DEP).** — The Commissioner has mentioned world competition problems, and as we all know, our world competitors are State-aided to varying degrees, some of them heavily. Given the state of the crisis mentioned in this question, is it not necessary for the Commission now to have a policy on the level of aid that Member States can offer their industry, given that it must be in the interests of Europe to build their own ships?

**Mr Andriessen.** — *(NL)* There is no reason to assume that, where aid is granted in third countries, the level exceeds that granted by governments in the Community, for the most part in accordance with the present directive.

I therefore believe that the difference in the competitive position of Community and third-country yards is caused not by government aid but by other factors. Hence my view that we must be extremely careful when considering whether aid to shipbuilding in the Community should be stepped up. I know that some Member States are discussing this subject at the moment. I am very hesitant about whether the Community should adopt this course but, as I have said, a final decision has not been taken. I hope and expect that it can be taken in the next few months.

**Mr Adam (S).** — Would the Commissioner not accept that unless we take urgent action to determine the level of shipbuilding in the Community, there will soon be no shipbuilding industry left? I would have thought that the Commission could come forward with some scheme whereby ships built in the Community for Community use could be subject to special support so as to establish a viable industry in the Community independently of what is happening in other parts of the world. We should therefore have a Community-based industry supported by the Community operating internally.

**Mr Andriessen.** — *(NL)* I have in fact covered this question in the answers I have just given.

The fifth directive is in force at this moment. This debate has revealed that, on the expiry of this directive, further provisions will in all likelihood have to be made. This will mean that we shall have been endeavouring to keep the Community's shipbuilding sector alive with government aid for I don't know how many years. I am firmly convinced that, unless the Community's shipbuilding industry undergoes fundamental restructuring and unless its competitiveness is improved, shipbuilding cannot be maintained in the Community in the long term. I very much doubt that an increase in aid is the most appropriate means to this end at the moment, given the repercussions it would certainly have elsewhere in the world.

This is not my final assessment of the situation. It is my provisional opinion and should be seen as supplementing what I have already said, that in a few months' time the Commission will be stating its definitive position on the best policy for maintaining part of the Community's shipbuilding industry, a goal which the Commission wholeheartedly supports.

**President.** — *(GR)* Question No 48, by Mr Geronimi (H-329/83):

Following the adoption of the Harris report on the peripheral maritime regions and island will the Commission be putting forward appropriate proposals for a pilot project for operating subsidies for fares on ferries to Corsica?

**Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission.** — *(IT)* As the Commission has already explained in an answer to a question in writing from Mrs Ewing — Question No 974/83, to be precise — the structuring of tariffs and the payment of operating subsidies for local public transport lie, generally speaking, within the competence of Member States. Therefore the operating subsidies for fares on ferries to Corsica, as also the introduction of a pilot project for assessing the effects of such subsidies, are matters which are primarily the responsibility of the French National Authorities.

Within the framework of regional planning, and in accordance with its rules of procedure, the Regional

Development Fund cannot act in regard to operating expenses. Its action is limited to contributions to investments. However, on the basis of the Harris Report in particular, the Commission, which had hitherto restricted its action to the construction of fixed infrastructures, is at present considering the possibility of granting contributions from the Regional Fund for investments in moveable infrastructures such as ferries. This is being done precisely in order to overcome the special difficulties affecting island regions.

**Mr Harris (ED).** — Whilst welcoming the last part of the Commissioner's answer, to the effect that the Commission is now considering the possibility of making some aid available to moveable objects such as the boats themselves, would he recall that in the report which I presented to this House, Parliament endorsed the idea that perhaps one or two pilot projects concerning, for example, road equivalent tariff should be undertaken with finance from the Commission, while accepting that, basically, ferry subsidies, as the Commissioner says, are the responsibility of the national or regional authority? Nevertheless we did call for one or two pilot projects to be financed by the Commission. Would he reconsider that part of his answer?

**Mr Giolitti.** — *(IT)* The Commission is prepared to examine this question, and in fact is already doing so. I have personally given instructions to the departments for which I am responsible, and which deal with the regional planning sector, for a study to be made of the possibility — we can go no further than this, at present — of setting up pilot projects as suggested by Mr Harris.

I would repeat that this is a very delicate legal question, since the rules of procedure oblige us to limit action by the Regional Fund solely to investment expenditure, interpreting the term 'investment' very precisely in its true sense.

**President.** — Question No 49, by Mr Seligman (H-330/83):

In which member nations of the Community is Sunday trading forbidden or severely restricted by law; will the Commission consider harmonizing legislation to prevent this type of restriction to free trade and customer choice?

**Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission.** — *(DE)* Trading by stores and other sales outlets on Sundays and holidays is governed by individual Member State regulations, which reveal considerable disparities and are not equally strict. Sunday and public holiday trading is unambiguously proscribed in Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Italy and the United Kingdom and, somewhat more flexibly, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg. Its goes without saying that exceptional provisions exist for

**Narjes**

specific sectors and under specific conditions, in particular with regard to the needs of tourism. The Commission has, at the moment, no intention of presenting proposals for harmonization in this area.

**Mr Seligman (ED).** — The Commissioner has given me the countries where there is restriction by law, but he will agree with me, I think, that the law is more disregarded than observed and that there is a degree of anarchy in this whole matter which needs clearing up. Does he not agree, for instance, that there are several advantages in having freer trading on Sundays? It is an interference with free trade to restrict trade on a Sunday; it is a restriction of customer choice; the fact that husband and wife are now working most of the week means that they have very little chance to do their shopping or their purchases for the weekend; work could be shared with other shop employees in order to fill out the extra time and temporary workers could even be employed to serve in the shops when this is possible; finally, it will increase sales and therefore help to revive the economy. It will provide, therefore, more jobs. So from all these points of view, I think much freer trade on a Sunday is something the Community should be working for. Does the Commissioner agree?

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) The supplementary question reveals that it was essentially to discuss the aspect of utility and the conditions under which the national regulations responsible for these disparities are enacted, extended, supplemented or repealed. My original answer was not based on that point of view. That must remain a purely national affair.

Indeed, I can see only very limited room for manoeuvre and also very limited necessity for Community regulations. We must not forget that the ban on Sunday working is rooted in religious considerations and traditions, which under no circumstances can be a matter for Community regulations or harmonization measures.

The only question as far as we are concerned is the possibility of distortions to trade arising in border areas as a result of such disparities in regulations, which would force us to take action. Here the Commission considers that, given the limited area served by a retail business — say, 10 to 20 km at the most — the extent of such trade distortion is so limited as not to merit an attempt at perfectionist legislation.

**Ms Clwyd (S).** — I was very pleased to hear the Commissioner's answer, because in Wales we have a referendum every 7 years on whether we should open pubs on Sundays or not. I am glad to say that several of our counties still remain 'dry' on Sundays and we are able to retain the peace and tranquillity of Sundays in many parts of rural Wales, part of which I repre-

sent. So I am glad to hear the Commissioner say he does not intend to interfere with that freedom of choice of our people.

(Laughter)

I would also like to remind him that the shopworkers' unions in Britain are opposed to Sunday opening because they fear further exploitation by the owners of those premises and they value their seventh day free from work.

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) Allow me to reassure the honourable lady member. The Commission has no intention of interfering with Welsh autonomy.

**Mr Marshall (ED).** — I congratulate the Commission on seeking not to enter into the morass of Sunday trading law, which would be a legislative nightmare. Can I say to the Commission that one of the strengths of Europe is its diversity and that there is no need to tell the small shopkeeper of Luxembourg that he has to be open, or can be open, the same hours as the small shopkeeper in Orkney and Shetland, Wales, or anywhere else. Would the Commissioner not agree that the job of the Commission is to free trade between States and leave national parliaments very much more to deal with trade within States, and that when we have created a common market within Europe, then perhaps we might look at Sunday trading, but not before?

**Mr Narjes.** — (DE) Thank you for the appreciative remarks. I would add that the community pursues a policy of subsidiarity and is therefore a proponent of deregulation rather than unnecessary regulation.

**Mr Gerokostopoulos (PPE).** — (GR) I am sorry to see that out of goodwill, you are being extremely indulgent to colleagues by allowing them to make speeches instead of asking supplementary questions. Both Mr Seligman and Ms Clwyd made speeches and did not ask questions.

**President.** — You are quite right, Mr Gerokostopoulos, but because there are not many of us in the House and we can therefore get on, and because many members of the Commission are here, I have indeed been a little indulgent.

**Mrs Ewing (DEP).** — I take the floor, although I am partly repeating what has been said, to ask the Commissioner whether it is not the case that when we talk about freedom of trading other freedoms are involved. Like some other Members, I represent an area where deeply-held religious beliefs lead to the view that if anyone opens he is really spoiling the way of life. Is it not the case that you might have freedom for tourists but, on the other hand, you lose the freedom of these people who have elected that their area will respect certain traditions?

**Mr Narjes.** — *(DE)* I feel that the answers I have just provided to the previous questions are in complete harmony with the remarks of the honourable lady member.

**President.** — At its author's request, Question No 50, by Mr Lomas, is deferred to another part-session.

Question No 51, by Mr Purvis (H-363/83):

During 1982, Commission external trade statistics show that Benelux imported 1 984 tonnes of polyethylene material of less than 3 metres in length and bags from Taiwan against an agreed quota of 48 tonnes. Allowing for temporary imports for processing and re-export, the figure is still 816 tonnes, or 1 700 per cent of the agreed quota. What action is the Commission taking to rectify these excesses, which are damaging to EEC producers?

**Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission.** — *(DE)* I can confirm that Taiwan has indeed exceeded the quota allotted to it for exports to the Benelux countries in 1982 of products falling within category 33 of the Common Customs Tariff. It must be added, however, that the quota figures are established on the basis of the shipping dates and do not therefore reflect their actual unloading date at Community ports. It is consequently, feasible that import statistics for any given year may reflect part of the preceding year's quota. Furthermore, Community import statistics contain imports of products intended for re-export.

In the specific case to which the honourable Member refers, approximately one half of the Taiwanese exports to the Benelux had been formally declared as products intended for re-export. But, even allowing for this, there is no doubt that the quotas were exceeded. The Commission has informed the Member States concerned in no uncertain manner. It is exploring, with the competent authorities, ways in which such occurrences can be precluded henceforth. The Commission takes the view that the case referred to is a one-off. It will continue to make every endeavour to ensure adherence to the existing textile agreements.

**Mr Purvis (ED).** — I have been trying to get some action from the Commissioner on this since earlier this year. First he denied that there was any problem. It was only when one produced definite statistics that he had finally to admit that there was a problem. He is still squirming today about re-exports when, in fact, even allowing for that, it is still hundreds of per cent over the limit. It could not possibly be the January shipment that put it over the limit, and it is not an isolated case. There are others going through Germany as well and from Portugal into France.

The quota system is completely chaotic. There is no control, and the Commissioner does not even know what is happening. He told me on 27 September that

he was going to get some action from the Benelux countries. He still says he is waiting, and it is two months later. Is that the way to run the external quota system, which is supposed to be the centrepiece of our textile industry? Would he please take more determined action to keep these under control and police the Member States concerned and get proper explanations as to why this is allowed to carry on?

**Mr Haferkamp.** — *(DE)* We are quite willing to do that but I must point out that both the Multifibre Agreement and the numerous bilateral textile agreements concluded result in thousands of quotas having to be overseen by the customs authorities of the Member States. However, despite the complexity of the system, there can be no doubt about the efficacy of both the quota and control aspects in the majority of cases.

It goes without saying that the Commission is prepared to examine every individual case where we can improve the control and achieve a more rigid adherence to the agreements by Member State customs authorities. I would nevertheless ask the House to bear in mind that we can do nothing without the necessary data and statistics, and errors cannot be excluded when customs offices are processing many thousands of documents annually. The Commission does not let up in its endeavours to ensure enforcement by Member State customs posts and national authorities of the quota agreements.

**Mr Moreland (ED).** — Does the Commissioner agree with me that this is not the only instance of Taiwan stepping over the bounds of our external trading relationship with them? There have been a number of instances where they have gone over their quota, where they have been dumping within the Community, and there is now another serious offence that they have created, which is counterfeiting and copying products such as ceramic tableware and figurines. We do have to watch the Taiwanese very carefully.

**Mr Haferkamp.** — *(DE)* All cases of dumping which are reported to the Commission by Member States are treated in accordance with existing regulation. Anti-dumping procedures have, indeed, had to be brought against Taiwan, but attempts to exceed quotas and dump goods have, regrettably, become part and parcel of contemporary economic and trading practice. We must do our utmost to make prompt and effective use of the possibilities afforded by both the GATT and our own regulations to counter such violations. Taiwan is no exception to this.

**President.** — Question No 52, by Mrs Ewing (H-388/83):

Will the Commission comment on recent progress made in fishery negotiations with Spain?

**Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission.** — (GR) The present situation regarding relations between the European Community and Spain on matters to do with fishing in 1983 is governed by an agreement concluded on 18 November and based on the framework agreement in force between the Community and Spain.

This agreement allows Spanish vessels operating within the Community's fishing-zone to take catches up to agreed amounts defined in detail by EEC Regulation No 709 (1982).

As for the negotiations on Spain's accession to the EEC, last June the Community issued a first statement on negotiations in the sector of fishing. Spain, for her part, had expressed a position somewhat earlier. The actual negotiations have not yet commenced, and I cannot therefore give any information at this time.

**Mrs Ewing (DEP).** — May I ask Mr Contogeorgis if he could be quite clear on one matter which is causing great worry on the part of the Scottish fishermen — perhaps not just them. And that is, in these negotiations for Spain's accession, is the North Sea to be excluded or not?

**Mr Contogeorgis.** — (GR) With the proposals it put forward as a basis for commencing the negotiations, the Community is protecting all the rights and interests of Member States on the basis of the agreement on a common fishing policy reached on 25 January this year.

**Mr Harris (ED).** — Does the Commissioner accept that at a time when at long last the Community is just beginning to think about cutting down some surplus fishing capacity for what is euphemistically called 'restructuring', it would be the height of madness to open up our waters still further to a country which has a deep-water fleet larger than that of the whole Community put together?

**Mr Contogeorgis.** — (GR) Fishing is undoubtedly one of the most important areas within the framework of negotiations on Spain's accession to the Community. The Commission is aware of the size of the Spanish fleet, and recognizes its consequences for the fishing activities of Member States.

As I said earlier, when stating our negotiating position we took into account the interests of all Member States, and I do not think we need be especially concerned about possible dangers to the common fishing policy achieved in January this year.

**Mr de Courcy Ling (ED).** — Mr President, my point of order is in relation to Question No 50, tabled by Mr Lomas, which refers to allegations printed in a newspaper that certain firms were not obeying the

EEC Code of Conduct by paying minimum wages in South Africa. One of the firms concerned is in the area that I represent. I am not raising this matter because Mr Dennis Thatcher is a director of this firm. I am raising the matter because it is a firm which employs a large number of people who pursue an enlightened policy among its employees in South Africa, and I am not aware of any evidence whatever to substantiate this allegation which Mr Lomas has quoted from a British newspaper in relation to Quinton Hazell. I would like to record that I think it is very unfortunate to table a question in August, repeating an unsubstantiated allegation in the newspaper and then not appear in this House in November, let the question go by default and allow the allegation to remain on the orderpaper, thereby casting a quite unjustified slur on a company in the area that I represent.

**President.** — (GR) The Presidency takes note of what you have said. I should explain that a request was received to transfer Question No 50 to December, and that it was published in error. You are therefore justified in having commented as you have, and the Presidency takes note of it.

**Mr Purvis (ED).** — Just very quickly on that point. Of course, repetition is the secret of good advertising, and Mr Lomas, by putting this back each month and making it appear every month on the orderpaper, just adds to the crime that he is committing.

I should like to raise a point on behalf of Mrs Ewing and many other Members. When we do not get satisfaction from the Commissioner, would you please, as President, make sure that we can get satisfaction from the Commissioner in his answers, and not take the part of the Commissioner? You represent Parliament, Mr President, and we would appreciate your support.

**President.** — My dear Sir, I am frightfully sorry, but I am tied to the Rules. No Member is entitled to a second supplementary question, and I am not taking the Commissioner's part. That is not true, and I reject the allegation.

Question No 53, by Mr Gerokostopoulos (H-281/83):<sup>1</sup>

In the 1980-81 annual report of 'Eurydice' (French edition), the end of the chapter headed 'Thèmes et répartition de l'intérêt' states: 'The Guide to school systems applying in Community member countries, which was to be published at the end of 1981, does not include any information about the Greek educational system; the Commission, however, will take the necessary steps to fill that gap'.

<sup>1</sup> Former oral question without debate (3-38/83) converted into a question for Question-time.

## President

The same report also states, in the chapter on 'Effectifs et nouvelles unités', that 'work to establish a national information unit in Greece is proceeding satisfactorily'.

Can the Commission say:

1. Whether it has taken any steps and, if so, what steps it has taken, to fill the gap noted in the 'Guide to school systems, etc.' as regards Greece (see first paragraph);
2. Whether the national information unit has now been set up by Greece and is operating, either in experimental or in fully-realized form, satisfactorily?

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — The publication, *The Educational System in the European Community: A Guide*, to which the honourable Member's question refers was published in 1981 and was based on the systems as they existed in the preceding years. Given the number of developments in the educational systems since the material was gathered, the Commission is now considering the possibility of adapting the *Guide* generally to bring it more up to date. An entry on Greece would then naturally find its place in that process.

On the second half of the honourable gentleman's question, may I say that the Greek Eurydice unit constitutes a section of the Directorate for EEC Affairs of the Greek Ministry of Education and Religion. It was initially established by a ministerial decision in July 1979. It took its definitive form in March 1981 through another ministerial decision. The unit is staffed by three full-time members and is, in the Commission's view, functioning satisfactorily. Its future plans include the preparation, in collaboration with the Commission's Eurydice unit, of an information booklet on the Greek system of education and the organization of an information seminar on the same topic in Athens early in 1984.

**Mr Gerokostopoulos (PPE).** — (GR) I shall not ask a supplementary question, because I am entirely satisfied by the Commissioner's statement. I hope the edition containing information on the Greek system will indeed appear during 1984 according to plan, and that there will not be any further postponement. I am especially pleased by the Commissioner's finding that 'Eurydice' is working well in Greece.

**President.** — In the absence of their authors, Questions Nos 54 and 56, by Mr Wedekind and Mr G. Fuchs, will be answered in writing.<sup>1</sup>

Question No 55, by Mr Kazasis, will not be taken, as its subject already figures on the agenda of this part-session:

<sup>1</sup> See Annex II.

No 57, by Mr Sherlock (H-433/83):<sup>2</sup>

By way of implementation of the 6th amendment to the directive on the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances, the Commission has entered into a contract with Chemical Abstract Service (CAS), in the United States. For UK producers, this means that chemical substances must first be notified to the Health and Safety Executive, then passed to Ispra, in Italy, which in turn will pass the notification on to CAS in the USA. Will the Commission give details of the contract between itself and CAS, state the likely cost of each notification and indicate whether, given that UK manufacturers will have to make more than 20 000 different notifications, the Commission is satisfied that the procedure is a sufficiently efficient, prompt and cost-effective one?

**Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission.** — (DE) Council Directive No 78/831, of September 1979, provides for the compilation of an inventory of chemical substances available on the Community market — in abbreviated form, BINECS. Article 13 of this Directive states:

The inventory shall give the chemical name under an internationally recognized chemical nomenclature . . ., the CAS number and the common name or ISO abbreviation, if any.

Commission Decision No 81/437, of 11 May 1981, lays down the criteria according to which the Member States communicate information for this inventory to the Commission. An annex to this Decision contains the procedure for compiling the inventory and lays down that the various substances notified are to be identified by their CAS number. (CAS in the abbreviation for 'Chemical Abstract Service Registry Number'.) The Commission must therefore, on a contractual basis, avail itself of the services of this body for handling the forms for notifying substances which have not been precisely identified. The cost of this procedure is entirely borne by the Commission. These notifications by European industry are forwarded by the Member States to the Commission, and for this purpose forms printed by the Commission and distributed gratis to the interested parties have been used. In this way, the collecting and handling of these forms has been so organized and financed by the Commission that the application of the Decision has meant no financial loss to the notifiers.

The procedure for handling these forms, carried out partly by the Joint Research Institute at Ispra and partly by the CAS as a contractual

<sup>2</sup> Former oral question without debate (0-58/83) converted into a question for Question-time.



**Narjes**

partner, is designed to ensure that the notifications are dealt with properly, rapidly and confidentially. Although it would have been possible to ask the chemical industry to include the CAS number in their notifications for purposes of identification, the Commission chose an arrangement which relieved the industry of this responsibility and of the costs that would have resulted from it.

By 31 March 1983, the time-limit for submitting notifications, the Commission had received altogether 78 000 forms, of which roughly 2 000 were of type A, 6 500 of type B and 69 000 of type C. The cost of handling them amounts to 40 dollars for each form B and 25 dollars for each form C. The total cost amounted to 260 000 dollars and 1 725 000 dollars respectively.

The compilation of this inventory constitutes a necessary and important step in the implementation of a directive which, in turn, is an essential instrument, not only for protecting the entire population — especially those handling these substances — and not only for protecting the environment, but also for ensuring the free movement of chemical products in the Community.

Finally, Mr President, I apologize for the length and the detail of this answer, but the question was such that I had no other choice.

**President.** — After this detailed answer, would Mr Sherlock agree not to take the floor?

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — Mr President, I should be delighted and charmed to agree to your suggestion.

**President.** — Question No 58, by Mr Rogalla (H-333/83):

What is the Commission doing in its preparations for the second direct elections to harness its authority, academic competence and organizing ability with the intelligence, originality and powers of persuasion to be found in the various Member States, and thus — by its wit and simplicity — impress on all the citizens of Europe that casting their vote is the biggest contribution they can make towards harmonious co-existence between the Member States?

**Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) This topic is not new to Parliament, since similar questions have been answered on many occasions in the past by colleagues more distinguished than myself.

The Commission should point out that neither the Parliament nor the Council has considered it necessary to make additional resources available to the Commission with which to take part in this campaign for the forthcoming European elections.

This is by no means being taken by the Commission as a reason for not playing its part. This it will do in

several ways. First, it will be using the resources at its disposal to encourage the electorate to assume their responsibilities in the building of Europe and go to the polls. Secondly, it will be making available literature, written in plain language reviewing the development of the Community over the twenty-odd years of its existence. Thirdly, it will be seeking to demonstrate — as it has done in the proposals that it has submitted to the Council — that some problems of vital concern to each of our countries cannot be resolved other than at European level. It will be doing these things with all the energy at its command and in the conviction that the turn-out in these elections will be an important test. As for the Commissioners themselves, they are politicians and, as such, they will each be taking part in the campaign in the ways that they consider appropriate.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) I wanted first to ask a question on the Rules of Procedure and to return to your comment that the Commission does not need any protection. I share your belief. The Commission is strong and extraordinarily well prepared. Nevertheless, I have to ask whether it would not be appropriate this evening to express to the Commission the thanks of the House for being so kind, like certain Members here, as to answer Parliament's questions. Allow me to ask you, Mr President, whether you share my view.

**President.** — My dear Mr Rogalla, I have to point out that this was not a clear question. Would you mind rewording it?

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) I would like to express my thanks to Commissioner Pisani and to ask him if he agrees with me that actions organized and carried out by the Commission by way of exercising its rights under the Treaties to promote the joint endeavours of Community institutions should be designed to meet the contemporary demand for vivid speech and concise information. Does, for example, an instrument which is to be seen in a Commission-sponsored exhibition now on display in this building, a machine inspired, perhaps, by contemporary penny-in-the-slot machines with lots of noise, which asks the citizen questions for him to answer by way of a game, meet the aspirations of present-day citizens? Are such things available in official Community languages other than French?

**Mr Pisani.** — (FR) Using the resources available to it, the Commission has made a variety of arrangements and in particular those to which Mr Rogalla refers.

If everything that we see on display here is in the French language, it is perhaps because, despite appearances, we are on French territory. I think that all these documents — kits, maps, interviews etc — will be available in the various languages of the Community.

**Pisani**

That at least is very much the Commission's intention.

**Mr Seligman (ED).** — I think Mr Richards is just about to say that there are more Commissioners present than there are Members of Parliament. I hope I haven't pinched his best remark of the evening. I am very sorry about this.

Would the Commissioner be prepared to enhance the effect of these elections by confirming that Parliament's main job is to supervise and advise the Commission in the conduct of the Community's affairs, and that really you live in fear and trembling of Parliament? We should then be well and truly elected and be doing an important job in the eyes of the public.

**Mr Pisani.** — *(FR)* Long experience of parliamentary life and life in general has convinced me that there is never any connection between quantity and quality. *(Laughter)*

**President.** — Question No 59, by Mr Marshall (H-493/83):<sup>1</sup>

As the free movement of capital is one of the fundamental principles of the Community, can the Commission state which Community countries permit the free movement of capital between Member States?

**Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission.** — *(FR)* A framework for Member States' obligations with regard to liberalization of capital movements is contained in the directives adopted by the Council in 1960 and 1962.

Exchange restrictions on all capital transactions have been abolished by Germany, Belgium and Luxembourg (except that these two countries maintain a two-tier market), and the United Kingdom. The Netherlands complies with Community obligations and adopts a liberal attitude towards transactions not covered by these obligations. France, Italy, Ireland and

Denmark maintain restrictions on certain transactions liberalized under the Community provisions, having been authorized by the Commission to invoke the safeguard clause allowed in Article 108 (3) of the Treaty. In the case of Greece, the Treaty of Accession contains provision for derogations with regard to exports of capital for a period of five years.

**Mr Marshall (ED).** — Would the Commissioner not agree that it is a very unsatisfactory state of affairs when five members of the Community impose significant restrictions and that it is high time that these restrictions were removed?

**Mr Pisani.** — *(FR)* To show how much the Commission agrees with the honourable Member's words, I should like to point out that in April 1983 the Commission forwarded to the Council a communication on financial integration, which is due to be discussed in the debate on Mr Halligan's report. In this document, the Commission draws attention to the limited development of the Community's financial development in relation to its economic weight — which is impeding the development of its international financial role — and suggests a number of solutions. In opening up capital markets in the Community, priority should be given to venture capital and securities denominated in ECU. The Commission will very shortly be making an examination of the existing safeguard clauses to assess whether their continued application is justified. In the circumstances, the Commission is demonstrating not only that it agrees but that it is trying to put an end to a situation that it considers less than satisfactory.

**President.** — Question-time is over. (1)

I would like to thank the staff on duty during this sitting, who have been good enough to stay on until this hour even though it had not been foreseen that the sitting would last so long. I also want to thank the members of the Commission, who have addressed us in an almost empty House.<sup>2</sup>

*(The sitting closed at 8.15 p.m.)*

<sup>1</sup> Former oral question without debate (0-64/83) converted into a question for Question-time.

<sup>1</sup> See Annex II.

<sup>2</sup> For the next day's agenda, see the Minutes.

## ANNEX I

### Votes

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

#### Motions for resolutions : Deployment of missiles and Geneva negotiations :

- Barbi (Doc. 1-1014/83/Corr.) : Adopted
- Focke (Doc. 1-1030/83) : Rejected
- Jaquet (Doc. 1-1034/83) : Rejected
- Boyes (Doc. 1-1045/83) : Rejected
- Fanti (Doc. 1-1065/83) : Rejected

#### Explanations of vote

**Mr Beyer de Ryke (L).** — (FR) Some proponents of nuclear disarmament say that, since we can do nothing against Soviet arms, the only solution is to call in question our own arms, since disarmament has to start somewhere. According to them, it is perfectly right to protest only against nuclear weapons, which, as all agree, are terrifying. What they hide behind their protests is their unwillingness to defend their own countries. The leaders of the Soviet Union will not even need to use nuclear weapons, but will take up their conventional weapons and quite simply make prisoners of these people who no longer have the will to resist. All these young people, who are so courageous when taking part in street demonstrations or forming human chains stretching for miles, will then receive a stern warning that they must no longer meet in groups of more than three or even two, and they will obey. Once they have submitted to communism, it will come home to them that they are slaves and, worse still, slaves in their death throes. Only then will they begin to fight, but by that time the conditions will be very different.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I am not the author of any of the words that I have just spoken, but I subscribe to them wholeheartedly. I have taken the text for my explanation of vote from Alexander Solzhenitzyn.

(Applause)

**Mr Enright (S).** — The right wing of this House, and I include in that term the Liberals — I think the people of the United Kingdom will be extremely interested to see how the Liberals have voted and will vote in this particular debate, because it will give them some inkling of who to vote for in June — feel, and in this they are led by Adam Fergusson, aptly named Adam because he is full of original sin, that we should stop and buy bombs. They have used entirely specious arguments to justify the siting of Cruise missiles on this half of the European continent. You do not have to be a unilateralist; you do not have to be a pacifist; you do not have to be a supporter of the USSR; you do not have to be an opponent of the United States of America to oppose the import of these superfluous dealers of death. We are told they are second-strike weapons; we are told they bring double death; we are told they take 2 hours to get over there; we are told they fly low; we are told absolutely everything except that they are no weapon to use in our armoury.

They bring no defence whatsoever. All they do is to illustrate Byron's saying: 'Mark where his carnage and his conquest cease. They make a solitude and call it peace.'

**Mrs Charzat (S).** — *(FR)* The peoples of Europe aspire to security, détente and peace. Ostpolitik and the Helsinki agreement bear witness so that. No sooner had this agreement been signed than the USSR was installing its SS20 missiles targeted on Europe, an enormous coercive battery of first-strike weapons. Since it is the lack of balance that has brought the negotiations on Euromissiles to a deadlock, the aim must be to find the point of balance at which a negotiated agreement can be reached between the two superpowers on arms reduction to the lowest possible level. This is the intention of the French Socialists' motion for a resolution.

The French Socialists will be voting against the motions tabled by Mrs Focke, Mr Fanti and Mr Boyes. We must not yield to the strategy of coercion pursued by the USSR with a view to consolidating its bloc, holding Europe hostage, and using nuclear terror to influence Europe's democracies. We shall be abstaining on Mr Haagerup's motion for a resolution, which fails to lay sufficient emphasis on the need for balance between the two superpowers' arms in Europe, at the lowest possible level.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Vankerkhoven (PPE).** — *(FR)* Wanting peace is not a matter of chanting slogans put into our mouths, or of following instructions without knowing where they come from or whose interests they serve. Wanting peace entails a degree of clear-sightedness and courage.

A degree of clear-sightedness to recognize that one-sided pacifism is not the appropriate response when SS 20 missiles are being deployed tirelessly by the USSR while the Geneva negotiations are going on. A degree of courage to declare that it is an unacceptable ideology which identifies the campaign for peace with the campaign for communism and has the presumption to hallow the weapons which serve that cause while at the same time condemning those which oppose it. Although I do not go so far in this House as to subscribe to the view expressed by Mr Simonnet, Belgium's former Minister for Foreign Affairs, that it is better to be an Atlanticist missionary than a Moscovite mole or a neutralist pigeon, I agree with Mr Lionel Jospin that if the nations of Europe wish to keep their independence, they cannot allow the USSR to exercise a right of veto over their security.

In leaving the door wide open to negotiation but at the same time making plain that it is no longer acceptable for the Western powers to come to the table without having established a common position and without having worked out arguments which will give their opposite numbers the incentive to display greater moderation, the motion for a resolution before us has the enormous merit of reminding us that peace and freedom are indissociable, and that both need to be defended if we want to look forward to a future in which we do not have to entertain the choice of being better red than dead but can remain neither red nor dead. These, Madam President, are the reasons, in brief outline, for which I shall be voting for the motion for a resolution tabled by the Group of the European People's Party, the Liberal and Democratic Group, the European Democratic Group and the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Gaiotti de Biase (PPE).** — *(IT)* On a subject such as this, it is not sufficient to vote with one's own group: it is necessary to say why one votes as one does. We are all in favour of the negotiations; and yet, there is a widespread impression that, behind the string of proposals — to which too much publicity has been given — the real bargaining has not yet begun and will not begin until it is clear to the USSR that the West is determined to re-establish the equilibrium that was broken with the installation of the SS-20s.

The pacifist movement, apart from its generous aspirations and legitimate anguish, does not merely strengthen, with the illusions that it creates, the Soviet hawks. By strengthening these it automatically strengthens the hawks of the West — those who consider that the Pershing missiles have got to be installed anyway. It is not a question of bringing pressure to bear on the Governments of the West to delay installing the missiles; it is more a question of the quality of the proposals that are put forward — less public, but more substantial.

I shall therefore vote in favour of the Haagerup resolution, even if I do not consider all of it well-expressed and to the point. But I shall also vote in favour of the Jaquet resolution, even if I do not think everything in this resolution is well-expressed and to the point either, and I also invite others to do the same, because I consider that these useless divisions in the Assembly are politically ruinous for Europe.

**Mr Boyes (S).** — I obviously want to oppose the Barbi resolution and any other resolution that would call for the installation of any further missiles in the European Community. I say 'further' because, unfortunately, we have seen the arrival of the Euromissiles in Britain already. I can give the House an assurance that those of us in the peace movement and the Labour movement in Britain will work as solidly as possible to get them sent back again. They were put there by man, they can be taken back by man.

I want to give a warning to this House and to all the people who work in the peace movement of what the ultimate is. I will take two examples. First of all, in my country, the Defence Secretary has warned that peace people who get near the missiles could be shot dead. More than that, a British citizen on British soil, unarmed, could be shot dead by a US soldier, and that is totally unacceptable.

I also want to warn of what happened recently in Turkey when members of the peace movement were arrested, imprisoned and given an outrageous and unjust trial. Mahmut Dikerdem, who was arrested with 17 or 18 of his colleagues, is over 60 years of age. He has been 40 years in the diplomatic service and is a former ambassador to four countries. Yet this man has been given an 8-year jail sentence and 2 years 8 months' internal exile. This is what happens to the peace movement when we fight for what we believe in.

We believe it is the right of all to fight for peace and disarmament, and threats of shooting and threats of imprisonment, as in Turkey, will not prevent us from fighting with might and main to end this arms race and to get rid of all Euromissiles.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Didò (S).** — *(IT)* The Italian Socialists and Social Democrats will vote in favour of the Jaquet motion for a resolution, because it exactly expresses their thinking on the subject of peace, closely linked with that of security.

We consider that it is necessary, through unceasing negotiation, to seek to restore the balance of military power at the lowest possible level, having due regard to the reciprocal needs of security.

The imbalance that exists at present, both where conventional forces are concerned and with regard to missiles, is due to the steps taken by the Soviet Union.

We consider that a compromise is possible and realistic, as was shown, for example, when that same assumption was made some time ago on the occasion of a direct dialogue between two negotiators — one American, one Russian — an occasion that became known as the 'stroll in the woods'. A moratorium on the implementation of the dual decision of NATO in fact concerns one side only, and is the equivalent of a unilateral disarmament measure, which we consider to be wrong. For this reason we shall vote against the resolutions that support this line, whereas we shall abstain on the resolution of Barbi and others because of the uselessly polemical and tendentious positions it adopts vis-à-vis the Greek Government.

**Mr Puletti (S).** — *(IT)* The Italian Social Democrats dissociate themselves from the position adopted by the majority of the Socialist Group. They will abstain on the Barbi motion for a resolution: they will vote in favour of the Jaquet motion, and will vote against all the other motions.

The reasons are as follows. We are convinced that the negotiations must be continued, and every effort must be made to reach an agreement that will restore the balance of military power at the lowest possible weapons level. That objective is not, however, being properly pursued so long as the firm decision of the West, to restore in any event the equilibrium that is today rendered meaningless by the Soviet superiority in conventional, atomic and theatre weapons, is not made clear. They are indeed following the right course, those political forces in Italy and in France, who do not let themselves be influenced by pacifist temptations, which are always seductive where Socialists are concerned, but are in reality a danger to the cause of security and peace.

Equally, the idea of a moratorium only serves to prolong a dangerous situation of imbalance, and to give a feeling of indecision and weakness on the part of the West. These principles and these concepts are expressed clearly, firmly and with a sense of responsibility in the Jaquet motion, which we will therefore give our full support. The Barbi motion, on the other hand, although it may be inspired by substantially similar aims, is unfortunately the overt vehicle for a strong attack on the Greek Government that we cannot accept, and because of which we must therefore abstain. Our vote against the other motions follows logically from the reasons I have just stated.

**Mr Israël (DEP).** — *(FR)* Overshadowing this debate is the self-evident fact that the aim of the USSR's world strategy is to finlandize Western Europe, to reduce our continent to a cataleptic state so that, like the rabbit caught in the huntsman's sights, it becomes incapable of the slightest movement.

*(Protests from the left)*

The purpose of deploying Pershing 2 is to break the Soviet dominance, restoring parity and avoiding an imbalance of terror. Among the dangers that we must guard against is pacifism, pacifism among our people, pacifism in our midst. Young idealists and clerics are being manipulated, especially in the Federal Republic of Germany, where pacifism has prospered because the German people have been frustrated for too long in their pursuit of their European destiny.

*(Protests from the left)*

At all events, ladies and gentlemen, the sad truth is that pacifism is the cat's paw of the warmongers. This is why we shall again be voting for the text proposed. In so doing, we shall, I believe, be displaying great courage, and I invite other Members of this House to do likewise.

**President.** — I would remind the House that we are meant to be a democratic institution, and in a democracy one has the right to be heard as well as the right to speak. Those who have already spoken have been listened to in silence, and I hope that all of you will this. If you do not want to listen, go out of the Chamber, but please allow people to speak without interruption.

**Mr Skovmand (CDI).** — *(DA)* A majority in the Danish Folketing have said a clear 'no' to the deployment of new nuclear missiles in Western Europe which is to begin in a few days' time. We think that much too little has been done to get genuine negotiations going with the Soviet Union, and for that reason we want deployment to be deferred. A majority in this House may be expected in a few minutes' time to adopt a motion for a resolution on the deployment of missiles which reflects a completely different view. The majority think that these deadly weapons cannot be deployed quickly enough. I am happy that Parliament does not have more power than it actually has, and I hope it never gets it. I intend to vote against this motion.

**Mr Bonde (CDI).** — *(DA)* I am glad that Mr Haagerup's American missile speech is so difficult to translate into Danish. My advice to Mr Haagerup is to concern himself somewhat less in future with missiles and more with fisheries and farming, which are subject that translate more easily into proper Danish.

But it is and remains illegal for Parliament today to give its approval to the deployment of the 572 new missiles in Europe. The vote today can only be made legal if the 10 countries agree to draw up a new treaty giving this Assembly additional powers to deal with military questions. Such a treaty would never be approved in the country Mr Haagerup represents.

I therefore vote against Mr Haagerup's missile motion today. And in that I am in agreement with Mr Haagerup's own voters, but he is not. He is not even in step with the policy pursued by his own government on the missiles issue, for the Folketing has decided that the government Mr Haagerup represents must work actively to make Scandinavia a nuclear-free zone and to prevent the deployment of missiles. May I ask the representative of Venstre to tell us whom the Venstre Party has appointed to speak for it on this matter? Is it Mr Haagerup or is it the Danish foreign minister? For the time being, I will follow the Danish foreign minister, since he would quite certainly have voted against Mr Haagerup's motion — otherwise he would not be Denmark's foreign minister.

**Mr Bøgh (CDI).** — *(DA)* When I vote against the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Haagerup and others, I do so in order to draw attention to the fact that the European Community, and hence also this Assembly, has no power to make pronouncements on military policy. I also of course, reject the motion because it is somewhat cold-war-mongering, and I wish to express the view of a group of Members by announcing that we in the People's Movement, together with Mrs Boserup and Mr Lynge, have today sent a petition to the President and the enlarged Bureau in which we invite Parliament to refrain from taking the vote and to deal with some other business on Tuesday, 22 November, between 11.55 a.m. and 12 noon, for at that time the workers in Denmark will be holding a symbolic five-minute work-stoppage to protest against the deployment of more nuclear missiles in Europe. We cannot ourselves ignore such a call. We shall take part in the symbolic work-stoppage on Tuesday and, as a logical consequence of this, we must ask that Parliament's Danish employees have the same opportunity to express their opinion.

**Mrs De March (COM).** — *(FR)* This vote comes at a time when international public opinion is deeply concerned at the arms build-up and the attendant risk of nuclear conflict.

For the first time in Europe and elsewhere in the world, millions of people, responding to the appeal launched by the United Nations for peace and disarmament, have been displaying the courage and clear-sightedness to set aside their religious and political differences and demonstrate for disarmament, for negotiation and often for an arms freeze.

I stress that young people have been particularly prominent among these demonstrations in Europe. The scale of these demonstrations is clear evidence of real anxiety which the European Parliament could not ignore. If the Geneva negotiations remain deadlocked and new euromissiles are deployed, this will come as a violent shock to the peoples of the Community.

From this point of view, the motion for a resolution tabled by right-wing groups in the House will clearly exacerbate the tension prevailing in international relations. The Communist and Allies Group will oppose this text, just as it will oppose anything which stands in the way of progress, however, slight, towards disarmament and a successful outcome to the Geneva negotiations.

If we set aside our differences, there is an historic opportunity to be grasped. This is reflected in various ways in the motions for resolutions that have been proposed. It is therefore vital that no stone should be left unturned in efforts to extend the negotiations,

so that new missiles are not deployed and we continue talking rather than engage in the lunatic arms race.

This idea is embodied in the motions for resolutions tabled by Mr Fanti, Mrs Focke and the Group of Parliamentarians for Nuclear Disarmament. We see this essentially as an immediate act, essential to the survival of humanity, to the right of the young and future generations to live in a world at peace, to the standing of this Parliament as a body committed to peace and disarmament.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Hänsch (S).** — *(DE)* The German Social Democrats and a majority of the Socialist Group support the motion for a resolution sponsored by Mrs Focke and others. We reject, however, the motion sponsored by Mr Barbi and others. Our action is dictated by three factors :

First, both the Right and Centre of this House have launched repeated thrusts with a view to forcing onto the agenda such matters as security, including the military aspects thereof, and also including them within European Political Cooperation. I am thinking of the report on the protection of sea-routes, and the one drawn up by Mr Fergusson. You ladies and gentlemen of the Centre and the Right of the House, now claim to be disappointed by the attempt to have the deployment of intermediate-range nuclear weapons in Europe discussed within the framework of European Political Cooperation, since such a subject is you say the exclusive preserve of NATO. We consider your attitude as one of sheer hypocrisy.

Secondly, we agree with Mrs Focke and others that this Parliament has a duty to Europe's citizens to address itself to an issue affecting their security and survival. We have to defend the interests of Europe's nations. It is in the interests of European citizens to negotiate the dismantling of the SS 20 missiles. An arms race such as you want in resolution 1014 would not make our continent a safer place, quite the contrary. Hence our demand for a moratorium on the deployment of new missiles in Europe and our appeal to this Parliament to urge the United States and the Soviet Union to set forth their negotiations in Geneva !

*(Applause from the Left)*

Thirdly, we reject categorically the attacks launched yesterday and today, in the course of this debate, on the peace movement in our countries. This is not a matter of cowardice or acquiescence, as implied yesterday and today. Nor is it a matter of the West's disarmament. There is no question of trying to equate Soviet weaponry with peace but it is, rather, an attempt to ensure a greater degree of security on our continent by reducing the nuclear arsenal in both West and East. We share the conviction that rearmament, including that by the West, will result in less, not more, security. Hence our rejection of the motion of Mr Barbi and others and our support for those recommendations which seek an extension of the Geneva negotiations and a new lease of life for European disarmament, both nuclear and conventional.

*(Applause from the Left)*

**Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul (S).** — *(DE)* I shall support the amendments which seek a moratorium, and I would add that I find this discussion somewhat eerie. We have been treated to speeches from yesterday's men — Mr Beyer de Ryke and Mr Israël even drawing on the arguments of the day before yesterday.

Mr Israël, you ought to be grateful that the German peace movement has come about and that it continues to exist.

*(Applause from the Left)*



One of the ways we became active was by asking the older generation, 'Why did you not resist National Socialism in good time? Why did you not resist the preparations for war before it was too late?'

*(Applause from the Left)*

Today we say, as young Germans we shall do our part to ensure that no war of aggression is ever again launched from German soil. You, Mr Israël, should rejoice at such a conviction rather than condemning the peace movement.

*(Applause from the Left)*

Both the German and European peace movement have recognized this. We urge all members of the House to vote with us to halt the tendency towards rearmament and to support a sensible European course. Let us not squander the opportunity of representing the real security interests of our citizens or subordinate them to short-sighted national interests or the interests of foreign powers!

*(Applause from the Left)*

**Mr Barbi (PPE).** — *(IT)* The Group of the European People's Party reaffirms its faith in the values of peace and freedom, on which are founded the democratic regimes in force in all the countries of our Community.

Peace, for us, is not simply the absence of war. Peace is just and lasting only when it serves a society that is based on human values, on the fundamental rights, on social justice, on solidarity with the poor peoples of the Third World. And it is precisely because of our attachment to these principles, and because we consider it to be the duty of a free Europe to defend itself against all the threats and blackmail of totalitarianism of any kind that we must keep a careful watch over the conditions necessary for the conservation of peace.

We Europeans cannot ignore that our freedom and our safety, today, are threatened by the intransigent behaviour of the Soviet Union, which makes a successful outcome of the Geneva negotiations impossible. For this reason, we wish to launch an urgent appeal to both sides to respond with concrete facts to the peaceful aspirations of all the people of our countries.

It is in this spirit that the Group of the European People's Party will vote almost unanimously — with the exception, that is, of one or two members who will abstain for personal and conscientious reasons — in favour of the text of the joint resolution of the four groups, which represents a satisfactory compromise that expresses our two-fold, indivisible concern for peace and security. That is, the implementation of real disarmament at all levels, through the continuation — of course — of the negotiations and the firmness of the Western powers in the discussions, which implies the rejection of any initiative whatever, honourable Socialist colleagues, that might precipitate a state of serious imbalance to the detriment of our security.

I should like to conclude by saying to my colleague, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, that I should not want the new generation, the one that will come after us, to ask us the same question: why did you not resist, in time, the Communist dictatorship?

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**Mr Chanterie (PPE).** — *(NL)* I am pleased that in these crucial weeks the European Parliament has debated the Geneva negotiations on intermediate-range missiles. It is an essential aspect of democracy that the major problems facing our society should be discussed openly. This contrasts with the situation under the totalitarian Communist régimes in Eastern Europe, where decisions are taken without the involvement of a democratic parliament, without a free press or the public having their say, without genuine peace movements.

I shall abstain during the vote today because the resolution does not cover various aspects on which my group tabled amendments, although I am very pleased with the statement that the chairman of my group has just made.

Firstly, this resolution does not mention the fact that nuclear weapons are the greatest threat to mankind and that everything must therefore be done systematically to reduce the rôle nuclear weapons play. The efforts now being made to keep the peace under arms are no longer acceptable.

Secondly, the resolution makes no mention of the enormous threat which the 360 SS 20 missiles aimed at our people, our towns, our industry and our defence installations represent for Western Europe.

Thirdly, I firmly believe that the resolution makes far too little of the desire our people have for peace, as the demonstrations on 23 October showed. In my country this demonstration was very clear in its message of peace and abhorrence of the build-up of nuclear weapons and equally clear in its call for disarmament on both sides.

Fourthly, it does not place enough emphasis on the Christian Democrats' primary goal, which has always been peace, meaning more than the absence of war and more than just a question of military protection.

Fifthly, it similarly places insufficient emphasis on the possibility of eventually combining the negotiations on intermediate-range missiles with the negotiations on strategic nuclear weapons. Within this broader context, it would be logical for French and British nuclear weapons to be included in the negotiations.

Sixthly, it takes little or no account of certain proposals that the deployment of American missiles should be delayed for a while as a gesture of good will, provided that the Soviet Union makes a serious countergesture by beginning to dismantle SS 20 missiles that have already been deployed.

Everything possible must be done to ensure the success of the Geneva negotiations. Negotiation and dialogue are, in my party's opinion, the only acceptable way to settle international disputes.

And seventhly, there has been no opportunity to formulate proposals for looking more closely at the problem of converting the arms industry to other product lines and urging the International Labour Office to draw up proposals as suggested in the position adopted by the Christian Workers' Movement in my country.

**Mr Haagerup (L).** — *(DA)* Out of respect for the Rules of Procedure, I shall not enter into any polemics with Mr Bonde. On the contrary, I will address my explanation of vote to the people whose motives I — unlike Mr Bonde — have much understanding for, Members such as Mr Hänsch and Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, whose views on these questions I respect, even if I do not share them.

My explanation is quite brief: we have put forward this motion for a resolution having had forced upon us a debate which we did not want, because we are convinced that, by going along with the Socialist motion, we shall weaken Europe's security and make it more difficult to reach agreement in Geneva.

**Mr Brok (PPE).** — *(DE)* I shall support the Barbi resolution, because the suggestions of either merging the INF and START negotiations or of calling a moratorium would be tantamount to the end of all disarmament. In October 1969, the Soviet Union rejected negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear missiles. Only after NATO had taken the dual-track decision was the Soviet Union prepared to talk. A further cancellation of the NATO dual-track decision would mean the end of the negotiations. We must not fail to recognize a fundamental difference of principle between East and West. I appreciate the existence of the peace movement, for it places the onus of justification upon our governments. They are thus obliged to provide the reasons underlying their call for deployment, unlike the Communist totalitarian régimes who confine peace-movement activists to prison, and therein lies the crucial difference between East and West.

I would say to Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul that the pledge of the Germans, in the aftermath of the Nazi period and the Second World War, never again to allow a war to be started from German soil was a laudable one. But such a pledge had a second part: 'Never again must a dictator be tolerated on German soil'. Both belong together, and I would not like to find myself one day faced with the same question from my son as that which I put to my own father about his acquiescence, in which I would be called upon to account for my lack of resistance to the contemporary dictatorship in Europe, one personified by the Gulag Archipelago!

*(Applause from the centre)*

**Mr Lalor (DEP).** — I wish to explain my vote in favour of the joint resolution (Doc. 1-1014/83) to which the chairman of my group, Mr de la Malène subscribed. This is the first occasion on which Parliament has before it a clear-cut-resolution which positively accepts that the EEC on the one hand has no competence on military questions, and on the other takes into account Ireland's special position of military neutrality and non-membership of NATO. I strongly support the condemnation of a Member State which sought to discuss the deployment of Euromissiles within political cooperation, which clearly is not the framework for such discussions. I also wish to support any initiative that will lead to fruitful negotiations on the reduction of nuclear weapons.

Finally, may I say that the system of political cooperation could be put in jeopardy if a certain Member State is allowed to continue abusing its presidential position and advance its own positions instead of those of the Member States of the European Economic Community meeting in political cooperation so as to adopt joint positions.

*(Applause from the centre and from the right)*

**Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S).** — *(NL)* When millions of Europeans demonstrated for peace in late October, they gave us, their representatives in the European Parliament, a moral mandate: stop the madness of the arms race, do not deploy any new nuclear weapons, gradually reduce the present arsenal to zero. We must respect this moral mandate with our vote today.

It would be inconceivable for European Political Cooperation not to take account of what the European public clearly wants. Are we going to surrender everything Europe has achieved to two power blocs that carry on their dangerous little war-games over our heads, but on our territory? Are we going to stand on the sidelines or look the other way while they negotiate, or pretend to negotiate, on our future in Geneva?

The possible deployment of new nuclear weapons in the Community is a challenge to its very survival. In this debate, in this vote, Europe has a last chance to give a loud 'no'. The public expects us to make our position clear. How we vote today will strengthen their confidence in political Europe or undermine it for ever.

We Flemish Socialists are carrying out our political and moral mandate in every respect. We marched hand in hand with the peace movement during the demonstration. We shall stand by the peace movement during the voting, and after this vote, whatever the outcome, we shall remain loyal to our commitment to peace and opposed to the nuclear build-up.

**Mr Balfe (S).** — We often hear, especially from the Tories, stories about Munich. We very rarely hear stories about Sarajevo, where another war started by accident because the powers of Europe had lost control and were over-armed.

I wish to make two or three short points. The British Labour Party is often accused of being a unilateralist and pacifist party. We believe that we should dispose of nuclear weapons because we believe that they are dangerous. We firmly support NATO and we firmly support the defence of the West, and that has been confirmed by our Party

Congress on many occasions. We remain in support of the British Army on the Rhine and we remain committed to the defence of Western Europe. We do not consider that the best means of insuring this is a nuclear weapons policy, either for Britain or by stationing nuclear weapons on British soil. We do not believe that in the final analysis the United States will prove to be our ally or that the dual key system will work. We believe that Europe should now start to shape its own defence priorities and should start to be seen as a separate power in the world. We reject the competence of this Parliament to do this. There is already an alliance for that purpose.

My final point is this. I shall vote against the Liberal-Tory joint resolution. I shall abstain on the Focke and Jaquet motions for resolutions and I shall vote for the Boyes and Fanti resolutions.

**Mrs Veil (L).** — *(FR)* It may seem strange, as has been remarked, that even after a long debate Honourable Members should still wish to give explanations of votes.

I nevertheless find it normal that Honourable Members should wish to state their positions individually on such an important subject, apart from the fact that they have a natural right to do so, especially since this is a problem which gives rise to differences cutting across party political and national allegiances.

Once again, some of our colleagues have allowed their reason to be clouded by passion; ignoring the differences to which I refer, they think that they can still set themselves up as judges, claim a monopoly of righteousness and denounce the evil motives of others, and even go so far as to see potential assassins among their colleagues.

Who can doubt that all of us in this House want peace, just as the citizens who elected us want peace? Who is mad enough today to want a nuclear holocaust, when everyone knows that it would be the end of our civilization, if not the end of the world?

But do we have any guarantee of peace when the Soviet Union is spending a large proportion of its resources on building up an arsenal of increasingly murderous weapons and targeting its missiles on us, in the hope that we will lose the will to defend ourselves?

We really should have learnt the lesson of the Second World War, which cost tens of millions of lives. There has been much talk of Munich, and I should like to say to Mrs van Hemeldonck that we in France remember that Daladier was acclaimed by the crowd at the airport when he returned from Germany. We now know the consequences of that monstrous agreement.

*(Applause from the centre and from the right)*

That was the cowardice of those days: the refusal to see the danger. And it led to those millions of deaths.

It was of course moving to hear Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul tell us that it is because of the millions of lives lost in the Second World War that Germany now looks to pacifism.

I say that it is because of those millions of deaths that we are here today, that we are building Europe and that it is by building Europe that we shall safeguard peace. But we shall not safeguard peace by giving up, we shall not safeguard peace by blinding ourselves to the fact that the Soviet Union is constantly building up its stock of arms and poses a threat...

*(Applause from the centre and from the right)*

... to our independence, to our freedom and to our survival.

I therefore wish to make plain that it is a sham to lend credence to the idea currently being canvassed according to which rejection of deployment of the missiles is the option for peace and life whereas, conversely, acceptance of the missiles is the option for war and death. That would be too simple, indeed too facile.

To want peace and to embrace pacifism is not enough to secure peace. In fact, if we adopt this course, we expose ourselves to blackmail from our neighbours. By contrast, to redress the balance of power, which is the only basis on which credible, verifiable disarmament can be discussed, is to resolve to defend both peace and freedom. That is the true option for life.

*(Loud applause from the centre and from the right)*

**Mr Alavanos (COM)** — *(GR)* Mr Brok may indeed have asked his father why he did not resist. However, my own generation, which did not live through the Second World War, had no need to ask the Communists why they did not resist, because in fact they did. Many of the 500 thousand Greeks killed during the Second World War were Communists. Mrs Veil spoke of millions dead. I ask, how many Soviets died? The Soviet Union gave twenty million dead. Isn't that enough? Do you want more?

Mr Barbi, we oppose the dangers of war and the dangers of nuclear missiles. We may be in the minority in Parliament, but we belong to a majority out in the streets, and the same thing that happened to the neutron bomb will happen to Pershing II and Cruise.

*(Loud protests from the centre and right)*

**Mr Adamou (COM)**. — *(GR)* Yesterday, the first European missiles from America were deployed in Britain. Perhaps those who admire the psychopathic Solzhenitsyn have not comprehended the terrifying consequences of this act for the fate not just of Europe, but of all mankind. Europe had the chance to become an independent power, and to play its own part in the formulation of world politics. With the deployment of American missiles, this chance has been lost. Europe has become a hostage of the Washington hawks, the maniacs who favour a thermonuclear holocaust in the belief that they will survive if the first nuclear strike is made against Europe.

The Greek Government, with its proposal for a six-month postponement of the deployment of missiles in Europe, offered a hope that this delay would allow more sober thinking to prevail. That is why its view received huge acclaim from millions of people in Europe. Unfortunately, the leading circles, drugged with anti-Communism, turned it down. We shall vote against all the other resolutions, and very much in favour of the Fanti and Boyes resolutions, in responsible fulfilment of a supreme duty to the millions of Europeans who have taken to the streets in the struggle to frustrate the plans of maniac warmongers, and who are bound to win in the end.

*(Applause from the Communist Group)*

**Mrs Lizin (S)**. — *(FR)* I wish to express my concern at the direction that has been taken by our Parliament. The majority in this House will be deciding today to announce to the European people that they propose to adopt an aggressive stance in future.

The votes of that majority are simply going to make a majority of young people, clear-sighted idealists and Christians, who have not been represented today, a little more convinced that Europe, as an institution, deserves nothing but distrust.

Although I signed the Boyes motion for a resolution, I now regret having taken part in this farce, this travesty of a debate. I should merely like to send a message to the clear-sighted leaders of the peace movements telling them that they should not attach too much importance to what has been said in the debate of death in this House.

The struggle will continue, it is going to continue outside until this majority has been reversed, because the real Europe is more important and will be stronger than these shadow figures.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mrs Baduel Glorioso (COM).** — *(IT)* I shall not vote in favour of Mr Barbi's resolution, and I am sorry that I cannot vote in favour of the Jaquet resolution either.

I shall only vote in favour of those resolutions that are genuinely for peace and against all existing or future missile installations, which create insecurity for our continent, which has already known two World Wars and tens of millions of dead. I shall vote in their favour to meet a moral and civil duty, and in my capacity as a Member of Parliament elected by the citizens of Europe, over four million of whom have demonstrated in the streets of our capitals. This morning they were here to tell us 'We can trust you', and we have replied 'Next time, elect those whom you can trust'.

Of these citizens — and take care, there are many of your children with us — who, on the streets of Europe, say clearly, 'Adjourn the negotiations until an agreement is reached, because an agreement would be possible' we have to take account.

And then — do not let us instal any new missiles! Rather, let us dismantle those already there. And let us also take into account the French and English missiles that are pointed towards the East, if necessary broadening the negotiations until both negotiations are united at Geneva. Finally, let us try to get disarmament under way, in a balanced, controlled manner. We can also ask the Soviet Union for a unilateral gesture — the start of disarmament and the dismantling of the SS 20s.

I call upon you — you who were elected by the citizens of Europe — to vote for the resolutions that support these ideas for peace, against new weapons, and for the dismantling of those already in existence.

*(Applause from the Left)*

**Mr Di Bartolomei (L), in writing.** — *(IT)* The basic problem is to restore balanced military relations between the super powers, at the lowest possible arms level. This objective is difficult to achieve today because of the imbalance caused by the missiles already installed by the USSR, since this power has no interest whatever in losing the advantage it enjoys. And so long as it does enjoy an advantage it will bring every diplomatic and political pressure to bear to retain that advantage, and hence will not negotiate for a fair and balanced reduction in armaments.

I am therefore convinced that, for the Western powers to grant a moratorium at this time would not serve to stimulate the opening of negotiations with any real possibility of success.

I will, however, add that I believe the pacifist pleas of so many European citizens, especially the young, to be sincerely motivated. But I am convinced that peace is not brought about only by expressing pacifist sentiments, but by working to ensure for everyone, conditions of security as a guarantee for peace.

For these reasons I declare that I will support the resolution signed by the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Glinne (S), in writing.** — *(FR)* I shall be abstaining in a strictly personal capacity, on the motion for a resolution tabled by my colleagues Mrs Focke and others, whose motivation certainly deserves a positive response as far as the bulk of its content is concerned. However, the French-speaking Socialist Party of Belgium, notably in the person of its president Mr Spitaels writing in *Le Soir* on 14 October 1983, has set a firm limit of 6 months to the additional moratorium which the negotiators in Geneva have been asked to observe. I am convinced of the need for an absolute time limit to concentrate the minds of the two superpowers on conciliation, and therefore consider it unreasonable to call for an indefinite moratorium, so that it is impossible for me personally to accept item 3 in the Focke motion for a resolution.

I shall be voting in favour of the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Jaquet and others, which is consistent with the way that I have voted recently on the same subject in the Belgian Parliament.

\* \* \*

**Arndt report (Doc. 1-856/83): Future financing of the Community: Adopted**

The rapporteur spoke

- *in favour* of Amendments Nos 6, 35, 36, 40, 73, 75 to 84; and
- *Against* Amendments Nos 10, 11, 13, 14, 16/rev., 17, 19, to 24, 26, 29 to 31, 41 to 44, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53, 55 to 60, 62 to 70, 72, 85, 87 to 95.

*Explanations of vote*

**President.** — I now have six requests for an explanation of vote. I would ask the House, in view of the fact that we have had a very long sitting and that we have kept several Commissioners waiting who are prepared to answer questions to the House, if Members would agree that they hand them in in writing.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Forth (ED).** — No!

**President.** — Mr Forth, it is not necessary to shout 'No'. You have the floor. Will you please give your explanation of vote?

**Mr Forth (ED).** — As always, I am delighted to uphold one of the few rights that Members have, and that is to give an explanation of vote.

I am unable to support this report, because I believe that it involves a judgment of the conditions in which we would be prepared to accept an increase in the resources of the Community and in value added tax. These conditions are set out in paragraph 24 and, in my view, are not acceptable, particularly with the addition of Amendment No 81, which the House has accepted and which says that an increase is inevitable. It goes on, presumably, to predicate that increase on paragraph 24, which talks vaguely and unspecifically about reductions in surplus production — in other words, there will still be surplus production — and also about containing the growth in expenditure on agriculture. In other words, growth will continue in expenditure on agriculture.

In my view, and in my own judgement, I am therefore unable to support a document which says that increases in Community resources are inevitable, but predicated on something which is not sufficiently specific in pledging a control on what, at the moment, is the main problem facing the Community — that of agricultural expenditure. I regret, therefore, that I cannot support this resolution.

**Mr Balfe (S).** — I shall make an extremely short explanation of vote.

I shall abstain on this because, like Mr Forth, I see a slow movement towards inevitability in this report, which implies that if you will sort out the Community financing you can have some more money. I do not think that is the way we should go about these things, so I shall be abstaining.

**Mr Adonnino (PPE).** — *(IT)* The Group of the European People's Party will vote in favour of the resolution which contains the opinion on the Commission's proposal to the Council regarding the future financing of the Community.

We shall vote in favour of the resolution because we wanted it. We have fought hard to get to this vote, even if, last month, we were the prime movers for the withdrawal of the motion for a resolution.

We have always held that it was politically essential for Parliament to express its own view on such an important subject, before the European Council at Athens, so as to maintain the consistency of our approach. Parliament has long maintained the need for an increase in own resources, as a necessary instrument for the development of the Community, whilst also accepting the need to tackle, at the same time, the disfunctions and imbalances that have occurred, and that have blocked the development process.

The motion that we are considering is in line with this philosophy. We shall also vote for it because, as a result of the strength of our appeal in regard to Community procedure, the principle of further increases in the VAT that comes direct to the Community has been retained.

Even with all the proper safeguards for the prerogatives of Member States, this procedure will thus avoid the great majority of delays and obstacles that have been the underlying cause of the present state of stalemate.

It is a proposal of great value from the institutional stand-point, and we are pleased that the resolution emphasizes the fact that it is in accordance with what Parliament has already resolved; we earnestly ask the Council to adopt it.

We shall vote for the resolution because, even though there has been an element of compromise with the other groups, so that we have had to sacrifice some of our positions, we agree with the principles adopted for adjusting the VAT rates, particularly the general principle, that is intended to take account of deficiencies and differences in the economic potential of different Member States and the pro capita gross domestic product, and the agricultural one, limited to cases of structural surplus,

We shall vote in favour of the resolution also because we agree with the principle that the new, increased financial resources should be used for expenditure in those sectors that Parliament has always said should have priority, and only exceptionally in other sectors.

We shall therefore vote in favour of the resolution, ladies and gentlemen, because, in the face of so much uncertainty in other quarters — we have seen the split vote of the Socialist Group — we claim the credit for having allowed Parliament to express an opinion on such an important subject.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Boserup (COM), in writing.** — *(DA)* The Arndt report insists that raising the VAT ceiling to more than 1% will make it possible to implement common policies in new fields. The Danish Socialist People's Party is against this extension of the EEC's competences: indeed, there is no hint of what new fields are to be opened up. There is talk of raising the VAT limit at first from 1% to 1.4% and later of introducing further increases of 0.4% at a time.

In Denmark, Parliament is curtailing the budget and thereby also the country's revenue. Likewise, all Danes are asked to show moderation, and yet the EEC has the impertinence to propose an increase of 40% in Member States' contributions. I repeat, a 40% increase in Member States' contributions.

What party, what association or, for that matter, what national parliament would dare to suggest that its revenues be increased by 40%? I fail to understand how the European Parliament can dare come forward with a proposal to increase contributions by this amount. Just as parties or associations would fear a fall in membership with such a big increase in their fees, the European Parliament should reflect that an increase of 40% would be enough to make its Members consider seriously whether they should not resign their membership and withdraw.



**Mr Eyraud (S), in writing.** — (FR) In the estimation of the French Socialists, the Arndt report takes too narrow a view of the future financing of the Community. In other words, the approach that it adopts is too strictly budgetary and not sufficiently political. It fails to analyse the reasons why the Community has reached an impasse and is therefore in a financial crisis.

If there is a budgetary imbalance as it claims, then the Arndt report should have asked why this should be, providing such answers as :

Because of the fall in VAT receipts over recent years, itself caused by the economic crisis and the associated rise in unemployment to 12 million, with the associated loss of spending power. Because of the failure to apply Community preference. Because of the United States' disregard of international trade rules, particularly in the case of agricultural exports.

If, 13 years ago, the Member States had adopted the figure of 2% rather than 1% of VAT, there would be no imbalance today.

The Arndt report makes no mention of these things.

The French Socialists would also have wished to contribute to the compromise reached in the Committee on Budgets. However, this was not possible, for a variety of reasons :

1. It is out of the question to establish an automatic link between the growth in agricultural expenditure and that in revenue, hoping that the former will not outstrip the latter. That is an economic nonsense.
2. We cannot agree to modulation of the VAT rate according to Member States' shares in final agricultural production. This would put agriculture, in the rural environment, at a disadvantage in relation to industry. There is enough unemployment among the industrial workforce without creating more in the rural community.
3. The idea of using the Community's net operating surplus as the reference for calculation of the VAT rate correcting factor is as vague as it is unrealistic.

For these various reasons, we shall be voting against the draft decision and against the motion for a resolution, although we are in favour of, for instance, the proposal to increase own resources with a view to giving fresh impetus to the building of Europe.

**Lord Douro (ED), in writing.** — The European Democratic Group, having participated fully and enthusiastically in the progress of the Arndt report through the Budgets Committee and in plenary sitting, are strongly committed to the objectives of this report. It has emerged successfully from this vote, and represents a positive and constructive response from Parliament to the Commission's proposals on the Community's own resources.

We believe that the report will be a most valuable weapon for Parliament in its fight to set a new course for future Community policies and to establish a viable and fair basis of future financing. We would particularly draw attention to some key paragraphs in the report which signal Parliament's firm resolve.

Paragraph 8 specifically refers to the 'unacceptable situation' of countries such as the UK in relation to its budgetary contribution. Paragraph 24, in many ways the key paragraph of the whole report, categorically rules out any increase in the percentage of VAT until and unless measures to restrict structural surpluses in agriculture are brought forward and accepted by the Council. Paragraph 25 drives the point still harder by calling for the annual increase in agricultural expenditure to be held at a lower level than the growth in overall revenue.

This is the strongest and clearest signal that Parliament has ever sent to the Council on this question, and the European Democratic Group are very pleased to have been closely associated with it,

**Mr Notenboom (PPE), *in writing*.** — (NL) Now that the idea of an agricultural indicator has been accepted, I feel there is far less need for an increase in the Community's own resources. The idea of the *juste retour* that now pervades the expenditure side of the budget must also be reflected on the revenue side. A key of this kind may also seriously affect the legal nature of our own resources. But Parliament would be showing weakness if it did not express an opinion in time for the summit meeting in Athens. In the circumstances, I shall abstain during the vote.

## ANNEX II

### I. Questions to the Council

#### *Question No 7, by Mr Lalor (H-324/83)*

Subject: Pilot EEC transport and programme

Will the Council give due reason why at its meeting of Transport Ministers in Luxembourg on 7 June 1983 it failed to reach a decision to implement the proposal to provide vital aid worth £ 700 000 and £ 2.2 million for two road schemes in Ireland, namely the Wexford ring road and the Dublin Airport link road?

#### *Answer*

In the light in particular of the experimental transport infrastructure programme submitted by the Commission on 10 December 1982, at its meeting on 7 June 1983 the Council had a further exchange of views on financial aid to transport infrastructure projects of Community interest.

The Council was not called upon to take any decisions on the financing of particular projects at that meeting, as it did not have before it a Commission proposal to that effect.

The Commission proposal on 'financial support for a multiannual transport infrastructure programme' was in fact forwarded to the Council on 9 August 1983.

The Honourable Member will not be unaware that in that proposal the Commission proposed financial support under the 1983 budget for the Wexford ring road but did not submit a proposal for financing the Dublin Airport link road.

The Transport Council is expected to take a decision on this proposal, which is at present being examined by the Council bodies concerned, at its meeting on 1 December 1983.

\* \* \*

#### *Question No 9, by Mr Hutton (H-374/83)*

Subject: Responsibility to Parliament of Coreper

The President-in-Office reminded Parliament 5 July that Coreper was an organ of the Council and was responsible to it.

Will he now seek the agreement of the Council to publish Press Releases, similar to those of the Council but containing more detail, to inform the European Parliament and the public of the course of discussions in Coreper and of decisions taken by it?

#### *Answer*

The Council confirms the reply which it gave to an identical question put by the Honourable Member (H-292/83) at Question Time during the October part-session.

The Permanent Representatives Committee is responsible for preparing the Council's discussions and carrying out the Council's instructions. The guidelines worked out by the Permanent Representatives Committee may always be called into question by the Council, which has sole responsibility for exercising the powers conferred upon it by the Treaties. Accordingly, the Council does not consider there is any need to prepare Press Releases on the Permanent Representatives Committee's discussions.

\* \* \*

*Question No 12 by Mr Antoniozzi (H-429/83)*

Subject : Agricultural protection and intervention mechanisms

Is it the intention of the Council to inflict irreparable damage on Italian farms with initiatives which would virtually transform the European common agricultural market into a free trade area owing to the radical and progressive dismantling of the protection and intervention mechanisms ?

It is particularly requested that the olive oil subsidies be maintained for the benefit of economically weak and socially disadvantaged areas, in accordance with the fundamental principles enshrined in the Community Treaties.

*Answer*

1. The reply to the first question can of course only be basically negative.
2. The common organization of the market in oils and fats provides, in the case of olive oil, for the granting of production and consumption aid.

No proposal to amend the basic principles of this aid scheme has been submitted by the Commission.

Following the recent agreement within the Council concerning the adjustment of the 'acquis communautaire' in the light of the possible enlargement of the Community, it is understood that any future proposal to alter the organization of the market will have to comply with the following objectives :

- (i) the balance of the market in vegetable oil ;
- (ii) maintaining olive growers' income ;
- (iii) the need for a market organization which can be controlled administratively and financially.

\* \* \*

*Question No 13 by Mr Ouzounidis (H-446/83)*

Subject : Unacceptable discrimination against immigrants in the form of a special motorcar insurance tariff payable by foreign workers in the FRG

According to press reports, German motor insurance companies intend to introduce, at the latest from the beginning of 1984, a special car insurance tariff payable by foreign workers and particularly Turks, Greeks and Yugoslavs. The premiums to be paid by foreigners (Auslandertariff) would be up to 50 % higher than those paid by German citizens.

The German car insurance companies have submitted a request for approval of this special tariff for foreigners to the responsible German state department (Bundesaufsichtsamt). This unacceptable discrimination against (European) foreigners and, particularly, against those from southern Europe is being practised by the insurance companies on the grounds that these persons cause more accidents than German citizens.

What measures does the Council intend to take to protect foreign citizens living and working in Germany from this kind of discrimination, which is creating a climate of fear and fuelling racism in Europe, and what measures does it intend to take to prevent such action being taken in the future?

*Answer*

According to the Treaty, the Commission is responsible for ensuring the implementation of the Treaty's directives, and of directives that establish institutional bodies by virtue of the Treaty. Council is willing to consider any statement made by the Commission regarding this subject.

\* \* \*

*Question No 19, by Mr Welsh (H-470/83)*

Subject: Council of Trade Ministers

Following the opaque answer given to my written question 778/83 will the Presidency put the question of regular meetings of Trade Ministers on the agenda for the next meeting of the Council (General Affairs)?

*Answer*

The question of regular meetings of the Member States' Ministers for External Trade is not on the agenda for the next Council meeting on General Affairs.

Trade policy questions are regularly considered in the 'General Affairs' Council which ensures the necessary cohesion of the Community's trade policy.

Consequently, there are no plans to call special sessions of External Trade Ministers.

\* \* \*

*Question No 21, by Mr Tyrrell (H-486/83)*

Subject: Council Directive 83/351/EEC<sup>1</sup> on air pollution by gases from engines from motor vehicles, including gases from compression engines

Council Directive 83/351/EEC makes specific reference to Article 100/EEC, the Article under which the Directive was made.

Article 100 expressly provides that the European Parliament be consulted if the implementation of the Directive involves the amendment of legislation in any Member State.

The European Parliament, in its opinion (OJ C 184, 11. 7. 1983, p. 131) expressly stated that there be included in this Directive provisions requiring the opinion of Parliament in the event of the Commission making more than merely technical amendments to the Directive. Instead, the Council has removed the Parliament's right of consultation in this area.

Can the Council explain why it has so deliberately removed the right of Parliament to consultation, and does it not regard this as an abrogation of the spirit of the Treaty of Rome?

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 197, 20. 7. 1983, p. 1.

*Answer*

The Council took the European Parliament's opinion into account during its proceedings on the said directive.

However, in common with the Commission, it did not adopt Parliament's suggestion to incorporate a provision whereby Parliament would be consulted on an amendment of the Annex to that directive.

Furthermore, the Council would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Communities in Case 25/70 to the effect that implementing texts may be adopted by the Council or by the Commission without further consultation of the European Parliament.

\* \* \*

## II. *Questions to the Foreign Ministers*

### *Question No 30, by Sir Peter Vanneck (H-393/83)*

Subject: Protection of the Community's oil supplies from the Middle East

In view of the importance to economic and social life in all Member States of all supplies from the Middle East, has the time come for Member States to share the burden in finance, material and men of protecting sea lanes for oil tankers bringing oil to Ireland. Denmark, Britain, Netherlands, Germany, France, Luxembourg, Italy and Greece, only two Member States bearing this burden in 1983 through the deployment of naval vessels in the Straits of Hormuz?

*Answer*

The Ten have not discussed this proposal which, as the honourable Member is aware, does not fall within the framework of European Political Cooperation.

\* \* \*

### *Question No 35 by Mr Kyrkos (H-380/83)*

Subject: Extradition of Turkish opponents to the Evren dictatorship

Can the Council of Ministers meeting in political cooperation state whether they will convey to the German Government their opposition to its decision to extradite to Turkey immigrants wanted by the authorities in Ankara? The German Government's decision constitutes not only support for the Ankara regime at the very time when the Evren dictatorship is taking new measures to suppress freedom of the press and political parties but also represents a violation of the fundamental principles of democracy and humanity.

*Answer*

The expulsion of foreigners is a sovereign right of any Member State, and cannot therefore be discussed within the scope of European Political Cooperation.

However, on the opportunity of this question I should once more like to stress that the Ten have repeatedly emphasized the importance they place on respect for human rights, and have drawn the attention of the Turkish authorities to this.

\* \* \*

*Question No 36, by Sir Fred Warner (H-428/83)*

Subject : Terrorist attack at Bologna Station

In view of reports of the escape of Licio Gelli who was detained in connection with the bomb attack in Bologna Station in October 1980 in which eighty people were killed, can the Foreign Minister's meeting in political cooperation say what cooperative action has been taken by other Member States, if any, to assist the Italian Government in bringing the perpetrators to justice ?

*Answer*

This matter has not been discussed by the Ministers within the scope of European Political Cooperation. The matter was discussed by the Trevi group. Cooperation within the terms of reference of that group, as the Honourable Member perhaps knows, is of a governmental nature and does not fall within the competence of European Political Cooperation.

\* \* \*

*Question No 37, by Mr Tyrrell (H-444/83)*

Subject : Decolonization of the Baltic States

What progress can the Conference of Foreign Ministers report in pursuing the request of the European Parliament for the decolonization of the Baltic States to be placed on the agenda of the United Nations sub-committee on Decolonization ? (report by Dr. Habsburg, Doc. 1-656/82).

*Answer*

The Ten have not requested that the matter of the Baltic States should be placed on the agenda of the United Nations special committee on Decolonization, nor do they intend to do so.

\* \* \*

*Question No 40 by Mr Van Miert (H-484/83)*

Subject : Establishment of a permanent secretariat for European Political Cooperation

As it is now two years since 'a small team of officials seconded from preceding and succeeding presidencies' was, under the London Report on European Political Cooperation<sup>1</sup>, put at the disposal of the Presidency, what discussions have the Foreign Ministers held regarding the possibility of developing this team into a permanent secretariat for European Political Cooperation ; and what obstacles prevent the establishment of such a secretariat ?

*Answer*

First of all, I would like to stress that the group set up after the London report functioned satisfactorily from 1981 through five successive presidencies. I must also stress that the formation of that group is a unique experience in the area of multilateral cooperation, and emphasizes the high level of trust between the Ten.

In the future, should it become necessary owing to an increase in the Presidency's responsibilities, the Ten could reinforce the group's 'functional support'.

Finally, I would like to remind the honourable Member that in section 2.3 of paragraph 2 of the Stuttgart declaration, there is special mention of appropriate reinforcement of the functional support granted to successive presidencies, so that these may respond to the increased duties they are required to carry out.

\* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> Supplement 3/81, EEC Bulletin, p. 17.

*Question No 41, by Lord Bethell (H-489/83)*

Subject : the destiny of Jarmak Lukjanow

On 11 October the Foreign Ministers were asked in the European Parliament what action they had taken over Parliament's resolution of 15 September about Jarmak Lukjanow, a Belgian citizen presently under sentence of death in the Soviet Union. The President-in-Office replied that the Ten 'shall pursue the course they judge most appropriate under present conditions'. Will the President-in-Office now clarify this answer and tell the European Parliament what action he has taken in this extremely urgent matter ?

*Answer*

I would like to assure Lord Bethell that the Ten are keeping fully abreast of the Lukjanow situation.

The Ten will act with great caution, bearing in mind the unusual circumstances involved, so as to avoid actions that might turn out to be counterproductive.

\* \* \*

*Question No 42, by Mr Balfe (H-490/83)*

Subject : Tamil minority in Sri Lanka

To ask the Foreign Ministers whether they have received any representations about the treatment of the Tamil minority in Sri Lanka and what response they have made ?

*Answer*

On 3 August 1983, the Ten made representations to the government of Colombo, stressing among other things the following points :

- The violent events that took place in Sri Lanka at that time provoked an intense response in European public opinion.
- The governments of the Community's Member States call upon Sri Lanka authorities to ensure the safeguarding of fundamental human rights in all cases.

\* \* \*

*III. Questions to the Commission**Question No 46, by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (H-296/83)*

Subject : Unfair trading practices

Would the Commission state the average length of time taken from the making of complaints of unfair trading practices to decisions being reached by DG 4 in 1980, 1981, 1982 and the longest and shortest time taken in those years.

*Answer*

In the years 1980, 1981 and 1982 eight final decisions were made by the Commission in connection with the competition rules of the EEC Treaty (Articles 85 and 86) following the submission of complaints against the Treaty.

The average length of time between the receipt of a complaint and the taking of a final decision by the Commission in the period indicated in the questions was 32 months ; the longest period of consideration was 50 months, the shortest period 14 months.



Furthermore, the Commission has recently decided, whenever possible, to speed up the handling of complaints by keeping administrative procedures as short as possible.

It should be noted that the average length of time in the past few years has already been somewhat reduced.

I can promise you that the simplification of these procedures will continue to receive the Commission's attention

\* \* \*

*Question No 54, by Mr Wedekind (H-364/83) <sup>1</sup>*

Subject: Helicopter crash caused by purifying agent

In September 1982, an American helicopter crashed near Mannheim in the Federal Republic of Germany. After investigations lasting several months, it appears that the accident was caused by a standard oil purifying agent that blocked the helicopter's oil jets. This oil contains minute particles of walnut shells.

Does the Commission know whether this lubricant, which is common in the USA, is also used in the Member States of the Community, in particular for passenger aircraft? Does the Commission agree that the product should be withdrawn from the market?

*Answer*

According to the very scanty and unofficial information available to the Commission, it does appear that the incident referred to by the Honourable Member did involve a military helicopter. Since it is well-known that extremely detailed instructions are laid down for their maintenance, it can safely be assumed that all the necessary precautions have been taken to clarify the incident and to prevent it recurring.

The Commission has not received any information on the outcome of the investigation into the cause of the accident, in particular on the suggestion that the crash was connected with the use of an oil purifying agent.

If the Honourable Member has additional information, I should be grateful if he would forward it to the Commission.

*Question No 56, by Mr Gérard Fuchs (H-271/83)*

Subject: Mining project in Carajas

Can the Commission indicate the amount of financial aid which the EEC intends to provide for the Carajas mining project, when the funds will be released and what benefits the EEC expects to derive from its contribution to this project?

*Answer*

On a proposal from the Commission, the Council of the European Communities delivered a favourable opinion on 12 July 1982 on the granting, under Article 54 (2) (ECSC), of an ECSC loan to the Brazilian Company CVRD of a maximum of US \$ 600 million for the partial financing of the development of the Carajas iron deposits.

<sup>1</sup> Former oral question without debate (0-44/83), converted into a question for Question Time.

The ECSC loan constitutes co-financing to be carried out by several international financing establishments including the World Bank. The rate at which the ECSC loan will be made available will depend on the progress of the work which is to be spread over the period 1982-1985 and on the opportunities available on the financial markets. A first tranche equivalent to US \$ 65 million was paid in October 1982.

The advantages for the Community of the development of the Carajas iron deposits can be appreciated in the light of the prospects and conditions for the supply of iron ore to the Community iron and steel industry. The fact that several Community iron and steel groups (from the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Belgium and Luxembourg) have already signed firm contracts with the CVRD for large quantities of iron ore (13,65 m tonnes per annum) at favourable conditions in relation to world prices, illustrates the importance which the Carajas product has for the Community iron and steel industry.

\* \* \*

*Question No 61, by Mr Kirk (H-378/83)*

Subject: Exports of chrysanthemums to Sweden

The Commission has previously confirmed that the Swedish ban on imports of chrysanthemums from Danish nurseries and elsewhere is contrary to the free trade agreement between the Community and Sweden.

Regardless of the fact that the Commission, through negotiations, has made this problem the subject of detailed discussions between the Danish and Swedish authorities, it must be pointed out that a continued ban on imports by Sweden will have a stifling effect on Danish nurseries. The ban is still operating in practice, and is clearly a protectionist measure on the part of Sweden.

What action does the Commission intend to take to bring about a rapid lifting of the Swedish import ban, with a view to ensuring free trade in chrysanthemums and the like between the Community and Sweden?

*Answer*

The question of Swedish restrictions on the import of specific flowers and in particular, chrysanthemums, has already been raised by the Commission on many occasions. An effort was made in the context of the most recent consultations, held in May of this year, to obtain an undertaking from the Swedish Government to remove the ban on the import of chrysanthemums from Denmark. Agreement was reached between the competent Danish and Swedish authorities on technical details.

Meanwhile the Swedish Government has informed the Commission that, as of 15 November, chrysanthemums in pots can be imported from Denmark to Sweden, provided certain protection and hygiene requirements are observed.

*Question No 62, by Mr Collins (H-384/83)*

Subject: Representation of the retail trade on the Working Group 'Christmas Butter'

Of the ten experts composing the Working Group 'Christmas Butter', three were representing the milk and milk product trades. These three representatives were nominated from the organizations Eucolait and Unecolait who have no direct connections with the retail trade and who are therefore unable to speak for the very people who will be affected by the decisions in respect of sales of reduced price Christmas butter.

Would the Commission not agree that as the retail trade is the body who will have to apply and carry out the management of any scheme in respect of sales of reduced price butter, then this body should be adequately consulted at the Working Group where these proposals are formulated and that last years disruption and confusion in the market could be avoided this year if the retail trade had been fully consulted at an early stage in the discussions?

*Answer*

The Commission shares the honourable Member's view that the retail trade must be included in the work of the 'Christmas Butter' working-group of the Advisory Committee on Milk and Milk Products, which met on 3 June 1983 to assess the results of the 'Christmas Butter 1982-83' campaign.

I would, however, draw his attention to the fact that the representation of the retail trade at the European level is particularly complex because of the existence of a number of organizations, both horizontal and specialized, representing this trade. Under a general agreement reached between the Commission and these organizations, the seats assigned to the retail trade on the Advisory Committee on Milk and Milk Products have been given to Unecolait, an organization that specializes in the retailing of milk products. It is therefore the experts of Unecolait who represent the retail trade in the working-groups of the Advisory Committee on Milk and Milk Products.

Within this framework, a 'Christmas Butter' working-group of the Advisory Committee on Milk and Milk Products, composed of ten experts, of whom three represent the wholesale and retail trades taken together, met on 3 June 1983. The Commission requested Eucolait and Unecolait to appoint the experts who are to represent the wholesale and retail trades respectively in this working-group.

I wish to emphasize that, according to the Commission's information, this latter organization embraces the national organizations of retail traders in milk products in eight Member States (i.e., all the Member States except Greece and Italy). It is therefore, according to the regulations applying to advisory committees, the most representative organization at the European level. This representative function has never been called into question until today.

\* \* \*

*Question No 63, by Mr Moorhouse (H-515/83) <sup>1</sup>*

Air courier services

How far have investigations proceeded into possible means of achieving a harmonized and more liberal regime throughout the European Community in dealing with Air courier services?

*Answer*

The Commission's services have in fact been informed of the difficulties currently being experienced by a number of private courier firms operating within the countries of the Community.

We are aware that different countries take a different attitude towards the existence of these private courier services. Certain countries extend to these firms facilities enabling them to operate under the best possible conditions, whereas others try to put geographical limits on their activities and the smooth operation of their services.

<sup>1</sup> Former oral question with debate (0-81/83), converted into a question for Question Time.

The Commission is not currently envisaging drawing up regulations for these particular services but is studying the question both within the larger context of air transport of lightweight packages and from the point of view both of facilitating and liberalizing traffic rights for aircraft intended solely for this type of transport.

The Commission hopes to present shortly a proposal covering this question by developing the ideas set out in an earlier proposal by the United Kingdom Government.

As you can see it is an area in which we are taking an active interest.

\* \* \*

*Question No 65, by Mr Key (H-400/83)*

Subject: Annex 1 of Directive 79/409

Has the Commission examined the need to update Annex 1 of Directive 79/409,<sup>1</sup> what conclusions have been reached and when does the Commission intend to call a meeting of the Committee for the Adaptation to Technical & Scientific Progress of the Annexes to the Directive with a view to making proposals for the adaptation of Annex 1?

*Answer*

The Council Directive of 2 April 1979 on the preservation of species of wild birds stipulates that special biotope protection measures are to be taken in the case of the species listed in Annex 1 of the Directive, in order to ensure that they survive and breed. Annex 1 lists rare species, those which are threatened with extinction as well as species which are particularly sensitive to certain changes in their environment.

Amendments to the Annex are made in accordance with the committee procedure laid down in Article 17 of the Directive.

The accession of Greece to the European Community and more recent knowledge on the increase in numbers and the population size of bird species coupled with the recent rapid deterioration in the habitat of certain species (the pink pelican, the crested pelican and the wood grouse to mention just a few, and many other species, too many to be listed here) make it necessary to amend this Annex.

The Commission therefore intends to forward a proposal for amending this Annex to the committee on the adjustment of the Directive in the first half of 1984.

\* \* \*

*Question No 66, by Mr Clinton (H-418/83)*

Subject: Distortion of competition in the Ethyl Alcohol Trade

Can the Commission please say what additional measures will be taken to finally put a stop to the unfair competition arising from the exports from France of subsidized ethyl alcohol to other Member States, including Ireland, Germany, United Kingdom and the Netherlands and, if the Commission are unable or unwilling to take effective action, does the Commission agree that action by the Member States concerned to prohibit the import of this subsidized commodity is in order?

*Answer*

In the first place, the Commission would refer to the appeal it made on 8 April 1983 in the action of the Court of Justice against France with a view to ending the situation which the honourable gentleman has described. At the same time the Commission requested the Court to take interim action.

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 103, 25 April 1979, p. 1.

In the meantime the French Government, on 6 May 1983, issued a Decision with a view to the voluntary application of the provisional measures throughout the current marketing year. As a result the Commission was able to withdraw its request to the Court to take provisional measures. The Decision of 6 May has been supplemented by the Decision of 18 July 1983 on purchase prices for beet alcohol subject to quota. This means that the French alcohol service can no longer purchase alcohol subject to quota at prices above production cost. In this way the distillers concerned were selling their alcohol surpluses more cheaply. I would point out, therefore, that thanks notably to the activities of the Commission the French Government has made some important changes in the monopoly which the Commission appreciates.

You suggest in this connection that Member States should take unilateral measures against imported alcohol. I would point out, however, that Article 46 of the EEC Treaty, which did allow of such a possibility, ceased being applicable since the end of the transitional period. The same is true of the protective measures which the Commission was able to authorize only during the provisional period under the second subparagraph of Article 37(3) of the EEC Treaty.

Naturally the measures that have been taken thus far cannot solve all the problems. Consequently the Commission has again begun talks with the French Government in order to arrive at a full adjustment of the French alcohol monopoly to the EEC Treaty. It will inform the honourable gentleman of the results of these talks.

\* \* \*

*Question No 67, by Mr Marck (H-430/83)*

Subject: Harmonization of rules on hormonal fattening

The Commission of the European Communities was given the task of examining ways of harmonizing the rules on hormonal fattening within the European Community as a whole and of formulating proposals.

The Commission requested a committee of independent experts to draw up a report on the subject. The committee was unanimous in its conclusions, which met with a broad consensus among both producer and consumer organizations. Objections were raised by the delegation of one Member State only, prompted by concern for its national trading interests.

What measures does the Commission intend to take with a view to implementing the proposed solution?

*Answer*

The Scientific committees of the Commission agreed that the *natural* hormones would not present harmful effects to the health of the consumer when used under appropriate conditions as growth promoters in farm animals. They also agreed that additional information was needed on two other substances 'trenbolone' and 'zeronal' before an opinion can be given.

Recent consultations of the interested parties in the Consumers Consultative Committee and the Veterinary Consultative Committee showed, however, a divergence of opinion as to course of action which should be taken as a result of these findings.

The Commission is considering these opinions urgently so that it may be in a position to make suitable proposals to the Council before the end of the year.

\* \* \*

*Question No 68 by Mr von Wogau (H-431/83)*

Subject : Exports of mineral water to France

Is the Commission aware that the French regulations governing the importation of mineral water into France stipulate that labels must be marked with the indication 'l' in characters 4 mm high, even when the indication of quantity is already imprinted on the bottle itself?

It is also compulsory for the importer's name to be given on the label.

Does not the Commission share the view that these conditions are incompatible with the free trade rules set out in the EEC Treaty?

*Answer*

The situation referred to by the honourable Member came to the Commission's attention at the beginning of October 1983.

It subsequently, on the basis of the provisions of Directive 79/112/EEC of 18. 12. 78 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertisement of foodstuffs for sale to the ultimate consumer, asked the French authorities for a statement.

The Commission will not hesitate to initiate proceedings under Article 169 of the EEC Treaty if the initial analysis confirm that the conditions laid down by the French authorities conflict with the provisions of the Directive.

\* \* \*

*Question No 70 tabled by Mr Gawronski (H-438/83)*

Subject : Advertising via satellite in Europe

Has the Commission considered presenting proposals on TV transmissions received by satellite in other Community countries than the country of origin ; in particular, how does it intend to resolve the problem of legislation on advertising?

*Answer*

1. The creation of a Community market for broadcasting, particularly by satellite and cable, is one of the most important tasks of the Community. I would point out that, in its resolution of 12 March 1982 on radio and television broadcasting in the European Community, Parliament recognized the need to draw up a framework regulation for the purpose, in particular, of protecting young people and regulating advertising at Community level. The Commission was called on to present a report on the mass media.

On behalf of the Commission my colleague, Mr Natali, expressly welcomed the resolution and announced that action would be taken.

In the summer of this year the Commission submitted an 'interim report on the realities and trends of television in Europe : Perspectives and Options' stressing in particular the policy of supporting a European satellite television programme. This report was forwarded to Parliament on 25 May 1983.

2. This will shortly be followed by a green book on the establishment of a Community market for broadcasting, particularly by satellite and cable. It will set out in particular the provisions of the EEC Treaty which are already applicable to broadcasting and which proposals concerning the development of a European broadcasting regulation the Commission intends to present as a matter of priority. It also includes the area of televi-

sion advertising to by the honourable Member. The Commission takes the view that the problem of applying the widely differing national legislation on advertising on television programmes which are either broadcast or relayed across national frontiers is through harmonization of the provisions in question. Article 57 (2) of the EEC Treaty provides special powers for the harmonization of laws for the purpose of facilitating the provision of trans-frontier services.

Finally it should be pointed out that trans-frontier broadcasts via satellite and cable not only raises questions concerning the application of the provisions governing television advertising. Other questions which must also be considered in this context affect, for example, provisions to protect young people, individual rights and industrial property and copyright.

\* \* \*

*Question No 71 by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-441/83)*

Subject: Pilot project on accidents in the home

It has been established that more than 4 million domestic accidents occur each year in the Community, that there are at least 30 000 fatalities and almost 4 million cases of injury and that the majority of the victims are children, elderly people and women.

In the light of these figures, can the Commission say what action it intends to take on the Council's decision of 23 July 1981 on a Community domestic accidents information service designed to enhance the safety of European citizens in the home environment?

*Answer*

The Commission, like the honourable lady, is extremely concerned about protecting the consumer against dangers arising from the use or misuse of certain products. This is why the Commission has been carrying out, as from 1 January 1982, the pilot project mentioned in the question, which was decided upon by the Council on 23 July 1981.

The pilot project is based on the systematic evaluation of statistics on accidents in the home. The initial findings of this project show that 10 % of all admissions to hospital casualty departments arise from domestic accidents. In almost all cases these accidents were caused by one or more domestic products.

The most common accidents (about 65 % of all cases studied) are those in which someone falls (stairs), slips or falls over some object. Falls of this kind can be fatal, and this applies particularly to older people. Two in every 1 000 falls resulted in death, the victim dying within one month of admission to the hospital.

Most of the other accidents arose from the ingestion of or contact with caustic or corrosive products. Accidents of this kind require an average hospitalization of over two days, though in the case of small children this will often be longer.

The ultimate aim — and this is also stated in the preamble to the 1981 decision — is to devise a 'system for assembling information on these accidents'.

The abovementioned pilot project has made it possible for the Commission and also for the Member States to define and to test certain features of the future system — the assembling of information from casualty stations — and also experimentally to assemble information from other sources such as centres for emergency aid in cases of poisoning.

In addition the pilot project has made it possible to set down the guidelines for future Commission action in this area, namely,

— firstly, extending the work of compiling statistics and improving evaluation procedures;

- secondly, developing a suitable institutional framework and a work programme on the prevention of accidents.

In the first half of 1984 the Commission will be submitting to the Council of Ministers a report on the pilot project and proposals for further Community action in this area. The European Parliament will certainly be invited to deliver an opinion on these proposals.

\* \* \*

*Question No 72, by Mr Bournias (H-443/83)*

Subject: Hydroelectric power in Greece

Concerning hydroelectric power in my country, since the Community is aware that Greece, in the field of exploitable waterfall power, is better off in kilowatt-hours per capita per annum not only than all the EEC countries but than all the other Western European countries apart from Norway and Switzerland (20 to 23 thousand million kilowatt-hours per annum), can the Commission say if the Community intends to finance the survey by Greek and foreign specialists, to avoid any further delay in a matter of such economic importance to Greece?

*Answer*

There is no budgetary item specifically entitling the Community at the moment to finance surveys such as that recommended by the honourable Member. The ERDF can, however, pursuant to Article 12 of the regulation establishing this fund, contribute to the financing of surveys closely connected with the operations of the Fund, to an extent not exceeding 50 % of the cost of such surveys. The eligibility of these surveys cannot be considered unless an application has been submitted by the competent authorities of the Member State concerned.

\* \* \*

*Question No 73, by Mr Ouzounidis (H-445/83)*

Subject: Unacceptable discrimination against immigrants in the form of a special motorcar insurance tariff payable by foreign workers in the FRG

According to press reports, German motor insurance companies intend to introduce, at the latest from the beginning of 1984, a special car insurance tariff payable by foreign workers and particularly Turks, Greeks and Yugoslavs. The premiums to be paid by foreigners (Ausländertarif) would be up to 50 % higher than those paid by German citizens.

The German car insurance companies have submitted a request for approval of this special tariff for foreigners to the responsible German state department (Bundesaufsichtsamt). This unacceptable discrimination against (European) foreigners and, particularly, against those from southern Europe is being practised by the insurance companies on the grounds that these persons cause more accidents than German citizens.

What measures does the Commission intend to take to protect foreign citizens living and working in Germany from this kind of discrimination, which is creating a climate of fear and fuelling racism in Europe, and what measures does it intend to take to prevent such action being taken in the future?

*Answer*

The Commission would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the answers it has given to the Written Questions Nos. 1483/82, 503/83 and 783/83, where it stated that it considers the discriminatory practice of German motor insurers to be incompatible with the provisions of the EEC Treaty, and more specifically with Article 7.



In a letter of 2 March 1983, the Commission drew the attention of the Government of the Federal Republic to its obligation to eliminate any discriminations against citizens from the Member States and to ensure that EC citizens are treated in the same way as German citizens in respect of motor insurance contracts. The German government, in a note of 31 August 1983, informed the Commission that it shares the Commission's view in principle.

In a further letter, of 28 September, the Commission asked for information about the practical steps that were being taken to put the principle into effect. The reply is awaited.

\* \* \*

*Question No 74, by Mr Welsh (H-450/83)*

Subject: Preferential duties on imports of Virginia type tobacco from India

Does the Commission consider that the Community is honouring its formal declaration of intent at the time of the Accession of the United Kingdom to the Community that it would provide for favourable treatment of Indian trade with the Community, under the GSP in lieu of Commonwealth Preferences; when under current circumstances, the preferential rate for Indian tobacco (7 % subject to a minimum of 13 ECU per 100 kg and a maximum of 45 ECU per 100 kg) results in a higher charge than the non preferential rate of 30 ECU per 100 kg?

Answer

It is true that the import quota for Virginia tobacco introduced in 1975 within the framework of the generalized preferences system is based on the negotiations concluded at the time of the United Kingdom's accession to the European Community. Since this quota was first fixed in 1975 it has proved possible to extend it considerably, both as regards the tobacco qualities concerned (extended from Virginia flue-cured to Virginia tobacco in general) and the quantities permitted (from 30 000 tonnes to 61 200 tonnes).

Under the Community's system of generalized preferences it is not possible to make any distinction between individual third countries. In principle, these preferences may be availed of by all developing countries covered by the generalized preferences system.

As far as India is concerned, while overall Community imports of Virginia tobacco have declined by about one-third in the period of five years from 1978 to 1982, Indian exports to the Community have not only been maintained but even extended (from about 16 000 tonnes to about 20 000 tonnes). This means that at the present time almost 80 % of Indian exports of Virginia tobacco to the Community enjoy the benefits of the generalized preferences system, as against 45 % in 1978. It is not correct therefore to speak of any erosion of the concessions being enjoyed by India under the system of generalized preferences.

\* \* \*

*Question No 75, by Mrs Le Roux (H-451/83)*

Subject: Butter exports

For several months the Commission refused to export butter to the USSR. Sales resumed a short time ago, but butter stocks remain high. Could the Commission say how much butter could have been exported without this ban and what has been its impact on the Community Budget?

*Answer*

The Commission is not in a position to make purely hypothetical estimates on the quantities of butter which might have been exported to the USSR.

These sales depend not only upon the USSR's import needs but also upon the price-level of Community butter in relation to that of butter supplied by other countries.

For the same reasons, it is not possible to assess the effects upon the Community budget. It may, however, be pointed out that exporting at the present level of export refunds is the least expensive way of disposing of butter surpluses.

\* \* \*

*Question No 76, by Mr Pearce (H-453/83)*

Subject: Grant from the European Regional Development Fund

Has a grant from the European Regional Development Fund been made towards the electrification of the railway from Garston to Hunts Cross in Merseyside and, if so, when was the grant made, how much was it and in what document was the information communicated to Parliament?

*Answer*

The electrification of the railway line from Garston to Hunts Cross in the Merseyside has received a grant of £ 781 200 which is 30% of the cost of the project.

The decision was taken on 20 December 1982 and was published in the Official Journal on 25 July 1983<sup>1</sup>.

\* \* \*

*Question No 77, by Mr Newton Dunn (H-456/83)*

Subject: Fuel subsidies for fishermen

How many Member States give fuel subsidies to their fishermen?

*Answer*

According to the Commission's information, Belgium, France, Greece and Italy have in the past notified the payment of fuel subsidies.

By decision of 8 February 1983 and 9 March 1983, the Commission has laid down that the subsidies in Belgium, France and Italy are incompatible with the Common Market and must consequently be abolished. Belgium did so with effect from 31 December 1982.

The Commission is at present studying the reactions of France and Italy to these decisions, and will take all steps necessary to guarantee the observance of Community law. Greece, for its part, has decided to abolish its fuel subsidies with effect from 1 January 1983.

\* \* \*

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 198.

*Question No 79, by Mr Provan (H-459/83)*

Subject : Fisheries inspectors

Will the Commission please report on the work of its fisheries inspectors ?

*Answer*

The first fisheries inspectors began working with the Commission in mid-October 1983. After a period of training, they carry out missions in the Member States in accordance with the Council's provisions laying down certain inspection procedures concerning fishing activities pursued by vessels of the Member States.

\* \* \*

*Question No 80, by Mrs Hammerich (H-463/83)*

Subject : The Commission's interpretation of points 1.4.2 and 3.2 of the Stuttgart Declaration

Does the Commission take the view that the phrase 'co-ordination of the economic aspects of security' justifies a parliamentary debate on the co-ordination of arms production in the Community? Does the Commission take the view that this phrase refers to joint arms production? It was precisely this phrase that Commissioner Narjes referred to during the parliamentary debate on the Fergusson report on 11 October 1983, prior to supporting, on behalf of the Commission, the plans for Community armaments production and a Community armaments economy.

The Danish Government has already stated that economic aspects of security do not include such matters (in the Foreign Minister's reply on 1 June 1983 to a written question from the Folketing's Community Affairs Committee).

*Answer*

The Commission would like to point out first of all that it is primarily a matter for the Heads of State and Government to explain or interpret the wording of the Declaration signed by them in Stuttgart on 19 June 1983.

When the Declaration was being signed by the Heads of State and Government, the Commission stated, in relation to the passages referred to in the oral question, that the words 'political and economic aspects of security' could not affect the competences of the Communities. The Ministers shared this view.

If the honourable lady reads more closely what I said on behalf of the Commission in this House on 11 October she will realise that I quoted the Stuttgart Declaration of the Heads of State and Government in June as a further example of the marked increase in awareness of the problems of European security policy which we have been able to observe for quite some time now throughout the Community in general.

Winding up a debate which Parliament had decided upon and carried through upon its own initiative, my statement was perfectly clear and could not have given rise to any misunderstanding.

I should like to sum up what I said on that occasion as follows :

The importance of the armaments industry cannot be overlooked, since the specific conditions it was created to meet are an essential factor in the structural orientation of industrial production generally in the various Member States, and this is particularly true in the case of high technology products. In addition to this, we have to take into account the

enormous explosion in costs in the entire area of industrial manufacture, which is becoming increasingly dominated by advanced technology, and particularly in the case of the production of armaments.

Since under normal conditions these developments and advances are no longer possible on national markets without imposing excessive financial burdens on the Member States and since these production lines are of vital importance for the competitiveness of our industry because of their high technological quotient, we are clearly being forced towards transfrontier cooperation within the European Community in the matter of armaments.

All of this affects the competences conferred by the Treaties on the Community — in the internal market, in competition policy, in social legislation, in the matter of public contracts, in the shaping of our industrial policy and in the matter of programmes for the promotion of research and advanced technologies etc. It is our task to see to it that we have in the Community a balanced economic development, prospects for the creation of jobs and unrestricted movement of goods and services.

For this reason we in the Commission have followed this initiative and this report of the House with the greatest attention and have welcomed it unreservedly.

\* \* \*

*Question No 81, by Mrs Boserup (H-466/83)*

Subject: Right of veto in an enlarged Community

Commenting on the Spinelli Report during the September 1983 part-session, President Thorn said with regard to decision-making in a Community of Twelve: 'The Commission believes that in this Community, in certain fields, unanimity should be replaced by a qualified majority in order to reduce the risk of blockage, which would be greater in a Community of Twelve than of Ten' (quote from *Agence Europe*, 14 September 1983). Does the Commission take the view that the right of veto ought to be restricted if Spain and Portugal accede?

*Answer*

1. First of all, I must point out that the Treaties recognize no right of veto. Even what is known as the Luxembourg Compromise does not establish a right of veto.
2. The Commission has consistently deplored the practice of insisting upon unanimity and has always considered it imperative to observe the voting procedures laid down by the Treaties — that is to say, deciding by a majority vote when the Treaties require it.
3. The Commission also takes the view that in a Community of Twelve the unanimity requirement at present laid down in the Treaties should be replaced in certain fields by that of a qualified majority.
4. This idea, advanced in 1978, has been elaborated by the Commission in its communication, submitted to the Council and forwarded to the Parliament, on the institutional consequences of enlargement.

\* \* \*

*Question No 83, by Mr Bonde (H-476/83)*

Subject: Attendance by Commission officials at EPC meetings

Which EPC meetings and committee meetings connected with EPC have Commission officials attended since the October 1981 London declaration, and how many Commission staff are directly or indirectly involved with European political cooperation?

*Answer*

Since the London report of October 1981, the Commission has been fully associated at all levels with political cooperation. It has therefore been represented at all meetings that have taken place since then within the framework of EPC.

\* \* \*

*Question No 84, by Mrs Nikolaou (H-477/83)*

Subject: Discrimination against Greece at the Galway conference in Ireland

As part of the conference of 29 and 30 September 1983 organized in Galway by the National Committee of Ireland in the context of the European Year of Small and Medium-sized Undertakings, there was an exhibition of products of SMUs whose main feature was the European Communities' stand.

Can the Commission state why the information material (tables, posters, comparative statistical data) referred only to the Europe of Nine and completely ignored the fact that Greece has been a member of the Community for two years, especially as the conference was held during the Greek presidency; and can it name those responsible?

*Answer*

In response to an invitation from the organizers of the exhibition referred to by the honourable gentleman, the Commission's Press and Information Office in Dublin took the necessary steps to supply a stand built in 1983 and containing up-to-date information on the Community of the Ten.

Shortly before the opening of the exhibition, the Dublin Office was informed that the room in which the exhibition was to be held was not large enough to accommodate the stand. Rather than cancel Community participation in the exhibition, a stand was used which was a convenient size for the hall, but which was built prior to Greek accession to the Community. Since some of the information displayed on the stand was not up-to-date, it was decided to affix notices containing updated material and to arrange for someone to be permanently present to answer any requests for information. The Commission regrets that this necessarily *ad hoc* solution did not allow of a comprehensive and accurate presentation of the Community of the Ten.

*Question No 85, by Mrs Lixin (H-480/83)*

Subject: Development areas in Belgium; exemptions for certain local authorities, Ath and Huy in particular

As the Walloon Region has proposed to the Commission that there should be a general system of exemption for local authorities which are not priority areas for aid, could the Commission say whether it is actually in favour of a case-by-case investigation, in much more detail than is proposed by the Walloon Region, which thus refuses to consider parts of the areas in question to be deserving of general attention in view of their difficult situation?

*Answer*

In its decision of 22 July 1982 on the development zones in Belgium, the Commission considered that the situation in the *arrondissement* of Ath, Waremme and Tournai, as well as in the northern parts of the *arrondissement* of Huw and Viers, did not warrant their classification as aid zones. There could therefore be no question of drawing up a general aid programme for these areas. However, being aware of the gravity of the redevelopment problems facing the coal and steel basins of Charleroi and Liege that border on these *arrondissements*, the Commission stated in the above decision that certain derogations could be granted in respect of individual projects submitted to it insofar as it

emerged from an investigation of those projects, which were first to be notified to it, that the result of the proposed aid would directly help the employment situation stemming from difficulties in the ECSC industries in the above basins.

\* \* \*

*Question No 86, by Mr Delorozoy (H-481/83)*

Subject: Modification of the system for bearer securities

As from 3 November 1984, new provisions<sup>1</sup> on securities will come into force under French law, according to which both registered and bearer securities (stock exchange securities, unit trusts and unlisted securities) will be everywhere replaced by obligatory registration in an open account at a bank or an accredited agency. Since such measures affect the traditional right to secrecy inherent in the physical possession of securities, could the Commission state whether in the short or medium term it is considering a recommendation proposing procedure for modification of the securities along French lines throughout the Community?

*Answer*

The problems raised by dematerialization of securities are under examination by a Commission Working Party. Whereas dematerialization can afford considerable cost savings in issuing securities, and also facilitates the administration of securities and the clearing of transactions, in some, Member States dematerialization would encounter resistance from investors, who prefer to hold their securities in physical form. If securities were to be generally dematerialized throughout the Community, this would result in securities becoming less attractive to investors in the latter Member States. In view of this, the Commission does not envisage proposing at the present time that securities be dematerialized throughout the Community. It intends however to pursue the examination of this question, which is of interest in connection with the possibility of strengthening the links between the European stock exchanges.

\* \* \*

*Question No 87, by Mr Adamou (H-483/83)*

Subject: The crisis in stockfarming in Greece

Stockfarming in Greece, which is the most backward sector of the backward Greek agricultural economy, accounting for 1/3 only of gross agricultural income, is in danger of ruin for the following reasons:

- a) abundant imports of cheaper stockfarming products from the Community (they rose from a value of 115 million dollars in 1980 to 365 million dollars in 1982),
- b) the high cost of animal feed (the price of maize has increased from 7.30 drachmas per kilo in 1980 to 16.5 per kilo in 1983),
- c) the high production costs of stockfarming products and the low prices fixed for the latter by the Community bodies.

The consequence of this situation has been a reduction in the number of bovines from 1 200 000 to 750 000.

What measures does the Commission intend to take to ensure the survival of stockfarming in Greece today and to create the necessary conditions for its further development, having regard to the exceptionally favourable conditions afforded by the Greek climate and soil?

<sup>1</sup> See Article 94-11 of the 1982 Finance Law, Chapter II; Section 11, law of 3. 1. 83 on the development of investments and the protection of savings: Decree of 2. 5. 83 on rules for securities.

*Answer*

The Commission is aware of certain difficulties encountered by Greek animal husbandry, but it would like to restate more precisely certain points raised in the honourable Member's question. From official statistics on the numbers of bovines as of 31 December, it transpires that the last year during which the number of bovines in Greece exceeded the figure of 1 200 000 was 1974 (1 240 000).

In December 1980, on the eve of Greece's accession, the number of bovines in that country totalled 848 000. The loss between December 1974 and December 1980 — i.e., before the accession — therefore amounted to 392 000 (31.6% of the total for 1974).

Between December 1980 and the latest census of December 1982, the number fell by 63 000 (— 7%) from 848 000 to 785 000, constituting an average annual decrease of 31 500 as against more than 65 000 during the period 1974-80. It is therefore undeniable that since accession to the Community the decline in the number of bovines in Greece has slowed down considerably. This is primarily due to the movement of market prices in Greece since the accession from 9.884 drachmas on the average in 1981 to 11.795 drachmas in 1982 per 100 kg live weight, and this has even improved on the average during the first six months of 1983 (viz., to 13.258 drachmas per 100 kg), despite the general crisis in market prices throughout the Community.

Moreover, this stabilization has been encouraged by a series of Community measures of support, including the calving premium and the premium for maintaining suckling cows, which Greece has received in full, besides profiting substantially from the special arrangements for importing young male bovines for fattening, arrangements which have contributed towards the maintenance or restocking of cattle herds.

\* \* \*

*Question No 88, by Mr Tyrrell (H-485/83)*

Subject: Commission Directive 83/463/EEC (Foodstuffs labelling)

Can the Commission state which persons or bodies it consulted before making this Directive; how such bodies were constituted and what advice it received?

*Answer*

Before it was adopted, Commission Directive 83/463/EEC was discussed with the official representatives of the Member States and with economic and trade experts. There was general agreement as to the advisability of introducing legislation in this particular area.

The directive makes it easier to indicate additives in labelling foodstuffs by extending the numbering system for additives. This means that additives which have not yet got a so-called 'E-Number' are given a temporary number which can be used on the label. All that is in question therefore is the problem of drawing up a complete list of the additives that may be used and that are in fact actually used in the Member States. This enables the implementation of a principle which was already contained in Article 6 of the outline Directive 79/112/EEC on the labelling of foodstuffs.

Furthermore, the Commission hopes that the new numbers that have just been introduced can be incorporated into the worldwide harmonization work of the FAO/WHO Alimentary Code, which would help considerably to simplify international trade. The principle of a numbering system for indicating additives in foodstuffs has already been decided upon within the framework of this Alimentary Code.

\* \* \*

*Question No 89, by Mr Skovmand (H-492/83)*

Subject: Net Community imports of foodstuffs from the developing countries

Can the Commission state how many tons of foodstuffs the Community imports from the developing countries each year, how many tons of foodstuffs the developing countries import from the Community and whether it has any proposals to reduce the preponderance of imports into the Community from the developing countries?

*Answer*

The movement of trade with the developing countries (Cl. II) in foodstuffs and livestock (Section CTCI O) has been as follows:

1 000 t

	EUR 9				EUR 10	
	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982
EEC imports from the developing countries (Cl. II)	28 177	30 059	31 260	27 660	29 555	32 257
EEC exports to the developing countries (Cl. II)	9 877	12 370	13 464	17 809	21 301	19 853
Net EEC imports	18 300	17 796	9 851	8 254	12 404	

Source: Eurostat

These data show that, despite repeated efforts by the EEC to facilitate the access of the developing countries to Community markets, the increases in imports of foodstuffs have been modest (14%) while exports of these products have risen steeply (101%) during the last six years covered by the table. Net imports from these countries have therefore fallen considerably.

The Commission does not entertain any proposal that would mean a deterioration in the developing countries' opportunities of access to Community markets.

\* \* \*

*Question No 90, by Sir Peter Vanweck (H-500/83)*

Subject: Supplies of Australian uranium ore to the European Community

Does the Commission expect Australian suppliers of uranium ore to fulfil to term their contracts with Community electricity undertakings?

*Answer*

There has so far been no interruption in the supplies of uranium provided for in contracts concluded between Australian suppliers and consumers in the Community.

The Commission points out that these contracts have been concluded in regular fashion by the parties concerned under an international agreement between Australia and the Community which came into force in 1982 for a period of thirty years.



The Commission has no reason to consider that the Australian Government might take unilateral measures to hinder the proper execution of these contracts, particularly as the agreement referred to contains, in Article XVIII, a clause providing for consultations in the event of any modifications being considered by the contracting parties.

\* \* \*

*Question No 91, by Mr Battersby (H-502/83)*

Subject: Euratom cooperation with the People's Republic of China

Now that the People's Republic of China is becoming a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency, what steps is the Commission taking to encourage cooperation between China and the Community in nuclear technology?

*Answer*

The fact that the People's Republic of China is a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) already means that there is indirect cooperation in the area of nuclear technology with the European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC), since the latter plays an active part in the work being carried out in this area by the IAEA.

On 28 October 1983 diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China were extended to embrace the EAEC. This means that an exchange of views can now be opened on useful cooperation in this area and possibly on the choice of areas in which attempts can be made to establish direct cooperation between the People's Republic of China and the EAEC in the matter of nuclear technology.

\* \* \*

• *Question No 92, by Mrs Castle (H-503/83/rev.)*

Subject: Exclusive Purchasing Agreements

What guarantee of security of tenure can the Commission offer to tenants of tied houses who are victimized because they exercise their rights under the Regulation 1984/83<sup>1</sup> to buy drinks other than beer from outside suppliers when supplies are available from them on more favourable terms and will the Commission ensure that the guidelines accompanying the Regulation make it clear that any such victimization will be monitored and exposed by the Commission?

*Answer*

The Commission is of the opinion that the right of the tenant to buy drinks other than beer from outside suppliers when supplies are available from them on more favourable terms, must not only be formally specified in the beer-supply agreement, but must also be allowed free exercise.

If such a clause is absent, or if the tenant is in any way prevented from exercising this right, e.g. as a result of economic pressure, the exemption referred to in Regulation 1984/83 will not apply. The provisions restricting the tenant's freedom will then be null and void and he will be free to purchase all drinks, including beer, from wherever he wishes, while retaining the right to remain on the premises.

If the brewery terminates the tenancy agreement and it can be proved that it did so in order to punish the tenant for making use of his right to purchase from others, measures should be taken to restore the tenant to his former rights.

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 173, 30. 6. 1983, p. 5.

Such measures can be taken in the first place via the national legislations, which can then directly apply the EEC rules of competition, as well as general exemption regulations. In such cases the tenant can accomplish what the Commission cannot, namely, obtain compensation for the injured party.

Further, after a formal complaint or ex officio, and where the circumstances so allow, the Commission may decide that the behaviour concerned falls under Article 85 (1) of the Treaty and, where appropriate, impose a fine.

\* \* \*

*Question No 93, by Mr Pattison (H-508/83)*

Subject: Community projects in favour of development in the South-East of Ireland

With reference to the projects on the Rosslare-Dublin-Belfast axis referred to in answer to my oral question No 416/83<sup>1</sup> of 12 October 1983, will the Commission state the precise nature of these projects, their exact location, at what stage of development they are, or when they will commence, and under what Community policies or funds they are being developed?

*Answer*

The proposal for a Council regulation presented by the Commission in August concerning the granting of financial aid under a multiannual transport infrastructure programme, twice refers to the Belfast-Dublin-Rosslare axis.

In particular, in respect of the 1983 financial year, it was proposed that aid be granted to the 'Wexford Bypass' project. This project would substantially improve links on the Belfast-Dublin-Rosslare international highway. Without Community aid it is unlikely that the project will be completed before 1990 or 1991. With Community aid five years can be gained on the initial programme.

Furthermore, a proposal has been made for the 1984 financial year for financial aid to the Shankill-Bray Bypass.

*Question No 94, by Mr Van Rompuy (H-511/83)*

Subject: Belgian textile plan

Is the Commission willing to extend the Belgian textile plan in its present form to 1984?

*Answer*

The Commission has received no notice of a proposed extension of the existing aid arrangements in favour of the textile and clothing industry in Belgium which are due to run out on 31 December 1983. It has therefore not concerned itself with what is at the moment a purely hypothetical question.

The Commission would add that after 31 December 1983 the Belgian textile and clothing industry may again apply for aid under the regional and general aid programmes authorized by the Commission from which it was barred so long as the sectoral programme was in force.

\* \* \*

<sup>1</sup> Verbatim report of proceedings on 12. 10. 1983, page 207 question 82 (H-416/83).

*Question No 95, by Mr Alavanos (H-513/83)*

Subject: The Greek memorandum

Can the Commission state whether, during the continuing talks on the Greek memorandum, it is proceeding on the basis that a derogation might be granted to Greece exempting it from the Community's rules of competition as has again been requested in the memorandum itself?

*Answer*

In its communication to the Council on the Greek Memorandum — COM (83) 134 — the Commission stated in reply to the Greek demands that the application of the competition rules on State aids be modified or derogated an account of special problems existing in Greece, that 'although the principle of a derogation is excluded by the Treaties, the rules on competition allow the Commission to take Greek particularities into account when considering aid projects, in accordance with Protocol 7 to the Act of Accession'. (Point 15).

This position still applies

\* \* \*

## SITTING OF THURSDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 1983

## Contents

<i>Mr Curry; Mrs Castle</i> . . . . .	205	<i>Shipbuilding — Motions for resolutions by Mr Fergusson and others (Doc. 1-1031/83) and Mrs Théobald-Paoli and others (Doc. 1-1051/83)</i>	
1. <i>Approval of Minutes</i>			
<i>Mr Arndt; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Collins; Mr Johnson</i> . . . . .	206	<i>Mr Fergusson; Mrs Théobald-Paoli; Miss Quin; Mr Blumenfeld; Mrs Ewing; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i> . . . . .	222
2. <i>Topical and urgent debate</i>			
<i>Grenada — Motions for resolutions by Mr Galland (Doc. 1-1020/83), Lady Elles (Doc. 1-1032/83), Mr Habsburg and others (Doc. 1-1042/83), Mr Gérard Fuchs and others (Doc. 1-1047/83) and Mr Fanti and others (Doc. 1-1058/83)</i>		<i>Human rights — Motions for resolutions by Mr d'Ormesson and others (Doc. 1-1010/83), Mr Israël and Mrs Ewing (Doc. 1-1024/83), Mrs Rabbethge and others (Doc. 1-1035/83) and Mrs Péry and others (Doc. 1-1056/83)</i>	
<i>Mr Galland; Lady Elles; Mr Habsburg; Mr Lomas; Mr Johnson; Mrs Poirier; Mr Glinne; Mr Gontikas; Mrs Veil; Mrs Anglade; Mr Pisani (Commission); Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr Pisani; Lady Elles; Mr Pisani</i> . . . . .	206	<i>Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Israël; Mrs Rabbethge; Mrs Péry; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Pedini; Mr Tyrrell; Mrs Veil; Mr Haferkamp (Commission)</i> . . . .	226
<i>Lebanon — Motions for resolutions by Mr d'Ormesson and others (Doc. 1-1040/83), Mr de la Malène and Mr Israël (Doc. 1-1043/83), Mrs Lizin and others (Doc. 1-1046/83) and Mr Segre and Mr Denis (Doc. 1-1062/83)</i>		<i>Convergence of economic policies — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1008/83) by Mr Adonnino</i>	
<i>Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Israël; Mrs Lizin; Mrs Cinciari Rodano; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Fergusson; Mr Baillot; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr Kallias; Mr Pisani (Commission); Mr Israël; Mr Albers</i> . . .	212	<i>Mr Adonnino; Mr Moreau; Mr Welsh; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i> . . . . .	228
<i>Cyprus — Motions for resolutions by Mr Fanti and others (Doc. 1-1067/83), Mr Bournias and others (Doc. 1-1068/83) and Mr Plaskovitis and others (Doc. 1-1069/83)</i>		<i>Natural disasters — Motions for resolutions by Mr Gbergo (Doc. 1-1009/83), Mr Glinne (Doc. 1-1049/83), Mr Herman (Doc. 1-1057/83), Mr Fanti (Doc. 1-1059/83), Mr Adamou (Doc. 1-1060/83), Mr Pedini (Doc. 1-1012/83) and Mr Denis (Doc. 1-1061/83)</i>	231
<i>Mr Kyrkos; Mr Bournias; Mr Plaskovitis; Mr Glinne; Mr Herman; Lord Bethell; Mr Adamou; Mr Irmer; Mr von der Vring; Mr Nikolaou; Mrs Anglade; Mr Alexiadis; Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Mr Irmer</i> . . .	217	3. <i>Votes</i>	
		<i>Mr Bonaccini; Mr Rogalla; Mr Beumer; Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Beumer; Mr Curry; Mr Simmonds; Mr von der Vring; Mr Enright; Mr Curry; Mr Sutra; Mr Glinne; Mrs Castle; Mrs Ewing; Mr Maber; Mr Galland; Mrs Kellelt-Bowman; Mr Tolman; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Clinton; Mr Israël; Mr Di Bartolomei; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr D'Angelosante; Mr Forth; Mr O'Mahony; Mr Barbi; Mr Enright; Mr Nikolaou</i> . . . .	231

4. *Cultural sector — Report (Doc. 1-927/83) by Mr Fanti*  
Mr Fanti; Mr Schwencke; Mr Gerokostopoulos; Mr Papapietro; Mr Bøgh; Mr Pedini; Mr Giolitti (Commission) . . . . . 236
5. *Special measures in favour of Greece — Report (Doc. 1-919/83) by Mr Papapietro*  
Mr Papantoniou; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mrs Fuillet; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Richard (Commission) . . . . . 241
6. *European centre for craft trades and SMUs — Report (Doc. 1-901/83) by Mr Deleau*  
Mr Moreau; Mrs Desouches; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Nyborg; Mr Narjes (Commission) . . . . . 244
7. *Results of Community sponsored R and D — Report (Doc. 1-931/83) by Mr Ippolito*  
Mr Veronesi; Mr Adam; Mr Pedini; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Moreland; Mr Narjes . . . . . 247
8. *Reactor safety — Nuclear fission technology — Report (Doc. 1-935/83) by Mr Galland*  
Mr Galland; Mrs Lizin; Mr Sassano; Mr Normanton; Mr Narjes (Commission) . . . . . 250
9. *Migrant workers — Report (Doc. 1-811/83) by Mrs Tove Nielsen and oral questions with debate to the Commission by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and others (Doc. 1-857/83) and Mr Frischmann and others (Doc. 1-861/83) and to the Council by Mrs Dury and others (Doc. 1-962/83)*  
Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mrs Gaiotti de Biase; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Ouzounidis; Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Adamou; Mr Remilly; Mr Buttafuoco; Mrs Dury; Mr Frischmann; Mr Eisma; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Ceravolo; Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Harris; Mr Richard; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Richard; Mr Enright; Mr Kellett-Bowman; Mrs Dury . . . . . 254
10. *Reduction of working time — Report (Doc. 1-909/83) by Mr Van Minnen*  
Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Van Minnen; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Van Rompuy; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Patterson; Mr Damette; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Eisma; Mr Brok; Mr Ingo Friedrich; Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Van Minnen . . . . . 266

#### Annex

Mrs Poirier; Mr de la Malène; Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Møller; Mr Alavanos; Mrs Castle; Mr Welsh; Mr Alavanos; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Nikolaou; Mr Eyraud; Mr Provan; Mr Kellett-Bowman . . . . .

#### IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN

*Vice-President*

*(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)*

Mr Curry (ED). — Mr President, I rise on an issue of very great concern to all the representatives of my country in this Chamber.

We heard that yesterday there was yet another trail of carnage wreaked — as it happens, in your country — by English football supporters. We would like it to be made clear to everybody in this House how much we deplore this appalling behaviour, which is such a discredit to the whole of our national life, and how much we hope that you will accept that it is a very small minority which is persistently responsible for it. This is the new barbarian invasion, Mr President. We wish to have nothing to do with it, and my group will be taking urgent action to see how we can make suggestions to our colleagues and friends in the

Community for curbing this sort of behaviour in the future.

*(Applause)*

Mrs Castle (S). — Mr President, I want to associate myself very strongly with what Mr Curry has said. We have been outraged to hear of the extent to which football fans from England — and I am asked by my Scottish friends to stress that they are from England — went on the rampage in Luxembourg. This shames us all and, like Mr Curry, I want us to give consideration as to how we can stop this happening, because I hope all Members of the House will agree that that sort of behaviour is not representative of our national character and our national conduct. We wish therefore to deplore it, to apologize to our colleagues from Luxembourg and to say that we will do anything in our power to stop this sort of thing happening again, not only in Luxembourg but anywhere that English soccer fans go abroad.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Let me thank our colleagues from the United Kingdom for their reaction. There has in fact been a lot of damage in Luxembourg and the cost runs into million of francs. There have also been victims, including some with serious injuries.

I have taken note of what the honourable Members have said. I am delighted at your words, Mrs Castle and Mr Curry, and I shall pass them on to the people of Luxembourg. I shall endeavour to see that they are reported in the Luxembourg press and you may rest assured that the people of Luxembourg will not judge the sporting, political and social behaviour of the British by the actions of a few.

*(Applause)*

### 1. Approval of Minutes

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

Are there any comments?

**Mr Arndt (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, page 17 of the German version of yesterday's minutes indicates which amended texts of the Commission regulation were adopted. By mistake, however, the text of the withdrawn Amendment No 7 has been printed and not the text of Amendment No 78, which was the compromise amendment by the Committee on Budgets. The German version should read *sollen vorrangig* instead of *müssen vorrangig*.

**President.** — Thank you for pointing it out. The matter will be attended to.

**Mr Sieglerschmidt (S).** — *(DE)* This is about the Socialist Group's question on the exercise of voting rights by Community citizens who live in other countries. I have just heard that, contrary to what Mr Pflimlin said from the Chair yesterday, the Council will not be available today to answer this question. In the circumstances I simply want to state — and I trust that I have the full backing of the House on this — that it is high time, and I mean during this sitting today, that we took a look at this matter which affects so many Community citizens who would like to vote but who as things stand at the moment are not going to be able to exercise their right to vote in June 1984.

If there is going to be any point to all this and if Parliament wants to avoid making a laughing-stock of itself, this matter has to be discussed in December and in my opinion there must be time for it then. I endorse what Mrs Castle said yesterday, that Parliament considers matters of worldwide importance, from North to South and from East to West, but here we are dealing with our own affairs, Mr President, and I would ask you to make every effort to ensure that the enlarged Bureau finds room for this item on the agenda for the December part-session.

**President.** — Mr Sieglerschmidt, I shall see to it that the matter you have raised is put to the enlarged Bureau with the necessary emphasis.

**Mr Collins (S).** — I refer to yesterday's announcement by Vice-President Mr Pflimlin that several oral questions — one by myself, one by Mr Johnson and others, too — were to be taken off the agenda because the President-in-Office of the Council could not be here. Now, Mr President, the reason I raise this is that, for example, Mr Johnson's question was down for debate last month and had to be taken off because the President-in-Office could not be here. It is off again, because again the President-in-Office says he cannot be here. I appreciate that Environment Ministers and Presidents of Councils have a great many meetings, but I would urge the Bureau to take this up with the Council at the earliest possible opportunity so that we know well in advance when these debates will take place. They are not irrelevant. They are not unimportant. They are very important, very central, to the work of the Community and of this Parliament and it really is quite indefensible for us to be pushed around like this. I make the point because, for example, in the case of Mr Johnson's oral question and of my own, we were originally told that the President-in-Office would be here on Thursday, then we were told he was going to come on Friday, then we were told he was not coming until Thursday after all, and that he would then be going away at 5 o'clock. Now this is no way to treat the Parliament and I implore the Bureau to open discussions with the Council on this matter as soon as possible.

**President.** — Mr Collins, I am of your opinion and we will see that the matter is taken up.

**Mr Johnson (ED).** — I merely wanted to say it would be of great convenience to me, and, I think, to our committee, if you could try to have those questions taken in December. Three times now we have been trying to get the Council to reply to them. It would be very helpful if it could find a moment.

**President.** — We will see to it.

*(Parliament approved the Minutes)*

## 2. TOPICAL AND URGENT DEBATE

### Grenada

**President.** — The first item on the agenda is the joint debate on five motions for resolutions on Grenada:

<sup>1</sup> Documents received — Texts of treaties forwarded to the Council — Referral to committee: see Minutes.

**President**

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1020/83), tabled by Mr Galland on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the situation in Grenada;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1032/83), tabled by Lady Elles on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on Grenada;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1042/83), tabled by Mr Habsburg and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on the recent events in Grenada;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1047/83), tabled by Mr Gérard Fuchs and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the situation in Grenada;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1058/83), tabled by Mr Fanti and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the United States' invasion of Grenada.

**Mr Galland (L).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in an outstanding article published in 'Le Figaro' on 28 October, our colleague Mr Edgard Faure gave his reasons for refusing to criticize the American intervention in Grenada as follows: 'Are we to take the view that the murderer of a Head of State should be protected by international provisions on human rights as soon as he takes his victim's place? Thirty eight years after the Nuremberg trials, he goes on, 'there is still no international legal body empowered to act against all those activities which might be described as 'crimes committed by States'. Violations can therefore only be penalized and checked by measures which have no prior legal authority. Intervention is not the exercising of a legal right, but nor is it directed against a legal right — it does not violate any law.'

Ladies and gentlemen, quite apart from this legal aspect, in situations of this kind we in this House, which is a symbol of liberty, must always ask ourselves the fundamental question — Do we want more democracy or less? That is precisely the question raised by the Socialist Group in paragraphs 4 and 5 of its motion for a resolution, considering that the people of Grenada alone should decide on their future government and calling for free elections.

What hypocrisy, ladies and gentlemen! Before the American intervention, was there the slightest chance of free elections in Grenada? Clearly not. Now a new process is under way in Grenada which will lead to free elections and a new democracy.

We want no political compromises and no demagogy. The Communists in their motion for a resolution, referred to the violation of international law and of the principle of self-determination. What callousness and what hypocrisy! Coming from you, that is really rich!

In Afghanistan there is less democracy — indeed, it has totally disappeared — but in Grenada there will

be more democracy. It is possible that a genuine democracy may be created. The disappearance of destabilizing elements and of the imposed Cuban ideology is a blessing. Freedom for the inhabitants of Grenada was a necessity, and that is why we are on the side of the democratic Caribbean countries and of the United States.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**Lady Elles (ED).** — There is an alarming increase in the number of wars in the world where through covert or overt operations the established order is being destabilized. One of the latest, to suffer from this type of event is Grenada — a Commonwealth country and a member of Lomé — and therefore we in this House have a particular interest and a particular responsibility. Back in 1979 Maurice Bishop overthrew the elected Prime Minister and headed the People's Revolutionary Government.

Opponents were imprisoned, the economy declined, but the real significance was that, on the whole, it appears that the population accepted this regime. It is not for us in this part of the world to impose a system of democracy anywhere else, but it is our duty to ensure that people have the freedom to choose the system which they themselves want.

But, last month, Mr Bishop together with three ministers and trades union leaders were killed in cold blood by the army, which declared it was setting up a provisional military government. It has been revealed, furthermore, that not only were there several hundred Cubans on the island, but also arms caches and that there was a Soviet/North Korean Agreement to provide at least 38 million dollars of arms to Grenada.

Six Caribbean countries including Barbados and Jamaica requested the US to assist in the joint effort to restore order and democracy. All these States recognized the strategic and geographical importance of the island in view, particularly, of its strategic position in relation to Latin America and as a springboard for activities in that part of the world. The Governor-General, Sir Paul Scoon, the only legitimate authority on the island, endorsed the request of these Caribbean countries. The US responded by sending troops, which, by all accounts, were welcomed by the islanders. This was not contrary to the UN Charter, as is sometimes fondly believed. The Treaty setting up the Association of Eastern Caribbean States declares that the States may take action for collective defence to maintain peace and security and fight external aggression.

There are now several urgent considerations. One, having restored order, with the Governor-General having appointed an advisory council to prepare for free elections, the US forces should be withdrawn as soon as possible. Second, the EEC should resume aid, if it has not already done so. At a time when every assistance to restore the economy and establish peace

Lady Elles

is needed, the Community should not fail in this regard. Third, there should be a European approach to these problems. The security of the Caribbean is not only of interest to the US but also to Europe. Also, we must recognize that there are about a hundred countries with small populations and poor economies which can only defend themselves through requesting external assistance. Those who criticize the external assistance given by the US should remember that four countries of the Community have troops in Lebanon with no legal framework for their presence. Their lives are at stake and the powers that they have even to defend themselves are limited. Moreover, decisions have to be made on the defence of freedom against Soviet expansion, whether it is direct or by means of surrogate forces such as the Cubans. Finally, we should not allow this even on any account to cloud relations between the European Community and the United States, on which, let us recognize, the security of the whole of the West is firmly founded. I hope that all Members of the House will support Amendment No 1 which has been tabled in the names of all four centre-right groups of this Parliament.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**Mr Habsburg (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, Parliament acted to its credit yesterday in speaking out by a clear majority in favour of peace achieved not through capitulation but through determination to defend freedom. This was the response of the representatives of the European people to those who still believe, as Hitler believed, that democracies are so decadent that a little push is all that is needed to bring them to their knees. It is regrettable that such an impression might have been created by certain members of this House. It is all the more important, therefore, that the majority was sufficiently substantial to allow no room for misunderstandings.

Today we are concerned with a different aspect of the same problem, that is with the question of whether solidarity exists among the free nations. For those not blinded by ideologies, the situation in Grenada was clear. Here was a small country robbed of its freedom through the collaboration of undemocratic and subversive forces and of an international hegemonistic power operating from Havana and Moscow. This posed a real threat to its peace-loving neighbours like Jamaica, Barbados, Dominica and St Kitts Nevis. The Governor-General at St George's, Sir Paul Scoon, appealed for help for his threatened people, not to the USA but to the Caribbean nations, which are associated with us under the Lomé Convention. These called for the support of the USA, since they are too weak to resist Castro's military might. Washington had to act to save Grenada's sovereignty and restore control of the island's affairs to its people, for the last American soldier will leave Grenada on 23 December.

It has been said that US support for Grenada is comparable to Soviet intervention under the Brezhnev doctrine. This is a preposterous statement which even those who make it cannot take seriously. The solidarity of free nations cannot be confused with imperialism of slave-owners. Decades later the Soviets are still in Budapest, Prague, Warsaw and Berlin — not to mention Afghanistan! The United States soldiers are going home after two months.

In view of this we as Europeans, who want a free and independent Europe and feel solidarity with those Europeans who are still separated from us by barbed wire and minefields, wish to say in this motion for a resolution that we are on the side of freedom and sovereignty for all peoples. We are no longer prepared, like the appeasers of 1940, to idly accept the expansion of totalitarianism. We feel solidarity with those who, like our American friends and allies, share our ideals. We are convinced that peace can only be preserved in the long term if all peoples — in Europe as well as in the Caribbean — are allowed the right of self-determination and if the totalitarian powers realize that acts of aggression will no longer be tolerated.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**Mr Lomas (S).** — Mr President, I want to make it absolutely clear at the outset that I condemn absolutely the murder of Maurice Bishop and his fellow ministers in Grenada. I was a personal friend of Maurice Bishop — I spoke with him only a few months ago in London. There is no excuse whatever for the brutal murder of Maurice Bishop and his ministers, and I condemn it absolutely.

Having said that, I must say that there is no excuse either for the invasion of an independent sovereign State by the United States of America. The excuses given, we now know, are totally specious and the invasion was planned for a long time before the murder of Bishop. The United States said that US citizens were in danger of their lives, and yet we know from other citizens there, including British ones, that there was not a shred of evidence for that claim. We were told that there was a huge Cuban armed presence on the island and that they had discovered a warehouse full of weapons. Now we know — in fact, some of us knew all along — that these Cubans were mainly workers on the airport, a civil airport, as well as a few teachers, and a few doctors, working with people of other nationalities there. This warehouse full of armaments was somehow supposed to be a threat to the United States and its client States in the Caribbean, as if a few hundred Cubans and one warehouse full of arms could be a threat to nations backed by the whole power of the United States of America! Of course there was a threat from Grenada! There was a threat because of the progress made in that island; a threat to those who want to go on exploiting the West



**Lomas**

Indian people; a threat by example, with a free health service, free education, the highest literacy rate in the whole of the Caribbean, and unemployment down in four years from 50 % to 14 %. Yes, that was a threat to the other countries who are exploiting their citizens.

The most impudent claim of all was that the invasion was to restore democracy. What, by bombing a hospital? By bombing a kindergarten? By destroying homes? By killing and arresting Grenadian citizens? By having this posturing, pathetic puppet of a so-called Governor-General, Sir Paul Scoon, whose first act to restore democracy has been to ban the New Jewel movement, to ban its publications, to ban all public meetings on the island and to impose a government without any consultation with the people of Grenada!

Finally, we are sorry that this resolution does not contain a word of condemnation or even regret at the invasion and the destruction and the deaths. It contains some good suggestions but, for the reasons I have just given, we in the Socialist Group shall abstain from voting on this resolution. We want to express our support today for the people of Grenada and to join with almost all the rest of world opinion in condemning the invasion, calling for the withdrawal of American troops and demanding freedom and democracy for the people of Grenada to decide their own future.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Johnson (ED).** — Mr President, is it in order for a speaker in this House to call the Governor-General of a territory associated with the Community a posturing, pathetic puppet? I would like you to consider whether that is in order.

**President.** — Mr Johnson, everybody in this House is personally responsible for whatever terms he uses. Other Members of the House may form their own opinions about the terms used.

**Mrs Poirier (COM).** — *(FR)* Mr President, a naïve observer might have thought that the invasion of Grenada, described as such by President Reagan himself, would have been roundly condemned by this House.

What kind of threat to security in the region, as one of the motions for a resolution puts it, could come from this little Caribbean island inhabited by 120 000 people defended by an army of a few hundred?

Now the American giant has decided to crush all semblance of independence in this small and weak country, as even the right wing of this House describes it. Yet there are those in this House who support, justify, and condone the aggressor, even though we are associated with Grenada by the Lomé

Convention, and even though this House itself is constantly preaching human rights to the ACP countries.

America's act of aggression is unjustifiable, and the exclusion of the press for several days is a telling indication that the American authorities had no wish to let the world know what was really going on.

Shall we pretend to believe that Reagan attacked Grenada in the name of democracy? Did the people of Grenada compel or ask him to invade the island? Shall we also justify this vicious and high-handed way of speeding up 'normalization', to use a term applied in one of the right-wing texts, for many other Latin American countries from Chile to El Salvador, where dictatorships have been set up and survive thanks only to Washington? Shall we tolerate the plans for intervention already drawn up by the United States with the help of Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala against Nicaragua? No, there is no doubt that stability and security in the region are threatened, but the threat comes from the US intervention measures. These have even involved massacres, which are justified in a callous — and I myself would say — servile manner by the motions for resolutions tabled by the right wing in this House.

We feel that the invasion of Grenada should be vigorously condemned and that we should be extremely watchful as to the possible consequences. The text put forward by the Communist and Allies Group calls on the Council to firmly condemn this act of aggression and to demand the immediate withdrawal of the troops sent to Grenada — which is what the General Assembly of the United Nations has voted in favour of by an overwhelming majority.

Everyone here must realize that if the European Parliament does not condemn this act of aggression it will be jeopardizing our relations with the ACP countries and indeed the very foundations of the development policy which it wishes to pursue with those countries.

*(Applause from the left)*

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, excuse me for addressing the House for a few seconds, but I would like to take the opportunity afforded by the presence of a group of visitors from Luxembourg to tell them of the statements made by Barbara Castle and Mr Curry a moment ago on behalf of the British Members, who have expressed their solidarity and sympathy with the people of Luxembourg and have condemned the acts of vandalism committed by a small group of hooligans in the Luxembourg capital following a football match. Sadly, such irresponsible elements exist in all the Member States and are not typically British. I would therefore like to pass on to the Luxembourgers present here the expressions of sympathy of the British Members.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Glinne (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, the Socialist Group will not be voting on the motions for resolutions tabled by the EPP Group, the Liberal Group, the EPD Group and the Group of European Democrats for a specific and fundamental reason, namely that their text, while making several pertinent points, is incomplete in that it fails to condemn the military intervention of the Reagan administration. We must be quite clear on this, because our respect for international law, which is of fundamental importance, cannot fluctuate in the interests of expediency and opportunism.

Military interference by one country in the internal affairs of another, especially when a big country acts against a small one, is always reprehensible, the more so since it tends to lend support to the idea that military action can be a substitute for diplomacy and political negotiation.

With regard more particularly to Central America, one cannot claim to support the 'Contadora' group, which is trying to promote a political solution to the problems affecting the region, while at the same time approving the principle of military intervention in Grenada.

Above all, this affair must not be regarded as a kind of practice run or exercise to prepare international opinion for other interventions of the same kind in Central America.

The Socialist Group has condemned and continues to condemn, first and foremost as a matter of principle, the continuing intervention of the USSR in Afghanistan.

For the same reason, we shall be abstaining from voting on the incomplete text before us.

**Mr Gontikas (PPE).** — *(GR)* Mr President, no one can condone force in any form, no matter who the perpetrator. This applies all the more particularly to us in this House, who have repeatedly recognized the inalienable right of States to national sovereignty, and the right of peoples to self-determination and have condemned the use of force in international relations.

However, ladies and gentlemen, in the case of Grenada there is an important difference. Although it still constitutes a legal basis of interference in the affairs of another State, the invasion has a legal basis. The intervention in Grenada is peculiar in that it was instigated by the island's governor, in the legitimate exercise of his authority in the country, precisely for the protection and preservation of that legitimate authority. It occurred with the concurrence, help, support and active participation of the countries which comprise the Association of Eastern Caribbean States, which is basically a defence organization.

Unfortunately, the fears of the legitimate governor of Grenada and the other representatives of the organization were justified. The discovery of secret military

fortifications, and of huge quantities of arms and equipment originating in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, the realization that the island's military equipment and telecommunications were under the control not of the Grenada authorities but of foreigners — Cubans in fact — justifies the concern of all those who said that Grenada was on the way to becoming very soon another Cuba or Afghanistan. Of course, and this is the sad thing, at the time when the invasion was being deliberately planned behind the scenes, none of us showed enough interest in Grenada to condemn what was going on there. The present justifiable interest of every free citizen in the developments in Grenada means that Parliament must take a decision, and it is for this reason that my group has tabled motion for a resolution No 1-1042/83.

The main points of this motion include the fact that democracy will be restored in Grenada and the call for every effort to be made to help the country overcome its economic problems. I do not believe that any free man can disagree that this Parliament has a responsibility and a duty, if it is to extend its well-established policy to this question as well, to take a stand on the Grenada problem, and to recognize that the successful intervention in Grenada has saved a country from a Communist strangle-hold.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**Mrs Veil (L).** — *(FR)* Mr President, for some days Grenada has been the focus of world attention. Attention has not been centred on the savage murder of its Prime Minister, Mr Bishop, by the revolutionary forces, nor on the coup which created a situation in which there was no longer any legitimate authority, but on the American intervention. The Governor himself, the representative of the British Crown, was powerless. Mr Bishop was almost unknown but appeared sympathetic to Cuba; none the less he was murdered for stepping out of line; perhaps he had tried to break away from Soviet/Cuban patronage to align himself more with the Americans. That was his mistake, for which he paid dearly. Deep down, some people may have thought that he got what he deserved — that is the way things are: in Grenada or anywhere else, things like that happen and are not given a second thought. But what has aroused the astonishment and disapproval, indeed the horror of the whole world was not all that, but the fact that the United States intervened at the request of the Governor-General and of the neighbouring islands to prevent the process from going beyond the point of no return.

The hypocritical chorus of lamentations and protests has been heard, while the coup, the murder, the arbitrary detentions and the presence of Cubans in workers' overalls rapidly transformed into soldiers ready for combat, have been forgotten.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

## Veil

No one mentions the cry for help from the Governor-General and his from his who were afraid that the revolutionary epidemic would spread to their islands and wanted to stamp it out while there was still time. The obvious intention of those who avoid mentioning this is the now familiar tactic of tarring the Soviet Union and the United States with the same brush and drawing a parallel between the situations in Afghanistan and Grenada. Just who is this comparison meant to fool? On the one hand we have a war in which for over three years peasants have been killed, villages have been wiped out and more than four million refugees have been forced to leave the country, a country which continues to refuse the system which the Soviets want to impose on it; and on the other, we have a country which has been subjected to a bloody revolution, with no legitimate authority capable of expressing its wishes or of restoring normal conditions. Admittedly, there has been military intervention, but this was called for by the country's neighbours, and the soldiers are already leaving the country one month after they came, since the situation has improved sufficiently for the Governor-General, whose authority has been restored, to begin the process of re-establishing democracy. We have every reason to hope that this process will be completed in the near future, whereas it is clear that if the US had not intervened, the people of Grenada would have been subjected for a long time to a totalitarian regime from which they would have had little chance of freeing themselves.

Of course, it is all very well to fight for certain principles when one is not oneself a victim of a dictatorship which may have a semblance of legitimacy.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

However, in Grenada all semblance of legitimacy had disappeared and in some cases we have to admit, sadly, that only foreign intervention can enable democracy to be restored.

As we know, democracies find it difficult to survive nowadays. There are only about 30 left in the world — including 10 in the Community which are sadly incapable of uniting to protect their rights.

A more serious question, however, is whether the democracies are not getting irretrievably caught in patterns of thought which prevent them from reacting appropriately, or rather whether they are not contaminated by spurious and cleverly insinuated interpretations of events which cloud their vision and numb their critical faculties. The problem of democracy is always the same. What means do we have at our disposal of defending ourselves against subversion, terrorism and totalitarianism, both at home and abroad? I am one of those who feel that the supremacy of democracy lies in its refusal to resort to practices which totalitarian regimes adopt without

hesitating, provided that the democracy in question respects its own principles. In any case, we have to know what we are talking about and should not speak of the violation of rights when no rights remain, only force and crime.

*(Loud applause from the centre and the right)*

**Mrs Anglade (PPE).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is easy to criticize the intervention of the US army on the island of Grenada, as it is easy to condemn any action considered out of context.

Before we speak of a 'coup' by Mr Reagan, there are certain things we should remember.

Firstly, the Governor-General of Grenada requested the intervention of the armed forces of Jamaica, Barbados and the US in accordance with the 1973 Constitution.

Secondly, the UN Charter recognizes the principle of collective regional security, and when the organization of Caribbean States, feeling that the security of the region was under threat, called for America's help, an ambassador was immediately sent to Grenada to decide on appropriate measures. American troops were sent to the island in view of the local situation. So much for the legal and diplomatic circumstances.

However, we should also consider the political situation. For four years the little island in the Antilles had been going through an experimental period under Mr Bishop. Mr Bishop's death on 14 October triggered considerable reaction in Cuba, despite the expressions of friendship by the new leaders. The ensuing internal disorder aroused the Governor-General's fears — and it is fortunate that it did so — that the situation would get much worse, and the island's neighbours feared that the situation could become irreversibly destabilized.

The discoveries made by the US forces showed how well-founded these fears were. When certain people speak of a 'coup', one wonders which coup they mean. They fail to mention the large amounts of weapons on the island, the astonishing number of advisers whose duties were not exclusively economic, the impressive military buildings with room for up to 900 men, the strategic installations and contracts signed with Moscow for the supply of arms. I think that these few examples are enough to convince anyone open to reason that US intervention in Grenada was entirely justified.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission.** — *(FR)* Mr President, I did not ask to speak before because the Groups are engaged in a purely political debate in which I would have liked to express my own personal views, but this is rather difficult for me as a Commissioner.

**Pisani**

However, since you have given me leave to address the House, I would first like to read the communiqué issued by the Commission at 8 p.m. on 26 October: 'The Commission is keeping a close watch on the situation in the Caribbean following the events in Grenada. It notes that in the absence of any frontier disputes an ACP country has been subjected to external military intervention. It remains convinced that the problems of the Caribbean, like those of Central America, cannot be resolved by military means but only by a political solution which respects the principles of non-intervention and the inviolability of frontiers.'

*(Applause from the left)*

In accordance with Lomé Convention II the Community has undertaken to support the Caribbean countries in their struggle against under-development. The Commission considers that this effort towards economic and social development is the only way to reduce tension in the region'.

To this I would add a comment which I made at a meeting of the Commission, namely that I had been in contact with Mr Bishop and was able to state that he was in the process of acquiring a firmer grasp of his country's economic needs and that he was involved in negotiations with us under the Lomé Convention which are likely to become increasingly fruitful. Doubtless that was the reason why he was killed.

In the light of the situation created by the events in Grenada, the Commission has decided to apply a theoretical freeze on aid granted under the Lomé Convention. I believe that this process involves two quite distinct approaches — the implementation of the decisions taken in accordance with the European Development Fund and the implementation of Stabex.

As far as the first point is concerned, the discussions of the Committee of the European Development Fund were recently suspended, although this cannot have serious consequences since relations will doubtless soon be resumed. I shall return to this point.

As for Stabex, the problem was more difficult, you will agree, since it was necessary to sign an agreement to transfer Community funds to Grenada, and in order to have a signature, it was necessary to have another party to the agreement. For a period there was no other party, and although the former Grenadian ambassador asked for the document to be signed, we were informed by the Governor-General that he was no longer in his post.

As soon as an administration has been set up as the legitimate representative of Grenada, the Community intends to see to it that completely normal relations are established with that country.

If, moreover, aid was requested on humanitarian grounds and if the most rigorous controls could

ensure that, as in all other areas, such aid could be of direct benefit to the people affected by these events, the Commission would consider making the necessary arrangements for granting the aid.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Christopher Jackson (ED).** — As the Commissioner repeated a Commission statement issued in October before several important facts were known about Grenada, in particular the request by Sir Paul Scoon, will he undertake to ask the Commission to review its statement as it now gives a misleading impression?

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) I shall not approach the Commission on this because I have never had any ambition to rewrite history ...

*(Cries from the right, applause from the left)*

**Lady Elles (ED).** — As I understood the question from my colleague, Commissioner Pisani, it was not to rewrite history but to write the facts as they are today.

**Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission.** — (FR) In the circumstances, and with some knowledge of the situation in question, the Commission was shocked by the fact that foreign troops had invaded an independent territory with which the Community enjoys normal relations and felt it appropriate to react as it did. Furthermore the text I read out is very largely based on the statements issued at the Stuttgart summit. There is no reason for the Commission to retract the text which it has published since everyone has the right to interpret it in the light of the circumstances in which it was issued.

**President.** — The debate is closed. —

*Vote*<sup>1</sup>

*Lebanon*

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on four motions for resolutions on Lebanon:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1040/83), tabled by Mr d'Ormesson and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on the attacks on French and American soldiers of the multinational force in Lebanon;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1043/83), tabled by Mr de la Malène and Mr Israël on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the bomb attacks in Lebanon;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1046/83), tabled by Mrs Lizin and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the situation in Tripoli (Lebanon);

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**President**

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1062/83), tabled by Mr Segre and Mr Denis on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the serious situation affecting the Palestinian people in Tripoli, Lebanon.

**Mr d'Ormesson (PPE).** — *(FR)* Mr President, after so many other victims, 297 American marines and French paratroops have gone to their deaths in Lebanon almost with a song on their lips. They were attempting to restore peace in that country with their bare hands. The faint-hearts of the free world insisted that the war in Lebanon was a civil war, but the truth is that that war serves first and foremost the interests of Syria, a country which is armed, aided and supported by Moscow. Its involvement in the murder of our sons, as in the murders of numerous diplomats and in the murder of Beshir Gemayel, is so obvious that Georges Marchais himself has been obliged to distance himself from Syria. If we take steps to punish these murderers and see that this crime does not go unpunished we shall be serving notice on Syria that it must leave Lebanon by a deadline yet to be established, failing which terrible punishment will be meted out to it. This open season for murderers must be brought to an end.

**Mr Israël (DEP).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, faced with the provocative terrorist attacks which have taken place in Lebanon and which have claimed so many victims amongst the members of the French and American contingents in the multinational force, as well as amongst the civilian population, we should, I think, take comfort from the reaction of President Mitterrand, speaking on behalf of the French Republic, and President Reagan, on behalf of the United States.

Nevertheless, it is difficult to avoid a feeling of dissatisfaction with these reactions, because we believe that they betray a certain degree of Western passivity, which is an inadequate response to the grave danger which terrorism in that region represents for the peace of the world.

We must ask ourselves what kind of terrorism this is. The terrorism with which that part of the world is afflicted consists, first of all, of the ideology of Khomeini, an ideology of death which, with a simple snap of the fingers, is capable of inducing men to commit suicide for the purpose of destroying other men. There is also the muddled ideology of Gaddafi, who thinks he can dominate the world with his two and a half million Libyans because he has control of considerable oil wealth and, consequently, weapons of death. But behind all that there is a prime mover, namely Syria, a State which has been fully and duly recognized by the international Community, a State

which is a member of the United Nations and which plays a decisive role in this terrorism.

Terrorism, Mr President is a three-stage rocket. The first stage consists of the Khomeini legions; the second stage is Syria. But the third stage is the Soviet Union, with its 7 000 advisors in Syria and its SS 20 rockets. Those SS 20's, in fact, give me grounds for saying that the rocket metaphor is an exact reflection of reality.

The truth is that the aim of this terrorism is to force the French and American contingents, which are the only guarantors of peace, the only guarantor for the West, to leave Lebanon.

But as I was saying, the greatest danger of domination comes from Syria, because we should have no illusions as to the political aims of that country. It wishes to annex Lebanon and erase it from the map. This same country is starting to attempt to destabilize Jordan by fomenting terrorism there and it is also attempting to eliminate Yasser Arafat. I shall not be the one to shed tears over the elimination of Yasser Arafat, but I think that the death of a clown is always a sad event and so if we stop to consider that Syria is in the process of eliminating Arafat this is an extremely serious matter, but what is Syria's purpose? Its purpose is to take the place of the PLO in the struggle to destroy the State of Israel and to unify the whole of the Middle East under the banner of Syria and Khomeini.

After that we shall see new tension arise in that part of the world between the Muslim fundamentalists of Khomeini and the Syrians, with their domineering ideology.

Faced with a situation of this kind, Mr President, what can our Community do, what can the international community do? There are not very many solutions. Armed intervention by the West in the region is out of the question. But political firmness and, above all, clear-sightedness, are possible.

At our modest level, clear-sightedness is what we must aim for. We must decide where the enemies of peace in the world are. We should never be in doubt about our target, and the motion for a resolution which we are about to vote on, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, attempts to cast some light on this trial of strength between the East and West which is taking place in Lebanon and in the whole Middle East, with an element of added complication which provides a natural justification for our duty to speak out.

**Mrs Lizin (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are all familiar with the situation in Tripoli, we are following from day to day, in pictures even, an organized genocide which is often reduced in press commentaries to a conflict between Arab factions that is of little concern to Europe.

## Lizin

The Socialist Group believes, on the contrary, that this conflict should give us urgent cause for concern. Firstly, because Europeans should never be indifferent to a massacre of civilians — and that is also what is going on — much less so when the massacre amounts to a case of genocide which has so many implications for the future of the Middle East, Europe and the world.

We should like to remind you that the departure of the PLO from Beirut was based on an agreement which guaranteed the safety of Palestinian civilians and the present genocide is one consequence of the failure to abide by that agreement.

The Socialist Group believes that the events which are unfolding at present will culminate in the resurgence of religious or political fanaticism, the resurgence of terrorism and Syrian expansionism. That may well be the price of Europe's silence if it permits force to carry the day. Only extremists can have any interest in seeing the extremists of the opposing camp triumph.

The only weapons available to us are diplomatic weapons, which is why we ask you to support this resolution which calls urgently for an initiative based on political cooperation.

**Mrs Cinciari Rodano (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President, I believe that this new tragedy which has struck the Palestinian people, the dramatic and bloody current events in Tripoli and this further massacre of civilians, including women and children, should make us think and 'use our heads' — I go so far as to say this, because I have recently had the impression that many of you here have lost the habit of doing so.

Those of you here in this Assembly who have lived through their own country's battle for independence and liberty, and have fought on their own soil against foreign occupying troops — I am thinking of the Italians, French, Belgians, Dutch and Greek — should be in a position to realize how hard and difficult the struggle must be for a people who have a battle for their homeland on foreign soil.

It is for this reason that the story of this struggle is punctuated with tragedies and massacres: from Black September to Tall el Zatar, Sabra and Chatila and today, Tripoli! It is for this reason that the struggle of the Palestine people has always had to be conducted on two fronts: against both the expansionist ambitions of the State of Israel and the attempts of various Arab States to use the Palestinian cause and the Palestinian organizations themselves for their own strategic aims in the region. This has made the task which Arafat set himself, i. e. that of defeating the extremists and abolishing terrorism, even more difficult.

If Yasser Arafat's attempt to make the PLO assume a full political and diplomatic role has not yet been successful, it is also the fault of the European governments which, in spite of their fine speeches in Venice in 1980 and in Brussels this year, have never really kept up with the facts, and have never even really recognized — not even, it should be noted, within the context of the Euro-Arab dialogue — the undeniable rights of the Palestinian people, and of the PLO as a political representative of that people.

Should the political representation of the Palestinian people, which is now assured by the PLO, disappear today, Europe would lose a valuable interlocutor — and not the 'clown' that Israel would have us believe!; the crisis in the Middle East would become even more tragically unmanageable and this would awaken the threat of serious international conflict. It has to be admitted, ladies and gentlemen: Europe is partly responsible for the tragedy in Tripoli. It is responsible because it abandoned its usual accepted role as an autonomous active presence in the Middle East.

Today, the Middle East situation is as explosive as a powder keg: the conflict between Iran and Iraq continues, and poses a threat as a destabilizing influence on other Arab States; in Lebanon, clashes and bloody terrorist attacks have recommenced, in spite of the Geneva Conference, and it is difficult to see how and when the foreign troops can withdraw. The Lebanon has become a tangled mass of contradictions; not only is there internal conflict, but there are also the ambitions of bordering nations to contend with, as well as the religious unitary policies brought in from abroad.

The military contingents sent by three European countries, so as to assure the departure of the Palestinian fighters and the protection of civilians in the camps find themselves playing an ambiguous role, where they are exposed to attacks, and where the situation is by this time completely different: following the possible unilateral initiatives from the United States, the European contingents could find themselves involved in a conflict of incalculable consequences.

We therefore renew our appeal to all of you here to find a negotiated and peaceful solution for the Palestinian drama and the Middle East problem, but we also ask the Ministers for Foreign Affairs united within the context of political cooperation to finally take courageous and autonomous decisions and to act, before it is too late, on their numerous words.

After 35 years of war in the Middle East is it really too much to ask that Europe should finally adopt a wise and far seeing political initiative?

## IN THE CHAIR : MR KLEPSCH

*Vice-President*

**Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S).** — *(NL)* Mr President, we all feel great sympathy for the Palestinian people — five million people who are wandering around and are turned out, threatened and homeless wherever they go. The history of the Palestinians is a tragic parallel to the century-long lot of the Jewish people. At present in Tripoli, Palestinian citizens, Palestinian soldiers and their political leaders are closed in by Syrian and Lebanese soldiers. Syria and Israel have recommenced their bombing activities and once more it is the innocent civilian population which will be the first to suffer. For us Europeans it is a point of honour to raise our voices in protest.

When the PLO and their leader, Arafat, left Beirut in September 1982, they did so in the context and with the guarantee of an international agreement. The European governments played a major part in bringing about this agreement and now bear the moral and political responsibility for seeing to it that this agreement is in fact respected as regards, among other things, the safety of the Palestinian citizens and their leaders. We must speak out against any attempts to eliminate physically the autonomous political representation of the Palestinian issue from the political stage. After the murder of Naim Kadir and Issam Sartawi the life of Yasser Arafat is now threatened. He is undoubtedly one of the people who must be involved in the talks and is the political representative of the Palestinian cause. Will it be in our interests if the PLO, which we recognized in Venice as being representative of the Palestinian cause, should no longer be represented in a politically responsible and autonomous fashion?

All the European governments played a decisive part in the Beirut agreement. We must take further steps and get the international initiative moving once more. Above all, we must not fan the flames. States involved in the multi-national forces must adhere strictly to their role as mediators. They must not take sides.

**Mr Fergusson (ED).** — Mr President, my group shares the deep concern of this entire House at the outrages against the French and American peace-keeping forces in Lebanon, which we wholeheartedly join in deploring. We entirely understand the deep feelings and the great sense of responsibility behind Mr d'Ormesson's joint resolution which, I think, is the one most likely to be adopted later on.

We do not pretend, of course, to be able to look any further ahead or to have any particular knowledge which others do not have about the way events in

Lebanon are now going to go. But we do have two difficulties in supporting every aspect of this joint resolution. For one, we are not convinced that any hint of an indefinite commitment by outside forces from America, France and Britain to stay there is very useful. More significantly, we would not agree that the punishment, appropriate or otherwise, of those who have tried to stir up more trouble by the largescale massacre of peace-keepers is a high priority — if, indeed, such punishment is feasible at all — or that it would contribute to defusing what is probably today the most dangerous single crisis in the entire world. On the contrary, though no one can question the right of peace-keeping forces to protect themselves or their need to ensure security, we would emphasize before all else the necessity for the utmost restraint by them in the face of the utmost provocation. No retaliation, no punishment is possible in such a case without further high risk to innocent civilians. Any such action by a peace-keeping force — and who else could do it? — is to risk being drawn further into a conflict which has no clear solution and becoming part of the problem itself. We can leave that to the Syrians whose contribution to Lebanese happiness has been so conspicuously absent over these last years.

**Mr Baillet (COM).** — *(FR)* Mr President, the tragic events taking place in Lebanon are highly disturbing and give cause for deep and justified concern.

A few days ago the bomb attacks on the French and American troops belonging to the multinational force highlighted the seriousness of the situation in this part of the world. This multinational force, which was sent to Lebanon at the request of the Lebanese Government, has no other aim than to protect the civilian population and to see that massacres such as those of Sabra and Chatila are not repeated.

This is what the French President emphasized only last night during a television broadcast.

Once again we condemn these attacks unequivocally. But, for some days now attention has been concentrated on North Lebanon, on Tripoli. A group of Palestinian dissidents, enjoying the direct support of Syria, has set itself the objective of destroying what is left of the PLO's military forces and has claimed a large number of victims amongst Palestinian women and children. The latest news suggests that the last refugee camp — the Baddawi camp — has fallen. One's conscience revolts in the face of such criminal acts.

The Palestinian people, whose history throughout these last three decades is one long martyrdom in the attempt to obtain the right to a territory, to a country of their own, must receive the active support of all peace-loving and progressive forces throughout the world.

**Baillet**

The Palestinian people's cause is a just and imperishable one. This is what Yasser Arafat said last Monday on French radio, quoting the example of other peoples who had fought to victory for the right to existence and independence on their own soil.

Today we can only repeat our full and entire solidarity with the Palestinian people and with the PLO and its leader, who has been recognized by the entire international community.

At the beginning of last week, on behalf of the French Communists and Allies, my friend René Piquet sent a telegramme to the President-in-Office of the Council, asking that the Ten should make use of the United Nations as a forum to arrive at political solutions to the tragic predicament of the Palestinian and Lebanese people. The contents of that telegramme are still valid. Time is running out, we cannot wait any longer, we must put a stop to this massacre.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Beyer de Ryke (L).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the events that have taken place in Beirut are not merely intolerable: they also raise a fundamental problem.

Over and above the question of bringing the perpetrators of these crimes to justice and punishing them appropriately, to quote the terms in which the matter was expressed in the resolution and those well chosen and fully justified terms in which the President of the French Republic expressed his views last night — in this respect I feel that I am probably more of a Mitterrandist than the French Communists, and certainly more than the Belgian Socialists — over and above the excellent terms in which these matters have been expressed, and in full respect of our own rights, there arises the question of defining the terms of reference of the multinational force. If these terms of reference are confined to sending soldiers out to Lebanon, and leaving them penned up in their barracks, sitting targets for acts of terrorism and victims of these same acts, there is no doubt at all that public opinion in our countries will not accept such a situation for long.

The true objective of the multinational force must consist in restoring — an objective which this Parliament moreover, has never ceased to proclaim and to call for — the unity of Lebanon by restoring the authority of its legally elected government. On many occasions Parliament has called for the withdrawal of all foreign military personnel whose presence is not desired by the Lebanese government. The presence of a European force is only justified to the extent that it is helping to achieve this aim. But if we want to achieve this aim we must give our men — those of the Community — the military and political means with which to carry out their mission. 'Les hommes ne veulent pas mourir' is the title of one of Pierre

Henri Simon's books. We have no wish to see our men condemned to die and we have no wish to let them die, but that presupposes and requires that they should not be hampered by the fact that their terms of reference are too narrowly defined with the result that they are paralysed. Let them adopt, and let them be authorized to adopt, the motto of Marshal de Lattre de Tassigny: 'Ne pas subir'.

**Mr Kallias (PPE).** — *(GR)* On a point of order, Mr President. When I signed the motion by Mr d'Ormesson which bears my name it did not yet contain paragraph 4 relating to Syria. I am obliged to point this out.

**Mr Pisani, Member of the Commission.** — *(FR)* Mr President, I am sorry that Mr Israël, when he addressed the House on the question of Mr Yasser Arafat, should have said that the death of a clown was a sad death.

*(Applause from the left)*

In my opinion, the death of any adversary, the death of any man during combat, is a sad death. Should Mr Yasser Arafat die in battle, struggling for the independence of his country, his death would be a sad death, but it would not be the death of a clown: it would be the death of a fighter.

*(Applause from the left)*

Secondly, I should like to say that the Commission has reacted very forcibly to the terrorist attacks against the American and French peace-keeping forces in Beirut. The Commission considers that, apart from the immediate evil which they cause, such attacks run the risk of making the achievement of peace in this region, the instability of which is threatening the entire world, even more difficult than it has been in the past.

In addition, the Commission finds itself fully in agreement with the statement issued on 9 November by the Member State governments of the Ten, which I should like to read out to Parliament in case any of you are not familiar with it:

The Ten are deeply preoccupied by the hostilities taking place at present in northern Lebanon and which are causing intolerable suffering and considerable loss of human life, particularly among the civilian population of the region, both Palestinian and Lebanese.

The Ten, who have on many occasions manifested their opposition to the use or the threat of the use of force in Middle East, appeal to all parties concerned for an immediate cessation of hostilities and for reason and moderation to prevail. As if there were not sufficient reason already, this renewed outbreak of violence renders more necessary than ever the urgent search for a negotiated solution to the problems of the region, in accor-



**Pisani**

dance with the principles that have been stated in the declaration of the European Council of 29 June 1982 and in subsequent statements. In particular, self-determination for the Palestinian people, with all that this implies, remains a key issue which must be addressed in the context of a global, just and lasting settlement of the conflict.

Should I be permitted to make a comment on this declaration, I should try to say, in objective terms, what the global solution consists of. In the opinion of the Community, it involves three aspects which are inseparable from each other. The first is the question of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, a right which is acknowledged in the communiqué. The second aspect is the question of reconstructing Lebanon itself and restoring its territorial integrity and its sovereignty. The third aspect is the right of all countries in this region, and, in particular, Israel, to security.

If I were to give my personal reaction to the situation in this region, I should say that if anyone were to say to me that he intended to base the future of this region of the world on the elimination of the State of Israel I should reply to him that he would be entering upon a hundred years war. But if someone were to come to me and say that he intended to base the future of that region on the non-recognition of the Palestinian people I should likewise reply that he was entering on a hundred years war.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The debate is closed.

*Vote*<sup>1</sup>

**Mr Israël (DEP).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, with his usual courtesy but with great insistence Mr Pisani latched on to a word I used when I spoke. What I said was that I should not be sorry at the death of Yasser Arafat, but I do have some feelings and I felt that it was always sad to see a clown come to a sticky end and to get himself killed in the middle of his own men.

*(Mixed reactions)*

I would ask Mr Pisani to consider that we may be moved by exactly the same feelings: an opponent who gets himself killed is an opponent, but a human being. The only thing is that in the particular case of the person we are talking about, there is some doubt whether he is, as you described him, Mr Pisani, a real fighter, and I am sorry to say ...

*(Mixed reactions)*

... that Yasser Arafat, with the support of certain powers which people here seem happy to stand up for, has not always conducted himself like a freedom

fighter but has used methods which are unacceptable in a civilized society. It was for this reason that I spoke about a clown and I do not think that Mr Pisani, in this role as Commissioner for development, has any right to criticize a Member's words.

**Mr Albers (S).** — *(NL)* Just a word, Mr President. Can you have it recorded in the minutes that this was clearly a statement by a clown?

**President.** — Mr Albers, I think we should try to keep any personal remarks here within the bounds of reason.

### *Cyprus*

**President.** — the next item is the joint debate on three motions for resolutions on Cyprus:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1067/83), tabled by Mr Fanti and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the proclamation of an independent Turkish Cypriot State;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1068/83) by Mr Bournias and others on the declaration of an independent Turkish Cypriot State;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1069/83), tabled by Mr Plaskovitis and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the condemnation of the unilateral declaration proclaiming the northern section of Cyprus an independent State.

**Mr Kyrkos (COM).** — *(GR)* Ladies and gentlemen, Mr President, the day before yesterday the Turkish-Cypriot sector, which was seized by invading Turkish forces in July 1974, declared 'independence'.

This is yet another *coup d'état* aimed at destroying the unity and independence of the Republic of Cyprus, which is a Member State of the United Nations. It is an act which enshrines force in the style of Attila the Hun as the rule in international relations, thus making a mockery of the principles of international law, and we should not forget that this latest Turkish recourse to high-handed action and *fait accompli* has made nonsense of the UN Secretary-General's efforts to find a solution through dialogue between the two communities, an initiative which was supported by the Greek Cypriot side, just as some progress was being made.

Some speakers here in this House have referred to Munich, so let us look at Munich, ladies and gentlemen, and at the Hitlerian mentality and the Hitlerian tactics of *fait accompli* and annexation. This should be a warning to us of the serious consequences which the Turkish *coup d'état* will have for peace in Cyprus and the region as a whole, for the peaceful existence of the two communities and the possibility of a peaceful solution to the Cyprus question unless, as a result of world-wide protests, this decision is immediately reversed.

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

## Kyrkos

We of the Communist and Allies Group will vote for the joint motion which has been laid before the European Parliament, in order to express our total condemnation of this latest *coup d'état* which was carried out with the blessings of Ankara, and ask the EEC Council and the Member States, especially the United Kingdom, which is a guarantor power, to take the most effective steps to nip in bud this venture, which has been undertaken by the Turkish-Cypriot leadership with the support of Ankara. For the moment I do not wish to go into the responsibilities of the United States and NATO, or the need for the Turkish occupying forces to withdraw immediately.

I should like to express the hope that all the parliamentary groups will be unanimous in their implacable condemnation of this affront to international law.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Bournias (PPE).** — *(GR)* Mr President, as you know, for 10 years now Turkey, a member of the United Nations, has persisted, in the name of so-called constitutional legality, in criminal action against a free, democratic country, the Republic of Cyprus. I say persisted since the crime has been repeated with the recent proclamation of the occupied northern portion of the island as an 'independent' Turkish-Cypriot State, with the leader of the Turkish-Cypriot community, Denktas, as its head, in violation of and total contempt for international law and international agreements.

Mr President, just as Turkey — who, together with Greece and the United Kingdom, is a guarantor of Cypriot independence — violated international law and invaded the island in 1974, so it has now ignored constitutional order, and the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations, the Council of Europe and the other international organizations which condemned the invasion and the occupation of more than a third of Cypriot territory, and instructed its *Gauleiter* on the island to declare the Turkish Cypriot community an independent State, the day after the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr De Cuellar had taken a very positive initiative which was accepted by the governments of Cyprus and Greece and approved by international opinion.

As was expected, all the groups in Parliament condemned this unlawful and impertinent act in the joint motions which we are now discussing, and it is doubtful whether the government of any free, democratic country, unless it has religious ties with Turkey, will recognize this second *fait accompli*, which disrupts the international order and threatens peace and will add another thorny problem to the already explosive situation in the Middle East.

The United Nations are now discussing this latest Turkish *coup d'état* and it is certain that this partition of the island, of which the governments of the 10

Member States and the Commission have already expressed their disapproval, will have no legal consequences.

Parliament, Mr President, has shown in the joint motion before us that it realizes it is fighting for and defending justice and international law.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Plaskovitis (S).** — *(GR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a series of resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations since 1974 have reiterated the demand of the whole international community for the withdrawal of the Turkish forces which in July 1974 occupied 40% of the area of the independent Republic of Cyprus and expelled 200 000 Greek Cypriots from their homes.

Turkey ignored all these resolutions and has high-handedly and illegally continued to occupy this part of the Republic of Cyprus for almost 10 years. A puppet government has in this section of the island under the hireling Denktas been trying ever since to undermine the unity and independence of the Republic of Cyprus.

It is obvious that without the protection of the Turkish occupying forces, Mr Denktas and his associates would not have been able to act as they have done all these years and fundamentally refuse to accept any sort of dialogue between the two communities. Such a dialogue could have provided some sort of peaceful solution to the island's tragic problem, for it is self-evident, ladies and gentlemen, that when one interlocutor holds a gun and the other is unarmed, no dialogue is possible.

Meanwhile, under the pressure of international opinion, a major initiative by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr De Cuellar, was recently announced, with the aim of encouraging understanding between the Turkish-Cypriot community and the Cypriot Government. This initiative was accepted without reserve by both the Republic of Cyprus and the Greek Government. This was the precise moment chosen by Mr Denktas, with the assistance of the generals who are keeping Turkey under their dictatorship as always under the armed protection of the Turkish invasionary forces, to declare a second *coup d'état* and proclaim the occupied territory an 'independent' State. His purpose and the purpose of his protectors is precisely to thwart the new peace efforts conducted by the Secretary-General of the UN.

I believe that Mr Denktas's treacherous plans will fail in the face of the sense of outrage in all the international organizations, the declarations by the governments of the 10 Member States of the Community and by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and the more general indignation of international

**Plaskovitis**

opinion and the international community at this crude violation of international law, which directly threatens the peace of this part of the Middle East.

Mr President, I believe that this joint motion, arrived at by all the political groups of the European Parliament, is in line with the preceding statements of condemnation, and so makes it possible for the European Parliament unanimously to express its condemnation of this provocative and unlawful act committed by Mr Denktas, and the imperialists who protect him.

For these reasons the Socialist Group and Pasok will naturally vote for this joint motion.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Glinne (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, the Socialist group condemns the declaration of independence issued by the Turkish authorities in Cyprus firstly because of its unilateral nature. The procedure which has been adopted is quite unacceptable. In addition, and above all, whatever the attempts at self-justification which accompanied this step, it has considerably complicated the Cyprus problem and will increase the tension which is envenoming Greek-Turkish relations and is aggravating the situation in the entire eastern Mediterranean.

The Socialist Group believes that this unilateral declaration will not facilitate a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus problem in any way and it expresses its firm belief in the fundamental principles underlying the resolution adopted last May by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Our group is looking to the process of political cooperation amongst the Ten and the governments of our Member States for an assurance — expressed in the clearest possible terms — that they will not give official recognition to the *fait accompli* in Cyprus and that they will inform the government in Ankara of their opposition to the decision, taken perhaps in haste or in collusion, by which the Turkish authorities have expressed their recognition of this unilateral declaration of independence.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Herman (PPE).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we must condemn the unilateral declaration of independence by Mr Denktas and we must call upon the Council to adopt all measures needed to ensure that this declaration remains null and void.

This Parliament's Cyprus delegation, which I have the honour of being President of, was in Nicosia last week and was still there on Saturday. We had the opportunity to establish numerous contacts — open, free and close contacts — with all the political forces and the government authorities in the country, both in the north and in the south.

The main conclusion which our delegation came to as a result of this visit is that there is a genuine and deep-

seated desire, felt equally by the populations of the north and the south, for peaceful coexistence, if possible, within the framework of a single, federal State which would guarantee the safety and the separate identity of each of the two component peoples.

We were able to see that the most recent proposals put forward by the Secretary General of the United Nations have been favourably received in all political circles, both in the north and in the south.

This is why it is regrettable that the officially recognized government, motivated by considerations which are mainly tactical, should not have felt able to reply immediately and positively, without conditions or restrictions, to the proposals put to them to the effect that they should return to an inter-community dialogue.

It is also the reason why we must not hesitate to condemn Mr Denktas's unilateral declaration of independence, which bars the way back to dialogue and makes the creation of a federal, free and independent Cypriot State, the guardian of the higher interests of both populations of the island, considerably less likely.

*(Applause)*

**Lord Bethell (ED).** — Mr President, it is a real pleasure to be able to agree with all previous speakers, including Mr Plaskovitis and Mr Kyrkos, in roundly condemning the illegal act perpetrated by the Turkish Cypriot leadership a few days ago. It is a disgraceful act, as is the continuing presence of Turkish troops in very large numbers in the north of Cyprus. This is an aggression and something that we and the Friends of Cyprus, a British parliamentary group, have always condemned.

*(Applause)*

I emphasize that I speak here personally not on behalf of my group.

Turkey is in violation of the 1960 Treaty of Accession, and I congratulate the British Government on having called for a meeting of the three guarantor powers. We shall see what excuses the Turkish Government has to offer if it takes up this offer which it is treaty-bound to accept. One must, however, ask oneself, if it is prepared to break this Treaty, what other treaties it is likely to observe. I congratulate the presidency on having been so quick and efficient in calling representatives together in Brussels the day after tomorrow. I wish they had been so quick and efficient over the matter of the Boeing massacre, but that is neither here nor there.

The case for approving the financial protocol over Cyprus is now overwhelming. Two governments have been blocking this protocol for the past year on the understanding that Turkish Cypriots still had some claim on the Republic of Cyprus, but now that the Turkish Cypriots by their leaders and by their unani-

### Lord Bethell

mous vote in their elected assembly have washed their hands of the Republic and declared that they are on their own, then we must take it they are on their own, then we must take it they have no further interest in the funds that have been decreed and apportioned by this Community for the Republic of Cyprus. Therefore, let that protocol be approved in short order. I can see no reason for delaying it.

We are against the creation of refugee masses. We are against military aggression and occupation. We are against invasion, whether by an ally or by an adversary.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Adamou (COM).** — *(GR)* Mr President, when the Turkish forces invaded Cyprus in 1974, Ankara justified the invasion by claiming that it had sent in its forces to enforce the rule of constitutional law. Now that Northern Cyprus has been proclaimed an independent State, thus violating not only constitutional law but also in a very real sense the territorial integrity of an independent State, the Republic of Cyprus, which is a member of the United Nations, Ankara is the first to hurriedly recognize this pseudo-state, which it created itself with its puppets and its nine-year military occupation in Cyprus. Where does it find the nerve? We all know who stands behind Turkey.

Mr President, last week I was in Cyprus as a Member of the European Parliament Delegation for relations with Cyprus. I totally agree with the Head of our Delegation, Mr Herman. The details of the torment suffered by the Cypriot people during the nine years of Turkish occupation are shocking. Two hundred thousand Cypriots still live as refugees in their own homeland, uprooted from their homes and separated from their property. Two thousand remain missing. Lord Bethell is right in saying that the cause of all this is the presence of the occupying forces in Cyprus. The European Parliament decided to conduct an enquiry into the fate of the missing persons, but met with obstacles and resistance from Ankara. Now the situation will become unimaginably worse. Parliament will have to take an open stand and categorically condemn this dangerous provocation. It must call for the restoration of the territorial integrity and independence of a sovereign State, the Republic of Cyprus.

We hope that all of you here will reflect on their responsibilities and will condemn this Turkish *coup d'état* by voting unanimously for this joint motion.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Irmer (L).** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my group also very much deplores the fact that the chances of finding an equitable, lasting and peaceful solution to the Cyprus problem have been seriously jeopardized by the unilateral action on the

part of the Turkish Cypriots. People who prefer — like Mr Denktas — to resort to violence when faced with difficult problems rather than trying to solve them through patience and reason, do not contribute to solutions, but merely cause further complications. Anyone who does this in a region as rocked by crisis as the Eastern Mediterranean is playing with fire. The Liberal and Democratic Group therefore condemns this act and supports the joint amendment which has been tabled.

However, there is a positive aspect to the question. I am very pleased to note that the Greek President of the Council is no longer standing over there and saying, like he did a few days ago, that this business was no concern of the European Parliament. Only a few days ago, he was questioning the whole idea of European Political Cooperation, but now that we are faced with the problem for joint solution he is not here, thank God. Perhaps he has learnt that it is a question of European solidarity when we take up problems jointly here in this Parliament and discuss them.

We can well understand Greece's particular interest in this situation and we can assure all our Greek friends that they have our backing. We hope the Greeks will take note of this and stand by us in future in European questions which are matters of great concern to us.

**President.** — Mr Irmer, I must remind you that the President of the Council is unable to be present here today because of the talks which are currently being held for the European Community in Athens.

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I felt that your remark was intended as a reproach and I think you should ask Mr Irmer to apologize for his discourtesy.

**President.** — Mr von der Vring, it is a general principle in this House that each Member is responsible for his own utterances. It is my job to endeavour, in accordance with the wishes of the enlarged Bureau, to maintain a good atmosphere by not allowing every possible question on which opinions might differ to develop into a debate and I intend to abide by this principle. Should the enlarged Bureau decide to proceed differently in future I will act accordingly.

**Mr Nikolaou (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like, with your permission, simply to inform Mr Irmer that the President of the Council is in New York today to raise the question of Cyprus at the United Nations.

As regards political cooperation, the subject we discussed in this Parliament the day before yesterday was, as you know, discussed by Greece in the context of political cooperation.

**Mrs Anglade (DEP).** — (FR) Mr President, the event which we are commenting on today surprised us, as it surprised the entire international community. We should like to ask you all to cast your minds back a few weeks to the time when, here in Strasbourg, the Turkish Cypriot leader, Mr Denktas, appealed to the President of the Republic of Cyprus, asking him for a sincere discussion of the difficult Cypriot question.

Today we are informed that he has unilaterally declared the independence of a Turkish Cypriot State. What are his intentions? Does he think he can thereby solve the problem? Does he think he can improve the lot of a people who have been torn asunder for so long? If that his aim, I think that the measures he has adopted are, to say the least, ill advised.

The tormented history of the island has demonstrated that force has never settled anything. We can only therefore, deplore this unilateral initiative, which will merely serve to envenom the difficult relations between the two communities. The negotiations under the aegis of the United Nations are making very slow progress, but the complexity of the question justifies the slowness. The recent proposals put forward by the Secretary General of the United Nations and the resolution adopted last May by the General Assembly call for full respect of the territorial integrity of the island and for the withdrawal of the occupying troops. These are so many steps towards a new legal framework for the island and they should be taken.

The Group of European Progressive Democrats, which I represent in this House, joins with other Groups, Mr President, in condemning any form of unilateral action and hopes that the Secretary General of the United Nations will be listened to, and his advice taken with regard to the difficult negotiations which he has entered on. Only a negotiated solution which takes account of the interests of the two Cypriot communities will satisfy everybody and, in particular, all the citizens of a State which will finally be restored to full sovereignty whilst its citizens will enjoy newfound harmony.

**Mr Alexiadis (NI).** — (GR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, for every crime there is both the instigator and the actual perpetrator of the crime, the brain which provides the inspiration and the hand which does the deed. The instigator in this latest Turkish violation of the law and the international order is the winner of the Turkish-style democratic elections, Mr Turgut Ozal. The puppet Denktas is simply the agent.

Mr Ozal revealed his intentions on the matter as early as 12 November when, on being asked by a 'Times' correspondent in Ankara why, on the map of Turkey which constituted the symbol of his Motherland Party,

Cyprus was shown as part of Turkey, he replied that had Cyprus not been included he would have been blamed for leaving it out. Replying subsequently to the same correspondent who asked him if he was in favour of a declaration of independence by the Turkish-held sector of the island, he added that the Turks and Turkish-Cypriots had waited for a long time, and would now be justified in declaring independence. If this was not incitement for this latest Turkish *coup d'état* I should like to know what it was.

Fine-sounding phrases are often to be heard in this House supporting human rights or condemning the intervention of the Soviets, Americans, Cubans and others in Afghanistan, Poland and, now, Grenada. However, a deathly hush surrounds the Turkish crime in Cyprus, which has been going on now for 10 years, with thousands of people dead or missing and hundreds of thousands of refugees, the systematic destruction of thousands of years of cultural heritage, and defiant contempt for the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations.

There are also those who discern some progress towards a re-establishment of democracy in the dictatorship's familiar conjuring tricks. It depends on how you look at it, of course. In reality, the aim is for aid to Turkey to continue, regardless of its regime and regardless of Turkey's indifference towards the basic principles of justice and morality, just as long as it can carry out its role as protector of western civilization.

This latest Turkish *coup d'état* provides all of us with an opportunity to demonstrate that our struggle for human rights and against interference is sincere. Firstly, however, our censure of this Turkish *coup d'état* must be unanimous and categorical, and must have an effect on the recognition given to this new Turkish-Cypriot regime, which is as democratic as the military régime it replaces.

The Germans were indignant when the Greek Parliamentary delegation did not visit the Wall of Shame during its stay in Berlin. We condemn this omission, but what is one to think of the wall of shame which divides a whole island, not just one town, and at which the same sensitive democratic hearts merely express a degree of displeasure. As a Greek, I am very angry and bitter and feel the need to raise my voice to tell the world that the efforts of the criminal accomplices to the evil of our time to erase 3 000 years of history are doomed to failure. They are not going to succeed. Greece is eternal and so is Cyprus.

**Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED).** — Mr President, I was sorry not to be able to join Parliament's delegation to Cyprus last week, but from the accounts that I have received of it, it seems clear that the gap between the views of the Greek and Turkish communities still remains virtually unbridgeable.

**Dame Shelagh Roberts**

Solutions could be found to such matters as the reallocation of land in percentage terms and compensation for property destroyed or taken over, but the really intractable problem still remains the key issue how one should constitute a federal State for Cyprus which would be acceptable to two very different communities.

I am bound to say that, given the history of independent Cyprus from 1960 to 1974, it is difficult to blame the Turkish Cypriot community for never again wishing to be a minority within a unitary State.

I think that we should show some sensitivity to their view that any solution must be based on genuine and enforceable safeguards for both communities.

Members of this House will know the history of Cyprus since Independence. Perhaps they need to be reminded that the Turkish intervention resulted from the coup by Nicos Sampson with the full support and encouragement of the Greek junta. Members perhaps should also be reminded of just how effective the economic blockade of the north has been since then and should show some sensitivity to this also.

*(Applause)*

I and many of my colleagues deeply regret the decision of the Turkish Cypriot community to declare total independence, whatever the pressures that were put upon them. I support the joint amendment. I do not believe that the action of the Turkish Cypriot community, nor the attitude of the Turkish Government, has helped in any way whatever towards finding a solution, but there is at least some hope, Mr President, in that both communities in Cyprus wish to be part of the European Community. Let us hope that the action which has been taken however regrettable, will at least lend added urgency to the work of the three guarantor powers and the United Nations to find a solution to the problems of this unhappy island.

**Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission.** — *(DE)* The Commission firmly condemns the unilateral declaration of independence by North Cyprus and we must demand that it be withdrawn. The Commission condemns the violation of existing treaties and United Nations resolutions and as far as the Community is concerned President Kyprianou's government is the only legal government of the Republic of Cyprus.

*(Applause)*

The Commission will continue to pursue the objectives of the Association Agreement with the Republic of Cyprus. The Second Financial Protocol has been mentioned in this debate. This protocol has been signed and has entered into force. It will be implemented in cooperation with the Government of the Republic of Cyprus. The Commission will give its full

support to the efforts of the Secretary-General of the United Nations with a view to finding an equitable and lasting solution to the Cyprus problem.

**President.** The debate is closed.

*Vote<sup>1</sup>*

**Mr Irmer (L).** — *(DE)* I have just asked to speak again because I wanted to make it clear that I was not criticizing the fact that the President-in-Office of the Council is not here today. Quite the opposite. I would be crazy to do so because I know he is busy. I only wanted to say that I am convinced that, had he been here, he would not have spoken as he did a few days ago but would have heartily welcomed the fact that we are all concerning ourselves with this problem. If there has been any misunderstanding about what I said before, I should like to offer my sincere apologies to the House.

**President.** — That would seem to clear the matter up.

*Shipbuilding industry*

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on two motions for resolutions on the shipbuilding industry:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1031/83) by Mr Fergusson and others on the shipbuilding industry;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1051/83), tabled by Mrs Théobald-Paoli and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, on shipbuilding policy.

**Mr Fergusson (ED).** — Mr President, there is probably nothing which distinguishes the shipbuilding area of Scotland, which I represent, from others in terms of despair and worry about the future except, perhaps, in one important respect. On the Lower Clyde, where unemployment stands now at over 20 %, and where, if the principal shipyard remaining there were to close down, it would be likely to rise to over 40 %, there exists a deep, morale-sapping suspicion, amounting to a conviction with which I would not quarrel; and it is that, although all shipbuilding countries tend to aid their shipbuilding industries in times like these — perfectly legally — in order to keep them going, the amount of illegal, unfair support, given in many indirect ingenious ways elsewhere in the Community, and still worse in the newly-industrialized countries, is far greater than in Britain itself. Yes, it is common for Member States to complain that others are breaking the rules while their own governments stick to them — possibly I am doing that again — but what should be equally

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**Fergusson**

common is a genuine belief that the international rules and limits during a recession as fierce as this one is.

As paragraph 2 of my resolution emphasizes, immediacy is quite as important as rigour in the enforcement of these rules but it is the crucial point at a time when shipbuilding orders are so few, when there are so many to tender for them, and when the temptation to cheat is so great. When a single order, of a single ship, will make the difference between a critically serious condition and one which is terminal, and when a country's manufacturing base is in danger of total destruction, it is not amazing that measures beyond the legal are taken. But when an unfair action by one State robs another of a shipbuilding order, shipyard workers know that no amount of reorganization, or manpower cuts, or pay restraint, will make any difference to their survival.

The Commission should be in no doubt what unfair aids in so socially sensitive an area as shipbuilding do to the respect which people can hold for the Community itself. Since a shipyard will buy in up to three-fifths of its production from outside, the devastating effect of a shipyard closure reaches far beyond that shipyard's own fences. For that reason, conviction that competition is fair will raise morale vastly and we await the Commission's assurance that it will act along the lines put down in my resolution and we will then do what we can, in our turn, to support the Commission itself.

**Mrs Théobald-Paoli (S).** — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to thank the Bureau for having grasped the seriousness of the situation in the shipbuilding industry. I can see that the gravity of the situation has been keenly felt by all the political groupings represented in this House. The criterion for deciding which cases are more urgent than others is anguish, the anguish of those who risk their lives in armed conflict, those who have been deprived of freedom, those who are victims of all kinds of attacks on their liberties — excuse me, attacks on human rights.

Thank you for not forgetting the anguish of those who run the risk of losing their jobs.

The heavy shipbuilding industry in Europe, Mr Fergusson, is really on the edge of the abyss. If immediate steps are not taken to modernize the European shipbuilding industry rapidly we shall witness the inexorable decline and obsolescence of the European merchant fleet. For six months now no Member State of the Community has received an order from another Member State. So the domestic market for the European shipbuilding industry has virtually ceased to exist.

Faced with competition from other shipyards, in particular Far-Eastern ones, which are fighting implacably

to obtain new orders with the benefit of direct government aid and working conditions and social security arrangements which would be unacceptable in our societies, it is our imperative duty to save a strategic European industry which is in great danger.

Let us launch a European offensive. At this very moment, when this House is beginning to discuss the Albert-Ball report, I shall quote only one sentence: 'Every time nothing is decided in Brussels a decision is in fact taken to create more unemployment'.

I shall shortly have the occasion to submit a more complete report on the shipbuilding industry to this House. But, as of now, this motion for a resolution is a passionate exhortation to the Council and the Commission, calling upon them to take positive steps and to complete very rapidly the proposals which were submitted in March.

What is at stake is the independence of Europe and the jobs of thousands of Europeans who are waiting to be assured that the European Community is aware of their problems and is capable of implementing a forceful European shipbuilding policy.

Let us break this vicious circle of no-Europe, no-growth and no-employment by voting in favour of this resolution. Let us demonstrate to millions of European households, to our fellow European citizens, that their problems are not merely understood but have been taken in charge by Europe, Europe our only chance for the future.

**Miss Quin (S).** — I too am very glad that urgency has been granted for this particular debate and I would very much support everything that my colleague Mrs Théobald Paoli has just said. In answer to a question of mine yesterday, the European Commission said that there was time before the next shipbuilding directive was due to be brought forward to consider the problems of this industry. I would like to say to the Commission very strongly that there is not much time at all given the nature of the crisis facing the industry and that we need new positive proposals very, very soon indeed.

Shipbuilding in Europe has suffered a dramatic decline and both production capacity and employment were halved in the EEC between 1976 and 1981 and, as has been pointed out, many EEC shipyards are in the poorest and most disadvantaged regions of Europe. The EEC as a whole is losing out very dramatically to the yards in Japan and the Far East and production output this year in the EEC has been reduced from 17 % of world output last year to 11 % this year and for western European countries as a whole the reduction is from 26 % of world output to 16 %. I would urge colleagues to vote for the Théobald-Paoli text and I must say to Mr Fergusson that I find his own text very negative in its stress simply on reducing aid within Europe and not concentrating nearly enough on the real problem which is

## Quin

the competition that we in Europe as a whole are facing from the Far East. I do not believe his text does give much comfort to the shipyard workers of the various regions of Britain that he is concerned about.

The question is not ironing out competition within Europe, but safeguarding the future of the European shipbuilding industry in the world as a whole. I would like to say to the Commission that it should come up with positive proposals, firstly to find out the real nature of the competition in the Far East about which still too little is known, and about which the Commission has not been able to supply me with adequate information; and secondly to make a clear commitment to safeguard a certain level of European shipbuilding capacity in the future and have, at the very least, a baseload of Community orders going to Community yards in the same way as Japan has managed to safeguard its own shipbuilding industry through its own ordering. So this is what we want — a long-term survival strategy which will ensure that this vital industry does have a future.

**Mr Blumenfeld (PPE).** — *(DE)* As the previous speakers and the rapporteurs have quite rightly said, the European shipbuilding industry is facing a crisis and I should like to point out that the industry is obviously in just as much a state of crisis at national level — be it in Scotland, Belgium, Germany, France or elsewhere in the Community.

If we want to try to get problems under control and call on the Commission not only to clarify the situation — it is high time this was done — but also to do something about it, we must also examine the European aids which have been granted for years now in various different ways and often on a remarkably generous scale. And then there is the question of the GATT regulations? To what extent are they compatible with our own Community regulations? Then we must support the Community shipyards which are and will remain competitive, so that they can survive competition with countries in the Far East and elsewhere outside Europe.

There is no point in saying that Mr Fergusson's motion for a resolution, which we support, is too negative. It is an appeal to the Commission, which could have got this underway a long time ago — and I hope the Commission will understand this correctly. In view of the tens of thousands of shipyard workers in Europe who are faced with the prospect of unemployment and have lost all hope, action should have been taken long ago. This is therefore an urgent matter and we hope something will finally be done.

If the governments of the Member States are not prepared to make a sufficient effort, or indeed any effort at all, the Commission must step in in its capacity as a European Institution. However, if, as I might venture to point out, shipyard workers in Asia are putting in 60 hours a week, this does not consti-

tute dumping in the meaning of GATT regulations, but a situation which we will have to give some thought to in our own shipbuilding industry.

The Commission must structure the aids to the European shipyards over a period of time starting from now. These aids are intended to help the industry to adapt. Since we cannot go along with the principle of the closed shop, we cannot support certain aspects of the motion for a resolution by the Socialist Group. The Commission must do all it can to support the competitiveness of the European shipbuilding industry.

**Mrs Ewing (DEP).** — Mr President, may I say that I support both resolutions. I think Mr Fergusson's is really just an attempt to deal with an internal market problem, and does not go far enough, so we need the other resolution which is trying to deal with the outside world. We know what we are up against in terms of world competition. In common with many politicians in Scotland, I was invited as the sole representative of my party to visit Mr Fergusson's disaster area in the Lower Clyde. Just to put it into context, I do not think the Community can allow a 40 % unemployment rate with no alternative in any part of the Community. In case it should be suggested by anyone that there is a workforce here which is not dedicated, let me say that it has a good work record with the most modern technology, and let it be quite clear that any delay in meeting their recent order was due to the constant changing by designers of very advanced technology. The burden is simply too heavy for this area to bear. It must be one of the worst. There may be others hit as badly, but it must at least join those others in being something that this Community cannot tolerate.

First I shall look at the long-term question which Miss Quin raised: the world market place. We were always told that one of the advantages of this Community was that in the world market place we would be able to get fair dealing for our citizens. We are not getting fair dealing. I know Mr Blumenfeld referred to the number of hours per week, but we know that there are State subsidies, and that is partly why there has been the dramatic increase in the Far East's share of the shipbuilding market. We are not being fairly treated and we have to accept that fact, and deal more toughly. Secondly, in the short term we must eliminate unfair aids, but I think this is the time for giving more aid to disaster areas. It is in our interests to have our own fleets built in our own Community.

**Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission,** — *(DE)* Mr President, I am very grateful to this House for making another request for urgency on the question of shipbuilding following yesterday's Oral Question by Miss Quin, thereby giving us an opportunity of discussing this matter.



## Narjes

We share the concern at the situation of the shipyards throughout the Community. We are aware of the unemployment figures and the resultant problems facing the people, communities and regions involved. As regards the procedure and following on from the points made by Mr Andriessen yesterday, I should like to begin by saying that the 5th Directive currently in force expires at the end of next year and that the Commission intends to decide on its new approach by January at the latest and will then submit its proposals to this House without delay.

However, we must have no illusions as regards the situation at world and Community level. To start from the point of view of demand there was a nominal 40-fold increase in world trade between 1948/49 and 1980. This went hand in hand with a similar rate of growth in the shipbuilding and maritime transport sectors. However, world trade has been stagnating for the last three years and it is unlikely to achieve the staggering growth rates of the previous decades again. This has meant a clear reduction in the demand for ship capacity, and on top of this the emergency measures of the last three or four years in Europe and elsewhere have to some extent anticipated the future need to find substitutes, which also means that there will be very little to boost demand in the foreseeable future.

As regards supply, I might point out that substantial capacities are at present laid up and could be used at any time should the demand increase. I would also point out in this connection that there has obviously been a substantial increase in productivity in this system of transport which will continue in the future. All in all, there is clearly a problem of overcapacity not only in Europe but in the world as a whole.

Then there are the peculiarities as regards developments in competitiveness. Generally speaking it is medium-level technology which is involved in shipbuilding, which, as we have seen from experience, the emergent countries are perfectly able to cope with. There is a corresponding shift in the shares of the market in favour of the emergent countries, since shipbuilding is obviously wage intensive, and for this reason the only European shipyards which will be able to survive in the long term in competition with the shipyards of the emergent countries will be those which are particularly efficient and competitive from the technical point of view or can achieve this, which will not be all of them.

However, it should be pointed out — and I think too little was made of this point in the debate — that 60 to 70 % of a ship consists of components supplied from elsewhere and that for this reason it is not only the European shipyards which we must consider, but also the suppliers, and that an additional thing we must do is to ensure that the suppliers can continue to sell their goods to shipyards in other parts of the world and that we do not end up in a situation

whereby third countries which are potential customers for our supplies are given the right or the excuse to stop importing these products because European shipbuilding has been subsidized in accordance with GATT and the relevant international regulations.

Obviously we will take account of all these points when we come to submit our proposals, which I cannot go into in detail now as the Commission needs more time to complete its work on them. However, I should like to say for the benefit of those who have called for transparency that the Commission publishes a list of all aid to shipbuilding of which it has been notified every six months. Thus, all aid granted officially and notified to the Commission are made public.

However, we also know that certain people in this field have grave doubts as to whether the rules will in fact be observed, and this is where the Commission's real problems begin, i.e. there is a problem of determining to what extent the individual Member States depart from the rules in the shipbuilding and repair sector. There is a grey area which is one of the main reasons why the Member States have in the past taken up to a year in some cases to discuss in the Council of Ministers what line the Commission should adopt — and we hope this will not happen in the future. It is not enough for the Commission simply to submit sound proposals, the main thing is getting them through the Council.

Whatever the details turn out to be, what we should realize first of all is that aids can make the process of adaptation easier and help to make the most efficient shipyard more competitive, but can never replace or stand in the way of a process of adaptation as this would be in conflict with the general economic policy of the Community.

Secondly, we will obviously make a distinction between the Community's domestic market and our world market. However, the domestic market should not be confused with total protectionism — this would be getting completely the wrong end of the stick. The concept of the domestic market is based on the principle that Europe has an identity of its own but should not turn into a completely protectionistic and — if you like — closed state as regards maritime transport. This would not only be out of keeping with our international commitments, but it would not be in our own interests either.

There obviously remains the question of the state of the shipyard workers and regions which have been hit by this structural crisis. The Commission will do all it can to use the Social Fund, Regional Fund and other structural aids to ensure that the Committee plays its part in promoting transitional and adaptation measures insofar as they are unavoidable and to the extent that they are at all feasible in the Community.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

Vote<sup>1</sup>*Human rights*

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on four motions for resolutions on human rights :

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1010/83), tabled by Mr d'Ormesson and others on behalf of the Group of the the European People's Party (CD Group), on the violation of human rights in the People's Republic of Guinea ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1024/83), tabled by Mr Israël and Mrs Ewing on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the prison sentence passed on Yossif Begun ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1035/83) by Mrs Rabbethge and others on human rights in Zimbabwe ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1056/83/rev.), tabled by Mrs Péry and others on behalf of the Socialist Group and Mr Pedini and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on El Salvador.

**Mr d'Ormesson (PPE)** — *(FR)* In April 1980 a resolution submitted by Mrs Pruvot and subsequently adopted by this Assembly drew our attention to the long series of criminal acts committed during the presidency of Mr Sekou-Touré. And Madame Pruvot asked, in particular, what had happened to Mr Djibil Bari, an African married to a French woman and the father of two children, who had not been heard of since 1972.

Let me remind you that 19 of the 24 members of the 1971 Guinea government have been executed or imprisoned and, according to Amnesty International — the quantity of documents which I have been able to look at tests the veracity of this claim — this country also has a very high number of political prisoners.

In other circumstances, I might have been tempted to ask Parliament to terminate the agreements between Guinea and the Community. But I am aware, as a result of having been rapporteur last March for the fishing agreement, that President Sekou-Touré appears to have the intention of adopting more open and more equitable policies. His attitude at the recent General Assembly of the United Nations would suggest that he is moving in that direction. This being so, if we wish to see links set up between us on a democratic basis and if we want those links to be deserving of our confidence, the European Parliament must call upon the Guinea authorities to provide all the precise information we need on what has

happened to the persons who have been declared missing. Parliament must also show that it is determined to see that political prisoners receive fair trials in impartial and independent courts.

This is the import of this resolution, which I sincerely hope Parliament will adopt.

**Mr Israël (DEP).** — *(FR)* At a time when the peace of the world is threatened by the deployment of nuclear missiles and an equilibrium of terror is in the process of being established, at a time when peace in the Middle East is seriously jeopardized and humanity itself is in great danger, at a time when in Latin America dictatorial regimes threaten the freedom of everyone, at a time when in Africa other dictatorial regimes are in power, I rise in this House, Mr President, on behalf of Mrs Ewing and my political group, in order to draw the Assembly's attention to the fate of one man, a mere individual lost somewhere in Moscow. This man is called Begun and he is accused of teaching the Hebrew language and of having once asked for permission to leave the Soviet Union.

I am making this appeal because this man has been condemned to ten years' imprisonment merely for having taught a language which does not happen to meet with the approval of the Soviet authorities. Such a condemnation is a clear violation of human rights in the cultural sphere. Every man has the right to pursue whatever cultural activities he likes and this right is spelt out in full in the constitution of the Soviet Union. And so, the fact that a man should be condemned to ten years' imprisonment for that seems to me to be an extremely serious matter which our Assembly, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, has the duty to condemn.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Rabbethge (PPE).** — *(DE)* Some two years ago the late Louise Weiss, our then oldest Member, said that this European Parliament had gained considerable moral repute and that what mattered now was to translate this into political authority. We have gained considerable moral repute, ladies and gentlemen, not only in our own continent but also much further afield. Great majorities of this Parliament have spoken out for the Argentinian women of the Plaza de Mayo, for Solidarność in Poland, for those suffering persecution in Uruguay and for human rights fighters in Czechoslovakia. We have also spoken out for Sakharov and for trade unionists in Bolivia.

Now we must admonish one of the ACP countries. In Zimbabwe, Bishop Muzorewa has been arrested without being charged with any criminal offence. Neither his family nor his lawyers are allowed to communicate with him. The European Community is a partner of the ACP countries, and partners and

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**Rabbethge**

friends must be permitted — indeed, as I see it, it is their duty — to draw attention to errors which are committed. Zimbabwe must immediately release Bishop Muzorewa and a number of other citizens who have been arrested over the last few months under similar conditions.

We expect our Lomé partners to apply appropriate laws without delay so that we can look each other in the eye when we come to discuss Lomé III with the ACP countries.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Pery (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the facts are known, acknowledged and, unfortunately, too frequent. The conclusions of Amnesty International's latest annual report condemn the political murders committed in El Salvador by the paramilitary death squads, made up of members of the El Salvador armed forces and led by high-ranking officers from that same army. The kidnapping of the government's Economics Minister and leader of the El Salvador Christian Democratic Party, Mr Amilcar Martinez Argeta, who is accused of calling for a dialogue with the revolutionary democratic front, must be unequivocally condemned by our Assembly, along with the public threats which have been made against the life of Monsignor Rivera Damat, Archbishop of San Salvador. Such actions undermine the attempts being made by the representative political forces in El Salvador to find a solution to the country's conflicts through dialogue. We are all fully aware that the only way of ensuring that human rights are respected in this country is to set up a democratic government based on free elections.

I hope, ladies and gentlemen, that our Parliament will be unanimous in expressing its concern at the persistence of these serious violations of human rights in El Salvador and will demonstrate its determination by voting in favour of the motion for a resolution which I am submitting on behalf of the Socialist Group and along with Mr Pedini, who represents the Group of the European People's Party and who is chairman of our Latin American delegation.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Van den Heuvel (S).** — *(NL)* Mr President, I should like to make a few brief remarks on behalf of the Socialist Group concerning the motion for a resolution on human rights in Zimbabwe.

As I am sure you will realize, my group welcomed the arrival of the Mugabe government. The people of Zimbabwe voted in favour of Mugabe in free elections. His government is held in great respect and has opened the way for a future in Zimbabwe when the people will be able to live in peace and freedom and when Zimbabwe should be able to find solutions to the enormous problems facing it. We must accept the fact that as far as human rights are concerned we

cannot simply apply Western European standards. A constitutional state cannot be set up overnight out of the chaos of a post-colonial state where injustice and oppression were the order of the day. However, we are somewhat concerned at the current situation since the reports we receive would indicate that certain fundamental principles of rights and justice are at issue, and since my group wishes to take a different approach from that frequently adopted by those on the right of this Parliament — I am thinking, for example, of the voting on the annual report on human rights in connection with a number of ASEAN countries — we intend to vote in favour of this resolution in the hope that it will make our friends in Zimbabwe realize that we expect great things from them as regards the introduction of a constitutional state for the people of Zimbabwe too.

**Mr Pedini (PPE).** — *(IT)* Mr President, as representative of the Christian Democrat Party, I fully support Mrs Pery's speech, and should like to thank her. We have accepted this motion, which is tabled in the name of our Group.

Personally, and I wish to stress that this is purely personal, I will abstain from the voting on the motion on Guinea, hoping that Mr d'Ormesson will excuse me for doing so, for the following reason: Guinea is one of the countries associated under the Lomé Convention; any request concerning human rights which is directed to Guinea should also be directed to other countries which come under the same Convention. This is therefore a general problem. Furthermore, I cannot forget that President Sekou Toré presided over the Assembly and Conference of French-speaking countries, whose representatives met President Mitterrand, in Vichy, France, two months ago.

These are my reasons, Mr President, for supporting the Pery motion on El Salvador, and for abstaining from the vote on the Guinea motion.

**Mr Tyrrell (ED).** — Mr President, I would like to associate the European Democratic Group with the comments made by Mrs Rabbethge and to thank her and her colleagues for bringing the case of Bishop Muzorewa before the House.

The Government of Zimbabwe knows that it has many friends in the European Parliament — and I say this to Mrs Van den Heuvel lest there be any misapprehension — we are amongst those friends. But our concern has been rising in recent months and it has been intensified by the imprisonment of Bishop Muzorewa whom many of us know as a man of peaceful intentions. We hope that his release will be speedy.

**Mme Veil (L).** — *(FR)* Mr President, the Liberal Group will vote in favour of the resolution on the imprisonment of Mr Begun; on the other hand, it will abstain on the others. Not because it thinks that there

## Veil

have been no violations of human rights in Guinea, El Salvador and Zimbabwe, but because it considers that, in the case of these three countries, it would be preferable to have more complete information which could be looked at by the Committee on Political Affairs and the Committee on Human Rights, in particular in liaison with the Development Committee, bearing in mind the Lomé agreements. This is the only reason for our abstaining.

On the other hand, as regards Mr Begun, this is a specific case and, as for all specific cases which are urgent, we are perfectly well informed and we know perfectly well that he has been condemned to prison, under what conditions and for what reasons. Our vote will be part of a general expression of public opinion, for which, in any case, no further enquiries are necessary, but for which, on the other hand, the support of our Parliament may be useful.

**Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (DE) Mr President, the Commission has often stated that it fully agrees with Parliament that every effort must be made in all ways to ensure the respect of human rights. I shall not comment on any of the individual points which are being put to the vote here today. I just wish to say that the resolution which Parliament is about to adopt will be supported by the Commission in the way I have indicated.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

Vote<sup>1</sup>*Convergence of economic policies*

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-1008/83), tabled by Mr Adonnino on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on the convergence of economic policies.

**Mr Adonnino (PPE).** — (IT) Mr President, we have insisted on an emergency motion, because this is a very important issue, which will be discussed once again at the European Council in Athens, and on which the Parliament will have to express its own opinion.

It is laid down in Article 103 of the EEC Treaty that the economic policies of the Member States are a 'matter of common concern', and Article 145 states that the Council must 'ensure coordination of the general economic policies.' It is the Commission's task to put forward the most suitable proposals for the achievement of this objective.

On 18 February 1974 the Council, after receiving a favourable opinion from the European Parliament and

the Economic and Social Committee and on a proposal from Commission adopted a decision to bring about further convergence of economic policies, which is seen to be a crucial element in the gradual realization of an economic and monetary union. It is laid down in this decision that the Council of Ministers should, by acting on Commission proposals, issue guidelines on economic policy for each individual Member State and for the Community as a whole; these would be formal acts of a binding nature; it is stipulated that the implementation of the guidelines and the effects of the national economic policies should be monitored. The Commission's rôle is to perform this monitoring function with particular care and, where there is substantial deviation from the guidelines, to issue recommendations which can, if necessary, give rise to appropriate Council Decisions.

The Parliament has for years been aware of the fact that the operation to align the economic policies of the Member States is a failure. At almost every summit meeting, the heads of state and government have confirmed their political commitment towards the bringing about of greater convergence between their economies. The Commission President has informed the European Parliament several times of the judgements of the Commission itself, pointing out the need for measures to correct the widening divergencies between the economies of the Member States, and committing himself to promoting the resulting policies.

The Council of Ministers has, however, made no decision, and has merely made formal statements which have had no practical follow-up within the context of national economic policies.

Nevertheless, the Commission has not seen fit to apply the measures laid down in the 1974 Council Decision mentioned previously with the necessary degree of determination, and has not therefore brought to bear sufficient political pressure on the Member States and the Council to oblige them to implement decisions aimed at correcting these divergencies. From 1974 to the present day, the Commission has only once applied the procedure laid down in Article 11 of this same Decision, when it addressed a recommendation to a single Member State. As we see it, the Commission's conduct contradicts its statement made in its Communication to the Council of 15 March 1982 on convergence, in which it stated that 'in the event of significant differences between these (policies of the Member States) the Commission should make full use of the existing consultation and recommendation procedures.'

The final report on the European Monetary System sent by the Monetary Committee to the Council and

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**Adonnino**

the Commission states that the credibility of the system will depend on the gradual improvement of economic convergence.

In its communication to the Council of Ministers for Finance dated 15 March 1982, the Commission stated that 'the persistence of these divergencies imperils the very nature of the (European Monetary) System'. The Committee of the Governors of the Central Banks itself stated in its Note Verbale to the Council of Ministers for Finance of 15 March 1982 that the strengthening of convergence, which is a prerequisite for any future development in the EMS, should be applied to all sectors of economic policy — in particular the budget — and should be obtained by applying coordinated national and Community policies, which would help to correct the imbalances which exist within and between the EEC countries.

These are the reasons why the Group of the European People's Party — and I hope that this will meet with the approval of the House — believes it necessary, hence the motion which has just been put before you to call on the Commission to refer to the Parliament on the reasons for its negligence, and to take steps for its powers and actions in this field to become substantially more efficient in the near future.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Moreau (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the need for economic convergence is frequently discussed by this House, and in every debate on the economic situation or on related topics someone always expresses the view that the Commission or the Council should do their utmost to ensure that the coordination of our economic policies becomes a reality.

The purpose of the motion for a resolution by the Group of the European People's Party is to question the Commission on whether it has failed to fulfil its role in this area.

Personally, I feel that the problem of convergence is affected very little by the Commission's attitudes and that the Council of Ministers bears most responsibility for this question.

For us, convergence implies a desire by all the Member States and Governments to integrate their economic policies more fully. Our speeches must have some substance, and our discussions on this topic, whether in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs or in plenary sessions of this House, are often far too academic — indeed, they have more to do with words than with reality.

None of us doubts that Europe and each of its Member States must fight inflation and control outside pressures as best we can to secure our own development. Those are the aims of Europe, and they are shared by the Member States. There is no escaping this fact, and we are in no doubt that to ignore it

would be to condemn Europe and those Member States tempted to do so to stagnation and decline.

But that is the reason — and I would stress this point — why we shall be abstaining. We should have liked the EPP's text to have been a little more far-reaching, since for us convergence does not imply a rejection of diversity, and we very well know that Europe is based on pluralism — because of our history and our socio-economic and socio-national structures — and that each country is free to choose its own way of achieving our common objectives. We therefore support all Community measures to facilitate active convergence in the economic and monetary sphere. At the next part-session, or at one of the subsequent part-sessions, we shall be commenting on the report dealing with this question by Mr von Bismarck.

Because of the vagueness of the motion for a resolution, my Group will be abstaining from voting on it.

**Mr Welsh (ED).** — Mr President, it is a great pleasure actually to have a chance to speak in the House instead of wandering about collecting people's signatures.

We in the European Democratic Group believe in convergence just as we believe in all the other good things of life. Therefore, we are glad to support this resolution because it is basically about a very important part of the Community's aspirations. But when we talk about convergence, we must be aware of what we really mean. What we mean by convergence is promoting the greater activity, prosperity and therefore the wealth of Europe so that all European citizens can benefit and all European citizens can have a higher standard of living and a better life. We do not believe that convergence means pouring money, for instance into my part of Lancashire, so that it somehow suddenly becomes as prosperous as South East England, because that sort of convergence does not actually work. We believe that the most important objective of the Community over the next two to five years is, first of all, the development of free capital markets; secondly, the recognition of the ECU as an international currency and that in turn will lead to economic and monetary union which will enable us to have truly converging policies.

We also in this group do not forget that the degree of convergence in economic management achieved by the Community over the last five years has been dramatic. The fact that we have avoided devaluations at this time of recession as we had in the 1930s; the fact that more and more countries are now managing their economies on prudent lines is a great triumph for the Community and one to be built on. So it is that form of convergence that we look forward to. It is that sort of convergence that we propose to work for and it is in that spirit that we are going to vote for this resolution.

**Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission.** — (DE) The Commission welcomes this motion for a resolution since it has been tabled at a time which enables us to discuss this problem of such crucial importance for the success of the Community's economic policy before the Athens summit. The Commission takes the view that the reference to the implementation of the Regulation of 1974 implies a review of the last ten years and that if we wish to turn these last ten years and the application of the 1974 Regulation to good use in the next ten years, we must go somewhat further. We must not merely assess the success or otherwise of the 1974 Regulation in terms of whether any legal instruments have been introduced and if so which and at what times.

From the point of view of the material development alone, it must be realized, we think, that the oil crisis and its unfortunate repercussions on the balance of payments situation of the Member States and their growth, that three years of stagflation and recession, that the disturbing increases in inflation rates between 1980 and 1982, the disturbing unemployment figures, the fluctuations in exchange rates and the international interest problems have all jointly and severally repeatedly encouraged the Member States at least to shift the emphasis in their policy in the short term if not to adopt a totally different policy in periods when any medium-term forecasts have become impossible.

This must all be considered in the context of disorder in public budgets and social insurance funds, which in turn create a need for rationalization which has substantially affected the capacity for action and room for manoeuvre of the governments of the Member States and will continue to do so for several years. Thus we can say in answer to the first question that the decision of 1974 formed the basis of our action and that the Commission has always and systematically respected the commitments arising from that decision — be it the various annual tasks in connection with the short-term economic policy guidelines, the quantitative budgetary guidelines or the medium-term economic programmes. As regards steps taken *vis-à-vis* Member States in connection with departures from the economic guidelines which had been laid down jointly, the Commission would remind you that it has always and, in particular, in the annual reports under discussion here today informed both the Member States and this Parliament on developments which might be detrimental to convergence within the Community.

Furthermore, the Commission has taken advantage of its right to make recommendations in cases where it felt that economic developments in certain Member States might seriously jeopardize convergence — I might remind you of the cases of Belgium and Italy — or when it felt that it was urgent that rapid progress be made in specific areas, such as indexing.

Similarly, the Commission has indicated the line to be adopted as regards budgetary policy and the promotion of investments, and I should also point out in this connection that the EMS consultation procedure means that we can conduct ongoing joint discussions of the economic policy to be pursued and even influence this policy. The Commission plays an active part in this process.

As regards the second question, I should like to point out that there is still a margin of uncertainty as far as the realization of our economic policy is concerned, particularly in connection with the behaviour of those engaged in activity in the Community, the structural situation and various other aspects. Generally speaking, the Member States are endeavouring to put the economic policy they have jointly decided upon into practice. However, the Commission regrets that the Council has over the past few years got out of the habit of adopting the quantitative budgetary policy guidelines but merely takes note of them.

As regards the third question, in 1982 the Commission made proposals for strengthening the European Monetary System. I would remind you that these proposals contain important aspects which would be in the interests of convergence in the Community if these proposals were to be adopted.

On the fourth point, the Commission is endeavouring, with all its proposals, to contribute directly or indirectly to a strengthening of the productive structures in the national economies of the various Member States and thereby to establish the conditions necessary for improved convergence.

Finally, I should like to draw the attention of this House to the fact — which Mr Ortoli also mentioned in this Parliament on the occasion of the debate on the annual report for 1983/1984 — that the most recent economic developments in the Community show better signs of convergence. Let us hope that these recent trends will continue. The Commission very much hopes to benefit from the support of this House in its efforts to consolidate this positive trend. A regular and systematic exchange of views between all the parties concerned is the most important prerequisite for any action by the Commission.

Finally, I should like to add quite frankly, that we will only be able to achieve lasting convergence of economic policy in the Community — and I am firmly convinced of this — if we also achieve a greater degree of convergence than in the past in our views on how to regulate matters generally, since only in this way can our achievements be guaranteed in times of crisis, i.e. we will have found a crisis-proof and confidence-inspiring approach. This also means that we must establish our priorities as regards the combatting of unemployment, price stability, external trade balance and budgetary discipline, etc, in a way that all the Member States can agree on and accept. Until we

**Narjes**

achieve this convergence of ideas and underlying motives, we will repeatedly be running the risk of the Member States drifting apart in times of crisis and being unable to steer a middle course.

(Applause)

**President.** — The debate is closed.

Vote <sup>1</sup>

*Natural disasters*

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the joint debate on seven motions for resolutions on natural disasters. I propose that the House simply vote on all seven. <sup>1</sup>

(Applause)

Vote <sup>1</sup>

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

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

*President*

3. Votes <sup>1</sup>

**BONACCINI REPORT (DOC. 1-988/83 'ECONOMIC SITUATION IN THE COMMUNITY')**

*Motion for a resolution*

*Recital E — Amendment No 4*

**Mr Bonaccini (COM), rapporteur.** — (IT) Mr President, with regard to this and other amendments by Mr Papantoniou I must say they are just a different way of expressing the same idea which is formulated in Recital E and other parts of the resolution. Since I do not wish to offend either Mr Papantoniou or the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, I shall leave the decision up to the House.

**ROGALLA REPORT (DOC. 1-903/83 'TAX HARMONIZATION')**

*Paragraph 10 — Amendments Nos 9 and 2*

**Mr Rogalla (S), rapporteur.** — (DE) Mr President, this is a very important part of the motion for a resolution and I trust that the problem can be solved by combining the two amendments in accordance with my views and those of the committee. We are talking here about zero rates which in the United Kingdom — I apologize for bringing this up — apply to foodstuffs, and the idea is to leave these out and to word paragraph 10 in such a way that it is clear that zero rating can continue and that the reduced and standard

rates apply to products and services other than essential foodstuffs.

We could perhaps solve the problem by leaving the text as it is in the first three lines, by combining the two amendments in a phrase reading *except in special cases of zero rating for essential foodstuffs* and by then continuing with the words *a reduced and a standard rate for other products and services*. This addition would make it clear that this is a special political problem and that the standard and reduced rates apply to all other products and services.

**BEUMER REPORT (DOC. 1-777/83) 'TURNOVER TAXES')**

*After the approval of the proposal for a directive*

**Mr Beumer (PPE), rapporteur.** — (NL) I should like to know if the Commission is in agreement with the changes to the directive as a result of the amendments which have been adopted.

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, as regards the Commission's view on the various amendments it would probably be simpler if I read out the position of the Commission.

We would reject Amendments Nos 1 to 5 and No 8. We would accept Amendments Nos 9 and 11 to 16. We would accept Amendment No 18 though I think we took the view, as did Mr Beumer, that it was the same as No 15. No 19 we would accept. No 20 we would reject. No 21 we would accept.

**Mr Beumer (PPE), rapporteur.** — (NL) The amendments by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs have been adopted and accepted by the Commission. As far as I am concerned, therefore, I am not asking for referral back to committee, which is what I should have done otherwise.

**CURRY REPORT (DOC. 1-987/83 'CAP')**

*Paragraph 14 — after the vote on Amendment No 57*

**Mr Curry (ED), rapporteur.** — May I suggest, Mr President, that instead of drawing attention to Members of this House who at least are here, even if they do not appear to be voting, it would be more appropriate to draw attention to the phantom troops who are not here on this important matter?

(Cries of 'Hear, hear')

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Curry, I have no comment on that remark, but you have made your point.

**Mr Simmonds (ED).** — I do not want to bother you, Mr President, but Mrs Castle voted twice at the last vote and not at all this time. Could she please be consistent?

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**President.** — Mr Simmonds, your point of order was not in order.

*Paragraph 19 — after the rejection of Amendment No 15*

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — (DE) Mr President, can the quorum be ascertained?

**President.** — Mr von der Vring, is this request for a quorum being made on behalf of your group?

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — Yes.

*(After the adoption of Amendment No 16 by electronic vote the President established that the House was quorate)*

*After the adoption of paragraph 19*

**Mr Enright (S).** — Mr President, the voting figures show that there are only 128 Members present, which casts some doubt on the count taken earlier.

**President.** — Mr Enright, as you know, it sometimes happens that Members are present but do not vote.

**Mr Enright (S).** — Could I request a quorum then, Mr President, at this moment?

**President.** — You cannot do it on your own, Mr Enright.

**Mr Enright (S).** — If 10 Members will stand with me, Mr President, we will find we have no quorum. *(Ten Members rose to support Mr Enright's request)*

**President.** — There is a request for a quorum supported by 10 Members.

*(A count was taken)*

It is impossible to establish whether the quorum has been attained or not. I shall therefore suspend the sitting for 15 minutes, after which a further count will be taken to try to establish whether we have a quorum.

*(The sitting was suspended at 5 p.m. and resumed at 5.15 p.m.)*

#### IN THE CHAIR : MR ESTGEN

##### *Vice-President*

**President.** — We shall now establish whether a quorum is present.

I note that the House is not quorate. The vote will therefore be postponed until tomorrow's sitting.

**Mr Curry (ED).** *rapporteur.* — Mr President, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, as rapporteur of this report, and most of all as simple deputy from the United Kingdom, I wish to record formally my total objection to what has just taken place.

*(Applause)*

My first objection is to the fact that even before there was a demand for a quorum, fewer than 160 Members of this House thought that reform of the CAP was important enough to be here to vote on it and that is the greatest scandal for this House.

My second cause for shame is the pantomime of this Parliament occasioned by these votes on the quorum. I cannot imagine a worse spectacle to put before the electors than this charade of democracy with which we have presented our face to the world.

*(Applause)*

Finally, Mr President, I note that some weeks ago this House voted on the Spinelli proposals in which we created a new Europe in a new universe. I now state just what that new world and that new universe is and I am deeply ashamed for this House and as a Member of this House, but, nonetheless, Mr President, there are problems which one has to ride, which one has to overcome, and I will carry on fighting so that this House is worthy of the name of 'Parliament'. At the moment I think it will be a long fight.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Sutra (S).** — (FR) First of all let me pay tribute to Mr Curry and to what he has just said and let me add that he has been a faithful rapporteur for the Committee on Agriculture, sometimes standing up for ideas which he did not share.

Secondly, with regard to our Rules of Procedure, Mr President, I would ask you to put a request as soon as possible to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to ensure that the legitimate right to ask for the quorum to be ascertained does not become a time-wasting anti-parliamentary manoeuvre which stops a parliament from operating and which is an affront to democracy.

Thirdly, on the subject here, I am inclined to say that if some people think we ought to go farther than the Curry report when it comes to agriculture, then this Assembly is going to collapse because there is no way we can go farther.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Mr Sutra, what you have asked for amounts to a change in the Rules of Procedure. You can make such a request to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

**Mr Sutra (S).** — (FR) Of course, Mr President, I shall do so forthwith. I shall call on the Chair to put the matter to the committee. I know it is difficult to teach the British anything about parliamentary procedure, since they invented it, but we also have a tradition of Roman law in Europe. It must be possible to make this Parliament work without all this nonsense which makes a mockery of democracy.



**President.** — I fully understand what you are saying but we must abide by the rules when it comes to changes.

**Mr Glinne (S).** — (*FR*) I should just like to point out, Mr President, that the Members of the German Social Democratic Party who are not here are not absent because of any lack of regard for this Parliament but because of a party conference in Cologne. Also, our party deplors the repeated use of the quorum ploy.

(*Applause*)

**Mrs Castle (S).** — Mr President, in view of the fact that suggestions are now being made that the rule relating to the quorum should be changed to avoid its abuse, may I point out that it has been deliberately manipulated this afternoon by members of the European Democrats who were here earlier and did not come back for the quorum. Where are they? There are less than 10 European Democrats here to back their own rapporteur and some of them have walked out since a quorum was declared. We have come back. Even their very president is not bothering to be here to vote, although he is former president of the National Farmers Union and it would be quite wrong to suggest that any of us on this side of the House have abused the quorum rules, so please do not let us have any hypocrisy.

**Mrs Ewing (DEP).** — Mr President, I must protest. My point of order was in before those that you have called and this has been seen by all those sitting all around me. I must make a formal protest. If I had not been very strong on my feet I wonder, indeed, if I would ever have been called by yourself. However, having got on my feet, may I ask, Mr President, if it is in order for quorums to be called so quickly one after the other when they were clearly intended as a move, not as a genuine desire to have a quorum? It was playing games with this House and we could all engage in this kind of game and we could all hold up the work of this House at any time. Those of us who have been in Parliament for many years could easily do this with procedures. It is not worthy of this House, nor of those who did it; it is not worthy of this lot here, the Conservative lot, of the same Member State as myself, although Mr Curry so nobly made his point. There were only 4 Conservatives there and I think it is quite disgraceful of the British group to be playing politics across the floor in this way with the rules of this House.

**President.** — Rule 71 states:

All votes shall be valid whatever the number of voters unless the President, on a request made before voting has begun by at least ten Members, ascertains at the moment of voting that the quorum is not present.

This means that at any time during the voting ten Members may ask for the quorum to be ascertained. This is what happened. It is in the Rules of Procedure.

**Mr Maher (L).** — Mr President, I deplore what has happened but I think that what is important now is what we do now. That is what is important. You have just suggested that we defer this vote until tomorrow morning. And I am asking you, is that wise? Our experience of Friday mornings would suggest that we will not have a quorum on Friday morning either. I think it is important to consider that. What is the point in deciding to have a vote if there is not going to be a quorum? So I think the House should be asked what its view is as to when this vote should be deferred till, because I do not think it is wise to suggest we should have it in the morning.

**President.** — I am not the one who came up with this solution, Mr Maher. It is according to the Rules of Procedure. The rules state that if the vote shows that the quorum is not present, the vote shall be placed on the agenda of the next sitting. The next sitting is tomorrow. There is nothing I can do about it.

**Mr Galland (L).** — (*FR*) It is perfectly true that the rules state what you have just said, Mr President, but that does not alter the fact that you are empowered to consult the House on a specific point, which in this case is to find out whether as things stand at the moment the vote is to be held tomorrow or not. Tomorrow morning at the beginning of the sitting you will be able to tell us what happened with the vote we are going to take now. It is quite absurd, Mr President, to think of putting off until tomorrow morning a vote on something as important as the Curry report. We all know that. Let us be practical about this and put the matter to the House. You can tell us what happened tomorrow morning, at the beginning of the debates.

As for Mr Glinne, I would agree entirely that the Rules of Procedure have been abused. But who asked for the quorum to be ascertained the second time? It was a Member of his group!

**President.** — Mr Galland, as things are at the moment — and I mean today — I can do only what is laid down in the Rules of Procedure. Tomorrow morning the House may decide otherwise if it wishes but here and now I must postpone the vote until the next sitting.

**Mrs Elaine Kellett-Bowman (ED).** — I was merely going to point out, Mr President, in response — but Mr Galland has already done so — that whatever Mr Glinne may say it was one of his colleagues Mr von der Vring, who in fact asked for the first one, and then, in fact, in response to Lady Castle, it was a British Socialist who asked for it the second time, despite the fact that earlier in the day, there had been only 2 people from the British Socialist group voting on the very important matter of tax harmonization on which nobody called for a quorum, but nevertheless, they were not here.

**Mr Tolman (PPE).** — *(NL)* Your conduct of the matter is correct, Mr President. If a vote is taken tomorrow and it again emerges that there is no quorum, we shall be left with the enormous problem that we shall have to wait until December before expressing an opinion on this exceptionally important report. We shall have missed the boat again if we try to deliver the goods in the middle of December, after the Athens summit. It is an absolute disgrace, Mr President, and something has to be done about it. The point I am making is for the benefit of you, Mr President, and for the Members who are here in the Chamber and for those who are not here and who ought to be here tomorrow. What measures can we devise and what possibilities are open to you, Mr President, so that everyone can be fully informed and warned to be here tomorrow morning?

**President.** — You are quite right, Mr Tolman. This is a political issue. But it is not a matter for the President but for the political groups. Each one will have to deal with it individually.

**Mr Chambeiron (COM).** — *(FR)* Mr President, it is not in my nature to attribute blame or praise. I do not want to point a finger — because as I said that is not like me — at those who are or are not to blame for the situation we find ourselves in. However, I should like to ask the Chair a question, after stating that I fully share your point of view as regards the application of the Rules of Procedure.

When the sitting was resumed you had the quorum ascertained. I think you should have told us how many Members you counted here. I shall explain why: Article 71, which you quoted earlier, states that account must be taken when it comes to the count of the Members who made the request for the quorum to be ascertained and who have not returned to the sitting. The point is that there are at least twenty Members who stood up but whom I cannot see in the Chamber any more, and they should have been included in your count.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Let me read the relevant passage in the Rules of Procedure:

If the number of Members required to make up the quorum is not present, the President shall not announce the result of the vote but shall declare that the quorum is not present.

Of course we know — everyone knows — that you have to include those who asked for the quorum to be ascertained. This was done.

**Mr Clinton (PPE).** — We are now in a position where the two sides who were responsible for looking for a quorum are expressing their shame that this House was turned into a circus this afternoon. And both sides seem to be saying *mea culpa, mea culpa*. I

am just wondering at this stage: is it possible for you as President to put it to the House that we now continue with our voting and that we forget about a quorum?

**President.** — I should dearly like to but I cannot.

**Mr Israël (DEP).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I believe that you are one of the best Presidents in this House and therefore please forgive me if I say that I am astonished that you told us, after Mr Chambeiron's comments, that account had been taken of the people who had asked for the quorum but who were not here when the count was made.

The fact is that our Rules of Procedure contain a note by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. It is written in small letters and states:

When establishing the result of the vote, account must be taken, pursuant to paragraph 2, of all the Members who requested that it be ascertained whether the quorum was present.

You said this was done but could you please tell me what the results were, Mr President? How many asked for the quorum, who where they, how many people were there when the count was made, and who was here? Or perhaps we have to start all over again?

**President.** — Mr Israël, I can only repeat that the Rules of Procedure do not permit me to divulge the numbers. I am in fact forbidden to do so, but I did assure you — and my assistants confirm the fact — that the people who asked for the quorum were counted, both on the first occasion when there was a count and the quorum was attained and on the second occasion.

**Mr Di Bartolomei (L).** — *(IT)* Mr President, I do not think we are going to solve this problem by resorting to a count. What we are up against is a very important and momentous political matter and if you ask me it has to be solved in a political fashion.

This Parliament is looking for some political elbow room. It is trying to increase its own powers with regard to the national Member States. In this connection an important battle is being waged. We have to be able to show the representatives of the Member States, who are meeting in Athens, that Parliament is in a position to deliberate and wants to offer some comment on the serious matters which will be discussed in Athens.

I think it will be of benefit to everyone. I wonder therefore if it might not be possible for the Chair to make a formal appeal to all the groups by getting the group chairmen together and asking them to see to it that there are enough Members in the Chamber this evening or tomorrow morning. Now, if there is one section — in this instance, the European Democrats — that wants to take a political stand over this, I

**Di Bartolomei**

think that the other sections could nonetheless see to it that Parliament can operate and take decisions.

I wish to make a formal request, Mr President, for a meeting of the group chairmen — if this is possible under the Rules of Procedure — so that they can be asked to ensure that there will be enough people in the Chamber this evening or, at the latest, tomorrow morning.

**President.** — I fully agree with what you say, Mr Di Bartolomei, and I shall forward your request to the President of the Assembly to see whether in fact anything can be done about it.

**Mrs Squarcialupi (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President, the result of postponing the vote until tomorrow, without even knowing if it will then in fact take place, will be a series of consequences which have to be looked at from the political angle and which are of vital importance to the reputation and to the work of this Parliament. Among the consequences of this postponement, let me mention that we shall not be able to discuss the report on which the Council asked for urgency, and this means that the Council will decide without knowing what Parliament thinks.

**Mr D'Angelosante (COM).** — *(IT)* If I have understood things correctly, Mr President, since the Rules of Procedure do not state that you have to announce the result of the count but simply have to indicate that the quorum has not been attained, you say that neither you nor the Bureau is required at any time to inform the House of the result of the count. If you ask me, this is a serious mistake. The fact is that the Rules of Procedure do not say this. The rules state that you do not give the number. But I am asking you now what the number was because I am querying the count. I wish you to tell Parliament how many were present and how many who made the request were absent. You are making a mistake if you interpret the part of the rule you quoted in the restricted sense as you have done. The general rule is simply that you are not required to give us the number but only to announce that the quorum has not been attained, but if we then ask for the circumstances to be outlined you have to tell us in my opinion. If you take the opposite view, we shall refer the matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions — of which I am a member — for a ruling. We are going to have a kind of dictatorship from the Chair otherwise, and the main thing is that it would be possible for a miscount to go unchallenged. Consequently, Mr President, I do urge you to give the House the result of the count.

**President.** — Mr D'Angelosante, I strongly and formally reject any suggestion of dictatorship by the Chair. It is certainly not my impression that any of the Presidents or Vice-Presidents who have sat here

have ever acted like dictators. I insist that you retract your statement.

On the other hand, I agree with the suggestion that the matter be referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. However, ladies and gentlemen, I think we should pay tribute to the integrity of the officials who are responsible for the count. It is not the job of the Chair to interrupt the work of this Assembly. Indeed, the President and I myself should have preferred to carry on with the vote. If we have to announce that there is no quorum, do not imagine that we are delighted to do so. However, I do not want to set any precedent now on this matter affecting the Rules of Procedure, because otherwise there is going to be no end to the argument and counter-argument.

**Mr Forth (ED).** — Mr President, I completely agree. I utterly deplore any suggestion that there has been anything less than a scrupulous following of the procedure by yourself and by the officials of this Parliament. I think any suggestion to the contrary is totally disgraceful.

As for the comment we have just heard that this matter is political, it happens that the Rules are quite clear. If this House wishes to make a political statement, it requires that a quorum be present. If sufficient Members cannot be bothered to be here to make a political statement, then, unfortunately, we are not in a position to make that statement. But the point I really wanted to make was that Rule 71 (3), which again is very clear and precludes any options, says: 'If the vote shows that the quorum is not present, the vote shall be placed on the agenda of the next sitting.' There is no other choice, Mr President.

**Mr O'Mahony (S).** — Mr President, I deplore totally what has happened here this afternoon, and I think we shall have to take steps to see to it that Westminster politics do not constantly intervene in our affairs.

Having said that, I think one possible suggestion is that we adjourn again for half-an-hour or three-quarters of an hour and appeal to the group chairmen to bring in their members. The reality is that there are sufficient people in this building to make up a quorum but they are staying out deliberately. Now that is to undermine democracy. That is exactly what is going on here this afternoon. So let us bring in our members. Bring the people in!

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — I have already said that this request will be forwarded to the President of the House and to the chairmen of the political groups, so that they can call their members together and remind them of their responsibilities. If we find ourselves in this situation, it is because of a political move by a section of the House and we have to consider the consequences of this political move.

**Mr Barbi (PPE).** — *(IT)* Speaking on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, Mr President, let me say that we have followed what has happened today with a great deal of concern and, I might add, with sorrow. I realise that the Rules of Procedure can also be used in a parliament for filibustering. I realise that political in-fighting includes such things and I am not at all shocked. But what does surprise me is that a few Members — and in saying this I am not accusing all the groups because I assume that the leaders of all the groups will be as worried and concerned as I am about what has happened today — have not hesitated in this disgraceful way to sabotage the work of Parliament at a time when it was known that the decision could be taken only here in this Chamber. The fact is that the Curry report cannot be deferred for a month. It has to be dealt with before the Athens summit, because otherwise there is no point to it.

We are all down-to-earth realists and we all know that if there is no quorum today it is even less likely that we shall have one tomorrow morning. The people who have made this move and who knew what they were doing and repeated it — I am speaking to Mr von der Vring and Mr Enright — knew they were preventing the European Parliament from fulfilling its political duty *vis-à-vis* the Council of Ministers, the Commission, the general public...

*(Applause)*

On behalf of the Group of the European People's Party I voice our protest against this behaviour and I appeal to all the group chairmen and to all Members on all sides of this Parliament so that something of this kind never happens again.

*(Sustained applause)*

**President.** — I endorse your appeal, Mr Barbi. We shall see tomorrow morning whether people have changed their minds. I hope the group chairmen will meet tomorrow morning. If there is no further request for a quorum it will not be ascertained. Tomorrow morning we shall proceed with the vote, no matter how many Members are present.

**Mr Enright (S).** — Mr President, I have been attacked personally as being responsible for what has happened this afternoon. I am absolutely delighted that you attach such importance to what I do, but why not blame the two-thirds of the Members of this place who are absent at this moment? They have gone away deliberately. The reason why I asked for a quorum was that the electronic voting machine showed there were only 128 people here. I have said before that attendance at this House is a disgrace, and clearly the blame does not attach to those who are present at the moment. But it is crucial that Members attend from Monday to Friday. That is our democratic duty. If we

are not here, we cannot express an authoritative viewpoint. That is why I asked for a quorum and that is why I turned up and made sure that members of my group turned up when the quorum was counted. There was no deliberate absence on this side.

#### DE PASQUALE REPORT (DOC. 1-930/83 'COMMUNITY'S STRUCTURAL FUNDS')

*After the vote on all the amendments*

**Mr Nikolaou (S).** — *(GR)* I just want to point out that, because of a mistake on the part of the Chair, I was unable to speak during yesterday's debate. The President promised me three minutes today to make an oral explanation of vote, but I shall in fact be giving my explanation of vote in writing.

**President.** — Your comments are noted. <sup>1</sup>

#### 4. Cultural sector

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-927/83), drawn up by Mr Fanti on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on stronger Community action in the cultural sector.

**Mr Fanti (COM), rapporteur.** — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the beginning of this month saw the successful opening in Paris of the Theatre of Europe, managed by Mr Strehler, whom we hope to have among us soon. Last week, in Bologna, the study congress sponsored by the Commission and European Parliament, on the preservation of European and Mediterranean historical cities took place, and was attended by an extraordinary number of academics and young people. These are two very different events, but I quote them as an example of the things which are being done this month to open up a new phase in the relationship between politics and culture, through the joint efforts of the European Parliament, the Commission and the Ministers for Cultural Affairs in the ten Member States of the European Community.

As a European Parliament, we have so far dealt with many cultural problems arising from the intense activities of our Parliament Committee, led so well first by Mr Pedini, and now by the present Chairman, Mr Beumer. Today, however, we suggest that Parliament draw up its own work programme for the reinforcement and extension of the cultural sector in the life of the Community, as proposed by the Commission, which would be in perfect harmony with the reports drawn up by Lady Elles in 1974 and Amadei in 1979.

At the end of the month Melina Mercouri will be having a meeting with the Ministers for Cultural Affairs in Athens, and straight afterwards the

<sup>1</sup> Deadline for tabling amendments to the 1984 budget: see Minutes.

**Fanti**

conclusions to be drawn will be discussed in a meeting with the representatives of the Parliament Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport.

In the few minutes available I obviously cannot go into all the various aspects of the report which the Committee has submitted. The cultural policy should have the same dignity and function as any other Community policy, and freedom of expression, pluralism and national values should be fully respected. Concrete action is needed to implement the policy. We are proposing a Community programme for the development of cultural life and the organization of culture in Europe, in which a leading part must be played by the workers in the cultural sector and the intelligentsia, and for the implementation of which adequate financial instruments and resources must be made available.

We believe it necessary to open a genuine 'cultural dialogue' in a bid to overcome the current inability of states to exploit the development of culture as a resource and, at the same time, as an objective in itself. The view of culture that still prevails is that it is meant to cater for the needs of a particular section of society, or that it is simply an item of consumption; moreover, it is commonly believed that it cannot make any significant contribution to advancing or enhancing the life of the Community.

Otherwise the danger of cultural decadence in Europe and a deterioration of Europe's backwardness in essential sectors will become dramatically irreversible. It must be realized that the spread of knowledge and the process of enlightenment, i.e. culture, are fundamental to the recovery of economic growth and the growth of democracy in Europe.

Although, as we know, the European Community has few natural resources of its own, it does at least have a precious cultural resource, as is evidenced by its history and philosophical and cultural heritage.

But we must also see that we are extremely slow to realize the significance of that resource and to exploit it to the full, either at Community level or at national level. I hope that the European Parliament will follow the guidelines of its Parliament Committee and will vote for this reform.

IN THE CHAIR :  
MRS CASSANMAGNAGO CERRETTI

*Vice-President*

**Mr Schwenneke (S).** — (DE) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, basically the Fanti report is not about money but about culture or, to be more precise, the realization which is gaining ground that there can be no further development of the European Community without a substantial increase in activities in the cultural field — although this will obviously mean

more money. Mr Fanti proposes — and we go along with him — to increase the funds allocated to the cultural field step by step to 1 % of our total budget, which would at any rate be a sum of the order of DM 500 million, which is vital if we are to do anything in the cultural field at genuinely European level. This work cannot and should not ever be a substitute for national, regional or local cultural policy, but this 1 % of the budget should rather encourage the earmarking of at least an equivalent sum for culture in other budgets. The European Parliament has of course set out the reasons supporting this request, as is clearly stated in the Fanti report.

I should just like to list six main aspects of the European Community's existing work — which is to be stepped up in the future — in the cultural field. Firstly, there is a promotion of European-orientated cultural events in the Member States, such as the Munich European Film Festival we have proposed or the European Music Year, which has already been fixed for 1985 and for which preparations are under way. Secondly, the protection of cultural workers, who are more and more frequently hit by unemployment and for whom programmes will have to be drawn up. Thirdly, there is our work on the protection of the cultural heritage, which is of no less importance than it was with the big event of 1975, i.e. the Year of the Cultural Heritage. Our cultural heritage is a European heritage and must be protected by European means. Fourthly, there are the exchanges of young people, which include cultural events and language courses. Fifthly, there is the promotion of artistic activities, and sixthly, the preservation of minority languages and cultures in Europe.

The European Parliament has always — but particularly since the direct elections — maintained that cultural policy is a genuine European matter. The preamble to the Treaty of Rome itself states that the quality of life in Europe must be improved. The majority of this House is, I think, in no doubt about the fact that cultural events increase the quality of life of Europeans.

The Commission has also reacted appropriately and tabled two excellent programmes — in 1977 and 1983 — and in the meantime, I am glad to say, the European Council has decided at its summit in Stuttgart that cultural policy is a subject with which the Community should rightly concern itself. We now hope that the Ministers who are to meet in Athens in two weeks time for the first conference of the European Ministers of Culture will not just utter fine sounding words, as they have often done in the past, and give the people of Europe further grounds for complaint that nothing is getting done, but will accept our resolution in accordance with their 'solemn declaration' in Stuttgart. We would therefore call on the Ministers to get some real work done on the question of cultural policy in two weeks' time in Athens and in the future.

**Mr Gerokostopoulos (PPE).** — *(GR)* Madam President, I believe that Mr Fanti's report on stronger Community action in the cultural sector will assist somewhat in dispelling the heavy, not to say stifling, atmosphere in this House after the previous discussions on such thorny problems — problems which have arisen both as a result of the tense international situation, fraught as it is with dangers for peace in the world and because of the crisis which seems to be threatening not only the Community, but also the very concept of European Union.

The most important thing, however, is that the vote on Mr Fanti's report provides this Parliament with a final opportunity to declare that it is fully aware of the importance of the cultural problem for the spiritual development and mutual understanding of the peoples of Europe, and, more especially, for increasing awareness of the fact that the existence of Europe's common cultural heritage is a basic element in the political identity of its peoples.

The vote on this motion does, however, provide another unique opportunity, i. e. to remind the appropriate national and Community authorities of the need to find common points of reference and common values, so as to facilitate the implementation of the European Union.

I shall not go on, ladies and gentlemen, to analyse individual points of this motion. This was done most successfully both by the rapporteur, Mr Fanti, and by Mr Schwencke. It is, however, worth drawing attention to and emphasizing some basic points in the document which I believe should be highlighted. I am thinking firstly of the categorical rejection of the claim that the terms of the Treaties allegedly do not allow Community action in the cultural sector. Secondly, there is the extensive analysis of the Communication from the Commission on Community action in this sector. Thirdly, there is the need to improve the living and working conditions of all those working in the cultural sector, and fourthly the suggestions for dealing with the financial problem, at both national and Community levels.

Before closing, Madam President, I should like to refer to the commitment which the Stuttgart Council formally adopted in June 1983. Both the rapporteur and Mr Schwencke also referred to it. This was the commitment to promote closer cooperation between the peoples of Europe in the cultural sector. I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my own hope that the meeting of Ministers for Cultural Affairs to be held in Greece at the end of the month will be the beginning of the necessary action for giving substance to the said Stuttgart declaration.

The European People's Party, on behalf of which I have the honour of speaking, fully supports the motion put forward by Mr Fanti, whom I should like

to congratulate most sincerely on his valuable and inspired work.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Papapietro (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I will not reiterate what the previous speaker and other colleagues have already said on the importance of this sector in constructing a united, peaceful and better Europe, and on the reputation that the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport of the European Parliament is gaining through its activities in this sector. I do not want to go into the merits of this motion, which views culture not only as an objective in itself, but as one of Europe's resources, and which is the fruit of the Parliament Committee's intense task of drawing up cultural intervention policies, in spite of the small budget allocated, so that culture might become one of the Community's intervention policies.

Because of the short amount of time available, I only want to stress one of the points mentioned in the report, i.e. the improvement of living and working conditions as mentioned in the EEC Treaty. This would include the provision of official recognition for cultural workers, and would require the approximation of provisions laid down by law, regulation or administrative action between the various Member States.

This section of the Treaty ties in with the possibility of a common cultural policy. Intellectual work has, as we know, become increasingly vital to the more advanced societies: science, technology, information, communications systems and knowledge have become more influential over production processes and the civil organization of society.

Modern means of communication have brought to the fore creative works and made them available to enormous numbers of people, when previously they were only destined for a small minority. Only imagine, for example, a great 18th century opera being shown on television via satellite.

The position of the intellectual worker bears no comparison with that which he held in even fairly recent times.

I believe that this, i.e. the ever greater importance of the intellectual role in society and hence the role and importance of the intellectual himself, is the social basis of a common policy in the cultural sector.

Another requirement for the exploitation of this valuable resource — I shall only deal with a specific problem here — is guaranteed respect for copyright — I previously mentioned satellite and cable television: copyright should once more be guaranteed; works and their authors, and cultural workers should, according to the Treaty, be allowed free movement. This, as we know, involves complex legal problems connected with the formation of a common legal area and a common notion — to give a single example —

### Papapietro

of 'cultural heritage', as well as complex systems to protect cultural work, which needs better protection.

The Parliament Committee will work on this for the next few months together with the appropriate committees, and we shall call on the Commission and the European Council to make proposals for and decide on this issue. By the way, it should be noted that the Commission has recently produced a very valuable document on the reinforcement of cultural action in the Community.

I believe that the Fanti report is a suitable framework within which these interventions can be implemented. It clearly defines the necessary basic principles.

The Committee voted unanimously in favour of the report, which means that all the political forces present in the Committee, and hence all those present in this Parliament, voted in favour of it. It therefore contains the basics upon which a joint European policy can be built.

We now call upon not so much the Commission, which we know to be prompt in this matter (indeed the Fanti report is based on a Commission document) but on the Council, to make it possible for the Parliament to carry out this policy, beginning with the budget.

**Mr Bøgh (CDI).** — *(DA)* Madam President, when the Commission drew up its communication to the Council concerning the strengthening of Community efforts in the cultural field, there was obviously no doubt about the fact that cultural policy is not mentioned in the Treaty of Rome and is therefore not a Community matter. For this reason, people are ingeniously discussing cultural policy simply as an aspect of industrial policy, copyright policy and social policy and have not defined in concrete terms what was meant by cultural policy or culture. However, Parliament's report on the same subject does not reflect this same circumspection. The fact that the word 'culture' or the phrase 'the cultural field' cannot be found anywhere in the Treaty of Rome is acknowledged, but the report states in the same breath and in so many words that culture is obviously to a large extent covered by the Treaty. There is not a single word of evidence to support this statement but nevertheless the report has the effrontery to maintain that those who think otherwise are not to be trusted. During the discussions in the committee, I urged Mr Fanti to withdraw these entire unsubstantiated arrogations against us Danes, among others, but he did not. As you know, we Danes have never regarded the Treaty of Rome as constituting anything more than the economic agreement which it is and we cannot go along with these things.

The report rambles on about the frameworks and content of cultural life and one gets the impression that the lack of clarity must be intentional, because

the whole thing has no legal basis. The only definitive thing that can be said about the concept of culture as reflected in the report is that it primarily means something which can be made use of for political and propagandistic purposes. The rapporteur speaks of an archeological and ideological cultural heritage as evidence of a common European culture which has, in his view, been reincarnated with the European Community. According to Mr Fanti, we should regard culture as an element in the construction of the new Community and he says that Parliament's job is to support culture in the major struggle which has been fought out at European level, and after culture has been used both to fight the Soviets and to build up the European union, things get totally out of hand. I quote.

Surely the European Community is the ideal institution to assist in this search for our cultural role in the world, to pose the questions and supply the answers.

This report is undeniable proof of the fact that this search for Parliament's cultural role in the world is somewhat confused, nor is it made clear who gave Parliament this vocation — presumably it was God Almighty.

However, we are brought back to practical and economic realities when the report states that culture is one of our basic resources and is one of the components fundamental to the recovery of economic growth and the growth of democracy. This is simply a prostitution of the whole concept of culture. Culture is a growing thing and not something which should be exploited for one purpose or another.

**Mr Pedini (PPE).** — *(IT)* Mr Fanti, I believe that it was in the letter written from Bologna, if I am not mistaken, that Erasmus of Rotterdam commented that culture never brings short term success, but is essential in the construction of a secure future rooted in awareness of the past.

Indeed it has to be said that this excellent report reaches us at an unfortunate moment in the life of the European Parliament, but it has also roused us from the gloom of a few hours ago, by making us aware that, thanks to your report, Mr Fanti, we are setting forth proposals which are fundamental for the future of the Community.

I believe that that great master of history, Huizinga, was right when he said that civilization is the awareness of values through which eras and their evolution can be interpreted. There could be no European Community today without an awareness of the values by which our times can be interpreted.

I therefore add my heartfelt thanks for this report which, I believe, contains everything necessary for the Commission, Council and Community to set up the cultural action which is absolutely vital.

This report, Madam President, stems from a long way back. It stems from the first days when, thanks to the sensitivity of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, we set up the social survey on the situation of artists and writers in the European Economic Community. It had its ups and downs, our Committee had to convince Parliament, for which due credit should be given to Mr Spinelli, who was then rapporteur for the budget, that action on culture should be a Community priority.

I should like to thank Mr Fanti for having expressed the unanimous sentiments of our committee, which is today led by the very experienced Mr Beumer.

Many aspects of cultural commitment in the report could be highlighted. But let us understand one thing: part of the need for cultural activity lies in economic necessity. Culture today is a very important investment, especially for a Community like ours, whose peoples, in a world which seems to entrust its future to technology alone, and in which the mass media are expanding, are becoming ever more geared towards cultural and artistic demand. It will then be Europe's particular responsibility to be able to satisfy these expectations, which will also entail economic advantages.

I believe that the report also highlights another particular aspect, i.e. the link between economics and culture in a world which we hope is making progress in the direction of peace. This is another reason why I shall add my vote to those of my other friends in the group and I also thank the Commission, President Thorn, his valuable assistant Mr Gregoire and Commissioner Richard for what they have done to enable culture in the last few years to take its rightful place in the political awareness of the Community and the debate in this Assembly.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission.** — (IT) Madam President, Mr Fanti, ladies and gentlemen, President Thorn very much wished to be present at this meeting today, but has been prevented because of commitments connected with preparations for the Athens Summit.

In a speech as short as mine must be, it is not possible to go into detail over the various aspects of the analysis contained in the excellent report prepared by Mr Fanti or individual points of the programme outlined in the motion. I will confine myself to explaining why it is that this report and motion have been introduced at the right moment, and to illustrating the fundamental principle which inspires them. When President Thorn comes to speak to your Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport next January, he will be able to dwell specifically on facts and ideas.

For some years now the Commission has been trying to enlarge and consolidate Community action in the cultural sector. Parliament has given us constant support and has sometimes even led the way — we refer here to Mr Arfé's report on the social situation of cultural workers and on the promotion of the film industry, and to Mr Hahn's three reports on the European Year of Music, television and the preservation of our architectural heritage. But since culture cannot be divided into separate compartments, a summary was needed. Today we have it in the form of a report from Mr Fanti.

I would firstly emphasize the originality of the report. Mr Fanti sets his colleague's preceding proposals within the wider context of the economic growth and the development of democracy in our society. By now it is universally recognized that culture is a powerful factor in social and economic development. Cultural activities also have an expansion potential which is often much greater than that of other activities.

The cultural policy urged by Mr Fanti is active and dynamic, not passive and defensive. His report will be a source of inspiration for those attending the ministerial meeting on cultural problems in the Member States of the European Community, which will take place on 28 November in Delphi. I hope it will make it apparent that total agreement exists between Parliament, the Commission and the Ministers for Cultural Affairs in the Member States.

In becoming actively involved in culture, the Community Institutions should satisfy not only the needs of the so-called cultural workers, but also the expectations of an ever increasing number of citizens, who expect their needs, which have until now been neglected far too much, to be satisfied through the development of culture. The principle behind the report and motion is summed up in a sentence found in both: 'the Community's purpose is to act on behalf of culture rather than on culture'. To act 'on culture' would mean using choices or preferences to direct its development; one type of ideological content would be given preference over the rest; priority would be given to a single aspect of taste, and a distinction would be made between what is European and what is not. We take great care to avoid this.

To act on behalf of culture would mean making the legal instruments provided by the Treaty of Rome, the possibilities implicit in Community policies (e.g. the vocational training, social and regional policies etc) and resources from Community funds such as the European Social Fund and the European Regional Development Fund available to culture in all its forms and aspects. I do not see why anyone should wish to reject a motion whose aim is to facilitate the free exchange of cultural goods, to curb the negative



## Giolitti

effects of the development of audio visual media on the jobs and incomes of writers and performers, and to fight against the unemployment which is affecting cultural even more than industrial workers.

Far from repressing the various cultural identities, whether national or regional, the measures which we intend to take will encourage them all. Our aim is to free them from the economic and social restrictions which impede their development, and whose existence and influence cannot be ignored.

Obviously the Commission does not pretend that an economic and social action will be sufficient to develop the entire cultural sector. This development depends on the artists and workers themselves, and the support which they receive from the public and the appropriate national and local authorities. The Commission does, however, maintain that Community action can eliminate some restrictions and facilitate the emergence of important fresh initiatives.

Therefore, without interfering in the creativity inherent in cultural activities, we should concern ourselves with the economic and social position of its artists. After all, in modern society, artists are cultural workers and, as such, have an equal right to demand the benefits of social progress.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the motion which you are about to vote upon means that the Parliament agrees with the guidelines set out by the Commission in its Communication. Nevertheless, the financial basis for our action will be largely inadequate unless the needs of the cultural sector are taken into account in our Community budget. It would be futile to hope for any reinforcement of Community action in the cultural sector without increasing the appropriations to finance culture.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

### 5. Special measures in favour of Greece

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-919/83), drawn up by Mr Papantoniou on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-639/83-COM(83) 477 final) for a regulation on special measures in favour of Greece in the social field.

**Mr Papantoniou (S), rapporteur.** — (GR) Mr President, the resolution which I am tabling on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs refers to the provision of Community finance for the construction, adaptation and equipping of vocational training centres in urban zones of Greece, where the

Regional Fund cannot intervene, and of centres for the treatment and medical, vocational and social rehabilitation of the mentally ill and the mentally disabled.

Both the Commission and the European Council, Mr President, have recognized the weaknesses of the social and economic structures of Greece and the need for financial support from the Community to enable Greece to remedy those weaknesses and to participate in the common policies of the Community. In the social field these weaknesses are especially pronounced in vocational training, particularly in urban centres. The Regional Development Fund is already contributing to the setting up of eight new vocational training centres in Greece, but no support is envisaged for Athens, which accounts for a third of the total population of the country and where there is only one vocational training place for every 3 500 inhabitants. Moreover, most of the equipment in existing centres is unsuitable and outdated and could not be modernized at reasonable cost. There are similar inadequacies, both of quantity and of quality, in the treatment of medical, vocational and social rehabilitation of the mentally ill and the mentally disabled.

These serious inadequacies in the social infrastructure prevent Greece from taking adequate advantage of the assistance of the Social Fund. Furthermore, it cannot offer its people the opportunities for vocational training which are taken for granted in other Community countries nor can it participate in policies for the social integration of the disabled. The Commission therefore took the initiative of proposing to the Council that special measures be adopted to provide financial aid for the creation and equipping of vocational training centres.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs fully supports the Commission's proposals and in particular approves of their being classified as special measures. It would point out, however that the limit laid down for financial aid to vocational rehabilitation centres, that is, the percentage of the total outlay, is significantly lower than the corresponding limit for centres for the disabled. This lower limit may unduly restrict the scope of their programmes. Furthermore, the Committee feels that the proposed decision-making procedure for the individual programmes is unduly cumbersome, with opinions being sought on two levels, once from officials and again at Council of Ministers level, and it therefore calls on the Council to simplify this procedure.

Finally, it stresses the need to implement the special measures from 1 January 1984 and hence to enter the relevant appropriations in the 1984 budget. I note that the necessary amendment has already been accepted during Parliament's first reading of the budget.

**Papantoniou**

Mr President, the motion for a resolution proposing the special measures in favour of Greece in the social field was approved unanimously by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and I hope it will enjoy the same success with Parliament as a whole.

**Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE)**, *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment*. — (GR) Mr President, I warmly welcome the report of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and thank my colleague Mr Papantoniou for his detailed presentation.

The special financial support for Greece in the social field is not only useful but essential because of Greece's special structural problems. Unemployment in the past two years has reached the startling figure of more than 10 %. It is true that this can be attributed to many factors, but one of them is the inadequate provision of training and education. However, there have unfortunately been instances where funds allocated by the EEC for this sector have been returned because they were not used.

Consequently, the Commission quite rightly proposed this special financial assistance for the modernization of the vocational training system and for the improvement of the social and vocational reintegration of certain categories of disabled people who are usually suffering from mental illness.

In its motion for a resolution addressed to the Council and supported by a unanimously positive opinion from Parliament's Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, the Commission specifies Greece's needs and proposes the allocation of a total amount of 120 000 000 ECU to be spread over a four-year period which we hope will begin in January 1984.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Greece has specific needs, to which Mr Papantoniou has already referred, but I hope you will allow me also to remind you that the population of the Attic Basin, the area around the capital, today accounts for one third of the total population of the country and that 60 % of the jobs in the industrial sector are in the Athens region, so that the rate of population growth has therefore been such that it has not been possible to create the necessary infrastructure and social services to keep pace with it.

Furthermore, whereas the Athens region has produced almost 60 % of GNP in recent years, it has accounted for only 27 % of public investment and about 3 % of state budget appropriations for infrastructure projects.

In addition, the level of development of the rural areas, which account for a large part of the population of Greece, is very low and fluctuates, according to area, between 25 % and 50 % of the Community average.

We support the Commission's motion for a resolution and feel sure that Parliament will approve it because it answers the specific urgent needs of Greece.

**Mrs Fuillet (S)**, *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning*. — (FR) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, this report deals principally with actions which are not eligible for Community grants, but which are necessary owing to the basic deficiencies of Greek structures.

As regards the construction and equipping of vocational training centres, the special action proposed is justified on the one hand by the fact that the European Social Fund does not provide for the construction of such centres and, secondly, by the fact that the absence of infrastructure in Greece prevents the intervention of the Fund. Furthermore the ERDF cannot intervene in Athens and in Thessaloniki, which are excluded from the field of application of the Fund.

In this context, it must be emphasized that the choice of such action in urban centres is dictated by the need to remedy the problems caused by the urban population spilling over into these zones, even if the aim of our policy is to fight urban concentration.

As regards the project for the construction and establishment of centres for the care and rehabilitation of mentally handicapped persons, the problem is the same as that mentioned previously. The total cost of reorganizing the psychiatric system is about 200 million ECU for a period of five years. Efforts must concentrate on reducing the number of patients in psychiatric units, improving the existing centres and creating units in non-specialized hospitals. The 60 million ECU proposed by the Regulation are essential to get this programme underway.

In fact the Community responsibility is on two levels: on the one hand it has a responsibility in the vocational sphere and, secondly it must assist Greece to acquire preliminary basic structures so that it can benefit from Community policies and instruments in the same way as the other Member States.

This is why the Committee on Regional Policy unanimously adopted the opinion in support of this report presented by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, and I recommend to all Members present, and particularly to those who will be able to vote tomorrow, to vote overwhelmingly in favour of this report.

**Mr Kyrkos (COM)**. — (GR) We will be voting for the special measures in favour of Greece in the social sector. While we would underline how positive and impressive the contributions of Mr Papantoniou and Mrs Fuillet and the case put forward by the Chairman of the Social Affairs Committee were, we would ask for an extension of the proposed measures. As regards vocational training, it should be pointed out that the problem is not one of adapting and intensifying the

## Kyrkos

activities of the relevant special centres but rather, to a large extent, of getting them started. Therefore, the Commission's proposal quite rightly refers not only to regional areas but also to urban areas which are not covered by the European Social Fund. However, it should be noted that the financial situation in Greece is such that it would be difficult to fund a large programme which, while inadequate in itself, would be enough in absolute terms to provide for 17 000 skilled training places in Greece over the next five years.

We agree wholeheartedly with that part of the Commission's proposal which refers to the modernization of the system of treatment and social rehabilitation of the disabled and the mentally ill; the situation of such people is tragic, they are cut off from Greek society and it is essential that this situation be rectified. We in this Assembly must not hesitate to condemn the utter indifference with which the problems of the disabled in our country are treated — or even ignored.

In addition to the efforts already made by many sectors of Greek society, the unanimous decision of this Parliament and the grant of substantial sums in aid will be a powerful spur to the Greek Government and Greek society to take further steps to implement urgent programmes to rectify the existing shameful situation and make life tolerable for such people and for their families, most of whom suffer from a feeling of guilt, conceal their tragedy and thereby aggravate its consequences.

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — Madam President, once again the actions of Parliament are proving, if I may say so, helpful to the activities that the Commission are anxious to undertake. In this field we have had a very useful debate, and I am very grateful for the support expressed in all parts of Parliament for these proposals. We regard them as important; we regard it, indeed, as extremely important that we should get them through the Council of Ministers, and therefore the support that Parliament is giving us is especially welcome.

Greece is, of course, among the regions designated by the Council as being in priority need of Social Fund aid, but its capacity to avail itself of that aid has given it a share of only 4% approximately in 1982 and its rate of actual utilization of Social Fund aid is even lower. The special measures now proposed by the Commission as part of its response to the Greek memorandum are not eligible for grants under any of the Community financial instruments, but they do relate to essential actions to be undertaken if this Member State is to be in a position to create the basic infrastructure necessary to carry out sufficient actions to enable it to qualify for a reasonable volume of aid from the Social Fund and give its people the kind of opportunities for rehabilitation and vocational training

which are taken for granted throughout the rest of the Community. In view of the economic situation in Greece, we think that special Community aid is essential if these developments are to take place.

I would say a word about the two major items which are contained in these proposals. As far as vocational training centres are concerned, the available statistics on employment and unemployment do not, in our view, reflect the realities of the Greek situation. The official unemployment rate has shown a sharp increase from 4.1% in 1981 to 6% in 1982 and an estimated 8% in the current year. These figures cannot, however, be considered fairly in isolation. They have to be looked at in conjunction with other factors such as the high proportion of the working population employed in agriculture — over 30%. One must bear in mind that Greece has the lowest income per head in the Community and has a very high degree of underemployment.

Against that background, the volume of vocational training being carried out in Greece is, by any standard, extremely low by comparison with other regions of the Community in need of urgent development. The figures are there and, I hope, are reasonably well known by now. There is a shortage of both training centres and training staff. Greece has at present a capacity of only 27 000 training places, representing approximately one place for every 340 inhabitants. The situation is particularly acute in Athens, where 37% of the population is concentrated but where the ratio of training places to population in the age group 20-44 years of age is no higher than 1 : 3 500. Moreover, most existing training centres and their equipment are completely out of date, unsuitable for modern training requirements and frequently incapable of being modernized economically. This is why the Greek Government has made it an objective in its five-year plan for the period 1983-87 to expand and modernize its vocational training structures. This will entail setting up 71 new training centres with a total capacity of nearly 17 000 places in the most densely populated urban zones; 53 of those training centres are planned for the Athens area, where capacity will be increased by nearly 12 000 places.

The problem is simply this: that the European Regional Development Fund is assisting the construction of training centres in other parts of the country, but legally it cannot finance the construction of similar centres in Athens or Salonika. Capital expenditure being out of the question, the Social Fund could only help the Athens and Salonika centres through the accelerated depreciation facility. This would, however, not avoid the burden of further capital expenditure for Greece. The Greek Government, in an endeavour to keep costs down, is now drawing up an inventory of existing publicly-owned buildings which might be suitable for conversion to vocational training facilities.

**Richard**

Special Community aid, in our view, is essential to the realization of this programme. The figure we are asking for is 60 m units of account. This relates only to the capital expenditure: it excludes the cost of training and it excludes the cost of training of trainers, which would, of course, be eligible for Social Fund aid in the normal way.

I now turn to the other part of our proposals. There are about 9 000 psychaitric patients in Greece in large institutions unsuitable for housing the mentally ill and seriously inadequate in space, beds, lighting, heating, washing facilities, cleanliness, sanitation and furnishing. Medical, nursing and paramedical staff are inadequate in numbers and inexperienced in modern psychiatric techniques. The result is a system based upon the principle of containment where mortality is high and the rate of integration into normal life is low. In the private sector, there is a total of around 4 000 patients. Material conditions may be sometimes better, but treatment methods are very similar. The Greek Government is determined to remedy the situation as part of its general reform of the public health system.

Psychiatric patients in Greece have, at the present time, almost no opportunities to accede to vocational training and join in a process of social and vocational integration as recommended by Community policy, accepted by Parliament and practised in the other Member States — frequently with Social Fund aid. Existing psychiatric health services in Greece are, for the most part, centralized and institutionalized. Many areas have no psychiatrist: we have come across cases, for example, where patients are treated as far as 800 km from where their families live.

Greece has recently enacted legislation for a new public health system based on the treatment of psychiatric patients in small units with family and Community support and aimed at reintegration into normal life and work. This will cost an estimated 200 m units of account over 5 years. It will entail the renovation and humanization of existing institutions and reducing the number of patients in them, simultaneously with the development of psychiatric units in general hospitals, setting up new community mental health centres and constructing a broad geographic spread of new centres to pursue modern methods of social and vocational integration. Community aid of 60 m units of account over that five-year period is, in our view, essential if this programme is to be carried out.

Finally, the Commission sees these proposals as exceptional, one-off measures as a gesture, among other things, of Community solidarity to enable Greece to bring about the essential processes of development which are obviously necessary to enable this Member State to participate fully in the European Social Fund and to bring social and human conditions of impor-

tant categories of the population up to a level prevailing in the rest of the Community. I congratulate Mr Papantoniou on raising this issue. I congratulate him on his report and, as I said at the outset, we are grateful for the support of Parliament in this endeavour.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

#### 6. *European centre for craft trades and SMUs*

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-901/83), drawn up by Mr Deleau on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the creation of a European centre for small and medium-sized undertakings and craft industries.

**Mr Moreau (S), deputy rapporteur.** — (FR) The report which I am presenting to you on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, in place of Mr Deleau, who is unable to attend, and which deals with the creation of a European Centre for SMUs and Craft Industries, arises out of the Parliament resolution of 16 February 1982 on the situation of SMUs and craft industries, paragraph 18 of which called for the creation of a European Centre for SMUs and Craft Industries in the course of 1983, the European Year of SMUs and Craft Industries.

I will deal in turn with the objectives of the Centre and the arrangements for setting it up.

1983, the European Year of SMUs and Craft Industries, is drawing to a close, and the final conference will take place here in this Chamber on 8 and 9 December next.

Having observed and participated in the events of this year very closely, I may say that it has been a success. All of the participants have expressed the wish that there be a follow up to this European Year 1983. Indeed there would be no point in presenting a Community programme for these categories of undertakings on 9 December next if we did not have the financial resources and instruments to implement such a programme from 1984 on.

Already the signs are encouraging. I am thinking in particular of the Commission proposal to create European venture capital for SMUs, a proposal which will be discussed by Parliament at one of the next part-sessions.

However, if one considers the programme adopted at the opening conference of the European year, whether on the question of financing, vocational training, the dissemination of information to company heads or the definition of the position of SMUs in their legal, administrative, fiscal, economic and social environment, many measures need to be taken, likewise indeed if we are also, just to quote a few examples, to

## Moreau

encourage SMUs to participate in sub-contracting, to issue patents, or to facilitate legal cooperation between SMUs or alleviate the difficulties of SMUs in peripheral regions! Consequently, to follow up the widespread publicity campaign undertaken successfully this year and to initiate proposals it is necessary to create the corresponding instruments.

If a Community policy for SMUs is to be implemented rapidly and effectively, the Commission must have greater resources at its disposal.

Resources must be increased while avoiding of course the pitfalls of bureaucracy.

The creation of a European Centre for SMUs, equipped with an adequate but manageable structure, will do just this. Indeed, the need for an independent and representative body acting as a link and initiator has been felt during the various conferences held.

Failing such a centre, the European Year 1983 will have been nothing more than an academic exercise and the Community programme for SMUs just another study. However, we have promised not to let this happen. The SMUs and craft industries must not be recognized today and forgotten tomorrow.

Where the aims of the Centre are concerned, I feel that it is essential that you adopt the first five paragraphs of the resolution submitted to you without major amendment. These five paragraphs all deal with the need for the Centre, of which there can be no further doubt today. Indeed the European Parliament, which approved the necessary appropriations for this Centre in the European Community budget for 1984, has already accepted the need for the Centre on a budgetary level. Today, all that is needed, so to speak, is to accept it legally.

As regards the functions of the centre, those mentioned in paragraph 6 of the resolution, (i.e. to disseminate information, to give an impetus, to evolve ideas) are just examples. In my view the Centre could also engage in other activities.

Once created, it will be up to the Management Board to define the objectives of this body. In my opinion paragraph 6 presents the general aims of the Centre sufficiently clearly for the present, though these will have to be defined in greater detail, and I am sure that both the Commission and Parliament will try to do this in the coming months.

As regards the arrangements for the operation of the Centre dealt with in paragraphs 7 and 8 of the resolution, the indications contained in these two paragraphs are necessarily limited at the present stage. We wanted to concentrate on formulating two essential principles. On the one hand, the representativity and independence of the Centre. On the other, its mixed financing, since on top of the present very limited budgetary allocation of 100 000 ECU in the Budget of the Communities for 1984, there should be an additional contribution from the professional organizations themselves.

In our opinion, the centre should also have private law status.

In conclusion, the creation of a European Centre for SMUs and Craft Industries is directly in line with previous resolutions by the European Parliament and the undertakings in the course of this year.

The Community, which has belatedly recognized the essential role of SMUs in its economic development, must acquire the resources and instruments necessary to implement a policy promoting such categories of undertakings.

Since 1953 there has been a very important office for SMUs in the USA, employing several hundred officials and intervening very effectively on behalf of the SMUs in the area of financing, investments, management consultancy, public contracts and labour negotiations.

To recognize the place and role of SMUs and craft industries in the Community economy and to wish to implement a policy in favour of such categories of undertakings implies likewise the acquisition of some essential instruments. The delay we have incurred must not be further compounded by lack of funds. This is the purport of this report, which I hope will meet with Parliament's widest approval.

That, Madam President, was what I wanted to say on behalf of Mr Deleau in presenting this report, and I should like to add, as Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, that I hope that this report will be adopted unanimously and that, even if some groups have comments to make on the vagueness of its mandate or the resources made available to this Centre, we manage to acquire the legal instrument necessary to back up the budgetary allocation.

**Mrs Desouches (S).** — (FR) We obviously support the creation of this Centre in principle. The importance of SMUs needs no further proof and we believe that any organization which can — as the report states — perform the function of disseminating information and, possibly, putting forward proposals, should be encouraged. Nonetheless, it must be said that the project before us is quite vague, and therefore we must ask the Commission to study the envisaged operation and structure of this Centre with a view to proposing an arrangement which is both clear-cut and consistent. For the moment, it is absolutely necessary that we agree to this concept so that work can continue. The amendments which have been proposed are varied and seem to us on the whole, pointless and even bad, in particular the one which proposes adding 'small private businesses' to the name of the Centre. Already, it must be said, we are encountering some difficulties in finding an exact definition of SMUs and SMIs, but what of the concept of small private businesses? In my view the centre must identify very clearly with the problems of craft industries, SMUs and SMIs and not deviate from this.

**Desouches**

Mr Delorozoy's amendment raises the problem of control. For my part, I am fully in favour of control, on condition that it is a financial control. Insofar as the Community provides finance it is normal that the Community should control. Of course if another form of control is considered, then I cannot agree. Furthermore, another amendment attempts to have an already existing establishment accepted as the Centre. To my mind there can be no question of pursuing such a policy. The Centre must be a new creation.

In conclusion, I hope that Mr Deleau's report is adopted without fundamental amendments. It presents a framework within which we can build.

**Mrs Tove Nielsen (L).** — *(DA)* Madam President, during our talks in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, I said that we in the Liberal Group would return to this question here in Parliament since we take a very positive view of the matter. We think it is very important that this Centre should be set up. It is not simply the Centre as such which we are interested in, but we are also extremely concerned about conditions for small and medium-sized undertakings — and I say this in the light of the fact that the idea for this Centre really originated with our French Liberal colleague Mr Combe, who has unfortunately passed away in the meantime, who actually proposed making 1983 the Year of Small and Medium-sized Undertakings. He was very much concerned about this issue. We in the Liberal Group have followed up this work and we have now arrived at what will be the culminating point of this Year of Small and Medium-sized Undertakings. I am pleased that the amendments which are in my name only have in fact been tabled on behalf and with the support of the Liberal Group, which agrees that if a new centre is to be set up in the Community it is important that it should be established in a Member State which has not got something of the kind already, since this is another of the ways in which we can make it clear to the citizens of this Community that what we are doing here is of everyday relevance.

Mr Delorozoy and myself have attempted by means of a few amendments to tighten up the text somewhat, since it is, we think, very important that certain aspects regarding the structure and respective competences should be clearly defined. We also think it is very important that the professional organizations represented on the Board should be the appropriate ones — although we obviously by no means think that the Board of Directors for a centre of this kind should be a forum for either current or previous Members of the European Parliament. It must be the members' professional qualifications which count, and it tends to be people in these organizations who are most highly qualified.

Madam President, I should like to conclude by saying on behalf of the Liberal Group that we are very pleased to have made so much progress and that we hope that the Council of Ministers will be able in the very near future to take its final decision. The requisite budgetary appropriations are there and we hope and believe that the Council of Ministers will also take a positive view. We are also obviously pleased, therefore, that the Danish Government is very interested in doing something with a view to having this Centre set up in Denmark. We are very much in favour of this and expect it will in fact be the case.

**Mr Nyborg (DEP).** — *(DA)* Madam President, the Year of Small and Medium-sized Undertakings is coming to its close and, as the introductory speaker in this debate, Mr Moreau, said it has been a success — fortunately, since the small and medium-sized undertakings and craft trades are essential to the life of the Community, since it is in these areas where the new jobs, which we so urgently need can be created.

My reason for tabling an amendment to this report is that, like so many other people, I know from experience that it is by no means difficult to grow from inside. It is very difficult, on the other hand, to tone things down, as it were, if they start off on a grand scale. I would therefore recommend a certain amount of caution as regards the economics of the project and that we should start by making the top post that of director, since no self-respecting Director-General can live without at least two or three directors below him, which would mean that we would have an entire hierarchy with all this involves.

Unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately — I do not know how we should look at it — the question of where the centre should be established is not to be decided here but in the Council of Ministers. Obviously, as a Dane, I would like it to be set up in Denmark, where we have a certain amount of experience with small and medium-sized undertakings, since we unfortunately have no large ones, and for this reason I can obviously give my support to the proposal to the effect that the centre should be set up in Denmark.

**Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission.** — *(DE)* I should like to begin by thanking the rapporteur, Mr Deleau, in his absence for his initiative and Mr Moreau for presenting this report so circumspectly on his behalf. This initiative indeed fits very well into the general context of the successful work which has been done in this Year of the Small and Medium-Sized Undertaking. If I have understood them correctly, all the speakers in today's debate are working for still further clarity in their attempts to achieve a broad consensus in favour of this initiative, and it might therefore be useful if I made a few remarks which might be of assistance in this respect. Depending on the form it took, a European centre could certainly

## Narjes

contribute towards documenting the importance of these undertakings for economic prosperity, clarifying the particular conditions with which they are faced and promoting awareness of the European dimension of both the problems and the solutions. In view of the tense budgetary situation, however, we should also have a clear idea of what we expect the centre to do, the purpose we expect it to serve and the form it will take, for example to avoid duplication of effort with existing bodies and to justify the new functions. Thus, the centre should not appear to be an end in itself and do no more than carry out public relations exercises.

The motion for a resolution specifies three functions: information, influencing national and Community authorities and evolving ideas. The information function should concern only those legal and regulatory provisions with implications for SMUs and craft industries. It is in fact virtually impossible for the sole proprietor of a business to find his way through the maze of national regulations, particularly when movements from one country to another are involved, including intra-Community trade. Thus there is a need for information, but we must raise the question — and this question will indeed be raised in the Council of Ministers — as to whether this should be a permanent task for the European Community which will continue to require public funds. Would it not be better to promote the information activities of those institutions which have already proved their worth with a view to increasing their degree of European cooperation? One might quote the example of the chambers of commerce and industry and their networks, but I am also thinking of the new legal information network and, last but not least, the new Carolus Magnus research and documentation centre which is mentioned in one of the amendments, and where apparently some of the highly attractive ideas put forward by Mr Deleau have to some extent already been put into practice without any need for intervention or assistance from above — at least as far as we know for the time being.

The centre should perform two further functions, i.e. alerting national and Community authorities to shortcomings or inconsistencies and putting into effect a genuine Community policy, and evolving ideas including defining the role of SMUs and ensuring that they are taken into account in Community policy.

Basically, this is all quite correct, but the terms of reference for the centre should be drawn up with caution and precision so as not to overshoot the mark, as otherwise this centre could end up as a policy-making body. The functions of the various responsibilities, i.e. policy initiatives, institutionalized surveillance and the legislative and executive functions are assigned by the Community system to quite specific bodies, nor would it be in the interests of this Parliament if new autonomous centres with a right of initia-

tive were to be set up. I was consequently pleased to hear Mr Moreau say that he was thinking in terms of private economic status, so that questions of this kind could scarcely arise in the Council of Ministers.

Nevertheless, the general approach of the motion for a resolution deserves our support, particularly as it is reflected in paragraph 5 which mentions, *inter alia*, the need of SMUs and craft industries for representation. This is a very important point. What we need at any rate is a sort of UNICE for these categories of undertaking, i.e. an independent body to represent the interests of the group *vis-à-vis* the Community institutions and, in particular, to adopt positions on the various proposals awaiting decision, i.e. a qualified and authorized partner which the Commission can consult for sound expert advice.

When the function and tasks of the centre become clear — and this will be necessary if the Council of Ministers approval is to be secured — the questions concerning the organization and status of the centre will be resolved almost automatically, beginning with the question of whether the centre should be set up from above, as I mentioned just now, or develop on the basis of agreement between the economic sectors involved. Until such clarity is achieved, the structure of the centre and the need for financing of the Community budget will remain rather uncertain.

The same applies to the motion for a resolution before us. In the discussions of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, the problem of the structure, location and staffing of the centre was not resolved but excluded from them and from the report. Mr Nyborg has reintroduced an aspect of the problem, but the concept of a director implies to the impartial reader that the centre might or should be a public institution. That point must be clarified. It might therefore be a little premature to put the motion to the vote in its present form. I can imagine, in the light of the comments made by Mr Moreau, that the groups will be trying to reach a compromise agreement this evening.

The Commission can offer you no patent remedies, but we can always help in ensuring that the questions under discussion are not only concisely worded and the options clear, and we can also help — if our help is wanted — in achieving a consensus between the parties.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

## 7. Results of Community sponsored R & D

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-931/83), drawn up by Mr Ippolito on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the

**President**

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-110/83 — COM (83) 18 final) for a draft Council resolution on promoting the utilization of the results of Community sponsored R & D.

**Mr Veronesi (COM), rapporteur.** — (IT) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission document mentions a real problem, which is of great current importance. Scientific research is not only a fascinating adventure but must also be a prerequisite for the peaceful development of civil, economic and social progress in the various nations of the world. Community research assignments are particularly geared to this second objective. Perhaps there have been delays in reaching the objective proposed by the Commission as regards Community cooperation. It is certain that this is a complex problem for which it is not easy to find a solution, and which faces the national research institutions of all the more advanced countries.

The Commission initiative is therefore welcome. The proposal, which received an unanimous vote in favour from the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology of the European Parliament, and Mr Ippolito's short but clear report, are more than sufficient to demonstrate the extent of the problem, making further illustration unnecessary.

I will confine myself to highlighting three points which might clarify the issue under discussion. The first concerns the need for close Community cooperation, and the fact that joint research must benefit everyone. It is therefore necessary to have greater courage in ignoring individual interests, which represent a danger that can strike at any time during the course of Community research projects.

The second point concerns suitable means for making available the results obtained from the research itself to potential users for technological applications. The Commission document is perhaps rather deficient in this respect, since it basically only relies on Directorate-General XIII. It needs imagination to pinpoint other channels and instruments which could be used. The Commission has made a few suggestions which appeared and still appear, suitable.

The third point concerns the amount of finance available. This is the *leitmotiv* of all our conclusions: the finance available does not seem to correspond to the needs proposed by the Commission.

In conclusion, we believe that the motion which we have tabled supports and upholds the Community initiative, and should therefore be unanimously supported by Parliament.

(Applause)

**Mr Adam (S).** — Madam President, first of all I want to congratulate the rapporteur in his absence. Research, development and demonstration are

accepted as having a very strategic role to play in ensuring economic prosperity, and the successful innovators benefit in terms of employment and of their balance of payments. We have only got to look at how good the Japanese and the United States are in this connection.

In the Community there are two broad motives for initiating joint action. Firstly, to increase the rate, efficiency and variety of technical development beyond that possible by national efforts alone. Secondly, to pursue Community and institutional objectives in national and international areas, as well as promoting Community integration.

The Socialist Group welcomes this report and the Commission's proposals to improve the utilization of Community R & D results. We have the same reservation as the rapporteur about the level of allocation for this purpose, but at least an improvement is indicated.

The major problem still remains the monitoring of the results. This is mentioned in paragraph 17 of the explanatory statement. I hope the Commission will accept that each research programme should have provision for built-in monitoring of the results.

I hope too that the Commission will accept paragraph 9 of the motion for a resolution and spell out very clearly how it intends to ensure that research findings are more efficiently made available to potential users.

I would also ask the House to accept Amendment No 1, in the name of Mr Linkohr. To overstress the self-financing possibilities, we believe in our group, is unnecessarily restrictive, given the economic position of the Community, and we would rather that that paragraph were deleted from the motion for a resolution.

**Mr Pedini (PPE).** — (IT) Madam President, the Group of the European People's Party supports this motion and approves the Commission's proposal.

If we were to take a look at the scientific research system of an important country such as Japan to form a comparison, I do not believe that our commitment would be seen to be much inferior to theirs; perhaps what is lacking is that research results are not made available to enough people and are not used. It is therefore even more appropriate that the subject of the use of Community research results be dealt with by the rapporteur with his usual authority. We therefore agree that the Commission should spare no effort, and hope that it will act accordingly. With reference to the proposed amendment No 1 tabled by Mr Linkohr, which requests the deletion of point 6, I wonder, Madam President, and I address Mr Adams in particular, whether a compromise solution would not be possible, so that point 6 would read as follows: 'urges the Commission to set as one of its medium term objectives the desirability of making programmes self-financing through the marketing of patents and licences'.



**Pedini**

In this way the scientific research service provided by the Community can continue to be free of charge, but in certain exceptional cases, measures can be taken to use patents by means of self-financing.

I therefore table this compromise proposal, and reconfirm that my Group supports this motion.

*(The sitting was suspended at 8 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)*

**IN THE CHAIR : MR VANDEWIELE***Vice-President*

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the Ippolito report (Doc. 1-931/83).

**Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission.** — *(DE)* I would first like to congratulate the rapporteur in his absence on his report and warmly thank the speakers for their constructive contributions towards it.

The Commission has submitted to the European Parliament a proposal for a Council decision, together with the corresponding communication, on the improved use of the results of Community-sponsored R & D. The Commission is pleased that paragraph 9 of the motion for a resolution submitted to Parliament by its Committee on Energy and Research approves the Commission proposal. The associated requirement that the procedure whereby research results are disseminated to potential users should be improved and made more effective will not pose any problems to us. Indeed, that is the primary purpose of the working programme outlined in the Commission document.

The remaining paragraphs in the motion for a resolution do not present any problems either, with one exception. Before going into this, namely paragraph 3, I would like to make some comments on a number of individual proposals.

According to paragraph 1, it is essential for the Commission to provide an assessment of Community activities to ensure that funds are used properly. In addition, paragraph 8 requests a report on the extent to which Parliament is involved in the protective measures concerning the results of Community-sponsored research. The Commission will be issuing statements on both questions in its annual reports which it will be submitting regularly to Parliament and the Council in the field of the improved use of R & D results.

I would point out in connection with paragraph 4 that already around one quarter of the specialists involved in the use of research findings were formally employed in Community research establishments. In mentioning specialists I am thinking also of the refer-

ence in paragraph 5 to special experience in marketing and industry and to the expertise of patent agents. I would emphasize that the Commission department specializing in the use of research results is staffed exclusively by persons with specialized knowledge of this kind, including three patent lawyers. Despite limited funds the Commission has for years been cooperating successfully with experts in a number of studies on marketing or technology, and one of our aims is precisely to intensify our activities in connection with marketing.

Although we therefore have the prerequisites for the objective mentioned in paragraph 6, namely to make Community R & D programmes self-financing in the medium term through the marketing of patents and licences, I am aware that this will be a lengthy process. We shall even have to make a serious effort to maintain and increase the revenue of approximately 120 000 ECU from the use of R & D findings in 1982. The objective you referred to sadly becomes even more remote when one considers the changes now being made in Community research policy. In view of this we have no objection to the proposal made by Mr Linkohr.

With regard to paragraph 3, the Commission shares the view expressed by your Committee in the first one-and-a-half lines of the paragraph, namely that measures to ensure that fuller use is made of research results ought to be closely coordinated. However, the conclusion which we have drawn on the basis of our experience differs from the rapporteur's. The research programmes are the responsibility of the Directorates-General concerned. They are carried out partly by private contractors and partly by Community research establishments scattered throughout the Member States. Their activities can only be coordinated by a central body which has no direct responsibility for any particular research programme, but which is in close contact with each programme director. Moreover, the task of making better use of research results — and here again we agree with the entire House — should be undertaken by specialists. If the Commission were to provide a team of specialists for each research project carried out by those Directorates-General engaged in research, six to eight times more staff would be needed, sadly an unrealistic requirement in view of the present staff policy. It is also unfortunate that Parliament's attitudes to the Commission's staff requirements, which are seriously hampering its further development, should be so restrictive.

I would like to conclude with those observations concerning paragraph 3. Once again I would like to thank the rapporteurs and the speakers for their contributions and I hope that this report will soon also be discussed by the Council.

**Mr Moreland (ED).** — I should like to ask the Commissioner whether he is not being a little cheeky, if I can phrase it this way, in making his remarks about staff. Have the Council and Parliament not been very generous about staff at Ispra, particularly following the ending of the Super-Sara project, by assigning the staff to other projects rather than getting rid of the staff?

**Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission.** — (DE) I was not just referring to Ispra; I meant that staff accounts for such a small part of the overall Commission budget that all political activity by the Community is hampered, while I regret to say that Parliament could be more helpful in catering for European objectives by providing the Commission with more qualified personnel.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

#### 8. Reactor safety — Nuclear fission technology

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-935/83), drawn up by Mr Galland on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the

proposals from the Commission to the Council on:

- I — a decision adopting a programme of research on the decommissioning of nuclear installations (1984-87) (Doc. 1-524/83 — COM(83) 298 final);
- II — a decision adopting a research programme on reactor safety (1984-87) (Doc. 1-528/83 — COM(83) 299 final)

and on the communication on a research action programme on the development of nuclear fission energy (1984-87) (Doc. 1-457/83 — COM(83) 300 final).

**Mr Galland (L), rapporteur.** — (FR) Mr President, I would like to say that this Commission action programme is in line with the policies repeatedly advocated by the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology which are the subject of highly topical discussions. Thus this report ties up, for example, with the Lizin report on nuclear safety, the Pintat report on the nuclear aspects of Community energy strategy and the Seligman report on breeder reactors. Moreover, I consider that this report meets an objective which was very well defined in the Linkhor report, which has been adopted, and in which it was stated:

'If one wished to describe the role of the Joint Research Centre more precisely, safety could well serve as the overall concept. It comprises the development of technical standards and devices to protect

man and his natural environment from the dangers resulting from the use of modern technology.'

Thus in many areas this Commission action programme is in line with the policies advocated by our Parliament.

I should like to make a few general comments, Mr President. First of all it is gratifying that the Commission appears to have learnt from the unfortunate experience of the Joint Research Centre. Now, the new policy consists in taking direct action only for activities on which there is broad agreement, or even full consensus, in the Community, and secondly, in developing shared-cost actions which permit further research in those areas where it is most advanced in a Community country and thereby make optimum use of Community resources and give the ten countries of the EEC the benefits of the results obtained.

It has to be noted, however, that shared-cost action is obviously more effective in an area where there has already been national investment, and it is to be regretted that parallel to this commitment on shared cost action, the European Commission does not take the initiative more often in making forward-looking proposals on new systems which would thus justify the creation of Joint Research Centres, about whose efficiency there would be little or no doubt.

Let me add that during the discussion on my report, a slight problem arose with the Commission which was settled by means of the amendments adopted by the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology. We believed that where there was shared-cost action, the European Commission should provide us with details of the programmes in which the Community funds for this shared-cost action would be invested.

As regards one of the two aspects of this report — reactor safety — obviously this is the larger sub-programme and involves both direct action by the Joint Research Centre and shared-cost action. This programme aims at improving living and working conditions, improving safety, protecting health and the environment and promoting industrial competitiveness.

This action covers both light water reactors and fast reactors. This shared-cost action budget has objectives and resources which have nothing in common with the previous programme, since it is multiplied more than ten-fold. The former budget was 6.3 million ECU and we have ten times that amount. However, the changes in the Super-Sara programme and the savings involved mean that the savings on direct action largely offset expenditure on shared-cost action. The overall budget will therefore change only slightly.

Furthermore, I would like to point out that this programme proposal has not been put forward to compensate for the abandonment of Super-Sara; it was drawn up well before the decision to discontinue Super-Sara, because it met a need.

## Galland

Now, Mr President, I would like to broach the second problem. It would be desirable if the Commission would state how it carries out the contracts, because it is in any case essential, in terms of the budget, for these contracts not to go the way of other contracts in the energy sphere, and therefore for the carryovers of payment appropriations not to be abnormally high.

As regards the decommissioning of nuclear installations, this is an old problem but one which remains very topical, because in 1978, when the first programme was implemented, only five nuclear power stations had been decommissioned whereas there are now more than ten, and in the next ten years, on the basis of a station operating life of thirty years, it will be necessary to shut down 20 to 25 reactors, thus fully justifying this programme.

Mr President, so as not to exceed my speaking time too much, I would like to say a word on the amendments. I am surprised at some amendments from the Committee on Budgets. They are six in number and I must say very frankly that I do not regard them as budgetary amendments, but rather as technical amendments which are the responsibility of the Committee on Energy. In the case of four of them — on which the Committee on Energy did not deliver an opinion because it was not aware of them — I personally recommend that they be rejected because the technical arguments are incorrect. This is not surprising and I don't understand why the Committee on Budgets has started tabling technical amendments. That it should table budgetary amendments, that I can understand, but if it intends to replace all the technical committees of Parliament, it is better that it should say so straight away and we could therefore make less of an effort.

As regards the other amendments, Mr President, a special problem arises since Mrs Lizin tabled three and has since withdrawn two. In the case of the third, I personally recommend that it should not be voted on, because it was not examined in committee. Mrs Viehoff was not able to submit her amendments to committee on time, and I would therefore recommend — since I know the Commission's feeling on this matter — that these amendments be rejected.

Let me conclude, Mr President, by saying that in my opinion it is necessary to avoid the error of regarding this as a report for or against nuclear energy. It is a report which accepts the existence of nuclear energy. Since this is so, do we want more or less safety for the nuclear power stations which exist and do we want Community action in this field? This is why I welcome the fact that the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology has voted by a large majority in favour of this report.

I simply regret that, in the spirit that I have just outlined, there has not been an absolute consensus on

this, because I consider that this is not a conventional discussion on nuclear energy, and that the report should be accepted unanimously.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Lizin (S).** — *(FR)* Ladies and gentlemen, I regret that this debate on energy is taking place during a night sitting and that we have so few opportunities in this Parliament to discuss such issues at times which traditionally are considered important.

The Socialist Group as a whole will support Mr Galland's report because its present form appears to us to reflect our own priorities on the question of nuclear safety. Indeed our group considers that it is crucial that significant progress be made as regards safety and that research is of major importance in this field when one considers that reactors are here to stay in Europe.

We are encouraged to support the report by the fact that Mr Galland has withdrawn the passages directed against those who express reservations about nuclear energy in general.

As a politician representing a Belgian town which is a nuclear site, and as the neighbour of a town 30 km away which has just experienced an earth tremor of greater intensity than any recorded to date in Belgium, I am particularly aware of the vital importance of research on safety, but above all perhaps its application in practice. Indeed we hope to see this research reflected rapidly in terms of Community policy, in European standards, in financing also, in particular with regard to the decommissioning of nuclear power stations.

Decommissioning is a very near prospect for many of these power stations, as Mr Galland pointed out. In Belgium, it is estimated that it will be in 12 years for Doel and in 15 years for Tihange I, and we welcome the fact that the research will cover a wide area, that it will include the elimination of radioactive waste and that its objective, as we are requesting, will not only be research, but also the implementation of a veritable Community decommissioning policy.

Finally, our group would like to point out three other aspects to which we attach importance: the Regulation providing for consultation in the event of the construction of nuclear power stations at borders, the establishment of a complete data bank on malfunctions in European reactors, and the coordination of aid plans and the creation of a European nuclear emergency service.

We also stress the importance of non-nuclear research. In this context, Mr Galland, let me say that one of the amendments of the Committee on Budgets should in our view be retained, namely Amendment No 6. And while congratulating you again, we wonder if it would be possible not to list only the French projects, as you have done in paragraph 5, since it

**Lizin**

may perhaps be worthwhile broadening the scope of this work.

**Mr Sassano (PPE).** — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, today we find ourselves once more discussing an issue which we were debating as far back as eight months ago. I am referring to the report on the Super-Sara programme, which represented one of the most important pieces of research into the safety of nuclear reactors which the European Community had undertaken, and which directly involved the Joint Research Centre, and indirectly, the scientific and technological skills of the Member States.

The remarkable courage shown by Commissioner Davignon, who requested adequate human and financial resources for the programme, thus encountering support from some in this Assembly, and diffidence and hostility from others, who saw in Super-Sara a chance to regain face after the preceding Community defeats in the nuclear field, has not been rewarded, and the Super-Sara programme, has, after years of study and accomplishments, been suddenly halted before reaching completion.

It would be interesting to identify the people responsible and the reasons for this failure, but unfortunately the Community is not in the habit of pausing to reflect on its own failures, preferring to pick itself up after a fall quite unperturbed, as if nothing had happened.

Very optimistically Mr Galland believes that the responsibility for the failure should be attributed to the management of the programme.

I am sorry, and also seriously concerned, that Mr Galland has not yet realized that the case of Super-Sara is typical in the Europe of today which has been appropriately renamed 'non-Europe'.

I should like those responsible in the Commission to inform us of the stage reached in agreements with the USA, upon whose technology our reactors' safety depends completely.

Although admittedly the finance involved, which amounts to 260 millions units of account for the 4 year programme on reactor safety, and 12 million units of account for the 5 year programme on the decommissioning of nuclear reactors, represents a fairly substantial part of the budget within the wider context of the Community's available funds, it is totally inadequate for the financial commitments which should be made.

Nevertheless, and in spite of our fears that the last spark of hope might be quenched, the PPE will vote for the motion which has been brilliantly prepared by Mr Galland.

**Mr Normanton (ED).** — Mr President, may I congratulate Mr Galland on his report which deals

more, as I see it, with a matter of emotional and political relevance to nuclear energy than to the scientific or technical aspects of it.

There are those in this Parliament — whom we all know, and Mr Galland has referred to them — who are totally opposed to all aspects of nuclear energy. Of course, the amendments standing in the name of Mrs Viehoff are a classic example of this. But all the scientific evidence in the world proves that nuclear energy is by far the least injurious to human health and to the environment. It is far less injurious than any other source of energy, in particular coal or oil.

The role of the Commission, therefore, as I see it is a political one in this case — and that is the way in which I interpret their proposals — other than a scientific one. For this reason I believe the House should give the Commission its fullest possible support.

Not only has the Community the resource sources — and no-one should underestimate those — for the proposed scientific action programme but the Commission has a political responsibility on behalf of and in the name of all ten Member States.

The last point which needs to be made in the short space of time available is that I feel that the full weight and the authority of the Community as a whole needs to be placed behind the efforts of those Member States of the Community who are striving, after ten years of stranglehold by the oil-producing countries, to rid themselves of the constraints which a dependence on oil has imposed. It is only by speeding the expansion of nuclear energy — and this programme will be a major political influence in this direction — that Europe can hope to begin to overcome the crisis and to see a resolution of the dilemma we are faced with.

**Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission.** — *(DE)* Mr President, I would first like to extend my warmest thanks to the rapporteur for his excellent report and for the proposals it includes concerning research projects. He rightly stressed that the programmes envisaged by the Commission and Parliament coincide more or less exactly. I would also like to thank those who have contributed towards this debate and have encouraged us to continue on our chosen path.

Before I go into the reasons why the Commission submitted the proposals now before us, there are two points which I would like to comment on. In connection with the Liège earthquake, Mrs Lizin, I would point out that the regulations relating to earthquakes are set out in our general nuclear programme, and we are preparing a study at Ispra on whether it is necessary to invest in simulation equipment to enable us to examine the consequences of earthquakes for individual reactors more effectively than is possible on a purely theoretical basis or on the basis of experience in other fields.

## Narjes

I have two comments to make in reply to Mr Sassano's question. Firstly, contracts cannot be concluded with the United States until the programme is adopted. Secondly, while we are sorry about the Super-Sara project, we must realize that if we are to have a successful energy and research policy we must have the strength to discontinue projects which for any reason — mostly unforeseeable — prove to be no longer desirable, justified or necessary.

To turn to the thinking behind our proposals, one of the main objectives of the Commission proposal for an outline programme on the Community's economic and technical activity from 1984 to 1987, which has been submitted to Parliament and to the Council, is to improve the management of energy reserves and to reduce our dependence on energy imports. To achieve this objective the Commission has prepared various action programmes, and the action programme on improvements in the recovery of energy from nuclear fission is now before you.

The Commission has always stressed that it regards nuclear energy as one of the most important means of diversifying energy production and thus of reducing our dependence on energy imports. In accordance with this principle, which has already been approved by Parliament and the Council, the Commission has proposed Community measures including measures concerning reactor safety and the closure of nuclear installations. Both programmes have been examined by the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology. They were the subject of Mr Galland's report and are recommended in the present report. We are grateful for this.

In the motion for a resolution before us it is regretted that the Commission has not proposed a programme on the reprocessing of nuclear fuels. However, the Commission has been constantly in touch with developments in this area and might be prepared in due course to examine the possibility of Community action. Since nuclear energy now accounts for a substantial proportion of energy production in most Community countries, the cost-sharing programme on reactor safety is a particularly important undertaking. The Commission proposal for an action programme in this field and the associated activities relating to all types of reactor mainly concerns light water reactors and fast breeders. In selecting research subjects particular emphasis was placed on accident prevention and the early detection of abnormal operating conditions.

Since the Joint Research Centre is also carrying out an extensive programme on reactor safety, it was considered important to complement both programmes in a sensible way. Another consideration in drawing up the programme was the use made of research projects forming part of national programmes, especially those which require bulky apparatus. The financial contribution towards the proposed programme takes account of progress in the

corresponding national programmes and therefore complements them. An increase in funds compared with the last cost-sharing programme on reactor safety has been proposed. The reason for this is that the programme has been extended to include fast breeders — the 1979-83 programme was confined to light-water reactors — and that a wider range of work is to be undertaken. It should be noted, however, that despite this increase, Community expenditure on reactor safety has not increased very much since, as you know, the Super-Sara project has been abandoned and an attempt has been made to rationalize the use of funds as far as possible. The programme can therefore be regarded as appropriate in view of the general financial situation.

As for the additional research projects proposed by Mr Galland under paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution, these are already implicit in the programme. The Commission will try to take account of these proposals as far as possible when implementing the programme.

To turn to the subject of the closure of nuclear installations, the proposed programme of research on this is to be a continuation of the current 1979-83 programme. Numerous public bodies and firms in five Community countries have been cooperating on this, and valuable results have already been obtained. These will be presented and discussed by an international panel of experts at a conference to be held in Luxembourg in May 1984. The rapporteur rightly drew attention to the growing importance of the closures in the coming years. The proposed funds, which were estimated in the light of the need for a strict budgetary policy and amount only to about 2 % of the total funds for the action programme, therefore appear very modest.

With regard to the opinion delivered by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, I fully agree that the possibilities for the final storage of radioactive waste and the results of the possible Community research programme should have a decisive impact on the implementation of the programme for the closure of nuclear installations. Concerning the proposal by the Committee on Budgets to reduce the duration of the programme to four years — that is, until 1987 — I would point out that the Commission completed preparations for the proposed programme as early as August 1982 to ensure that it could be adopted in good time. The action programme was not then in existence. The second programme on nuclear closures was, like the first, planned to run for five years, since a fairly long programme would offer advantages in terms of administrative costs and continuity of research. The Commission intends, however, to synchronize all the subprogrammes connected with the action programme when the programme is reviewed at the end of 1986.

## Narjes

In conclusion I would once again like to stress the importance of the programmes under discussion. The Commission feels that they will make a major contribution to the debate on nuclear energy, especially since they will result in a closer approximation of the various safety provisions, and to the removal of barriers to trade in the Community.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

### 9. Migrant workers

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-811/83), drawn up by Mrs Viehoff on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on the problems of migrant workers.

The following oral questions tabled pursuant to Rule 42 of the Rules of Procedure will also be included in the debate :

— oral question with debate (Doc. 1-857/83) to the Commission by Mrs Cinciari Rodano, Mr Fanti, Mr Ceravolo, Mr Papapietro, Mr Carossino, Mr Galluzzi and Mr Bonaccini :

Subject: Education of the children of migrant workers

Can the Commission state what action it has taken on the resolution of 18 September 1981 (OJ No C 260, 12 October 1981) on the education of the children of migrant workers and in particular to the implementation of paragraph 6 of the resolution which calls on it to provide the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport with the information already in its possession on the state of implementation of the Directive of 25 July 1977?

Has the Commission taken steps to organize, in conjunction with the national authorities, pilot projects to improve the conditions for the implementation of suitable teaching methods and for the training of teachers? Can the Commission also state whether it has extended the field of application of the Directive, in accordance with paragraph 5 of the above-mentioned resolution on the education of the children of migrant workers?

— oral question with debate (Doc. 1861/83) to the Commission by Mr Frischmann, Mr Adamou, Mr Damette, Mr Ephremidis and Mr Alavanos :

Subject: Unemployment among immigrants

Despite the considerable contribution immigrants living and working in the Member States of the Community have made to the industrial development of Western Europe, they are currently having to contend with the tension created by the

climate of hostility towards foreigners and are much more acutely affected than their other comrades by the problem of unemployment.

According to a recent study by the Nuremberg Institute for Labour Market and Occupational Research, immigrant unemployment is far higher than the average. In the summer of 1982, unemployment among foreigners in major West German cities amounted to 25-30 %.

Would the Commission therefore state :

1. What specific measures it is taking, within its overall strategy to fight unemployment, to combat the tremendous social problem created by mass unemployment among immigrants and the climate of hostility towards foreigners?

2. What its attitude is to the harsh anti-social measures taken by certain Member States' governments against immigrants from within the Community, which violate EEC Regulation 1612/68, ILO Convention No 97 and the European Social Charter, e.g. deportation of immigrants whose income or living space does not meet the required standards; obstructing young people's education and preventing the reunion of family members, etc.?

3. How, more particularly, it intends to deal with the problems of Greek immigrants which have become especially acute on account of the long transitional period provided for in the treaty of accession as regards their right to freedom of movement?

— oral question with debate (Doc. 1-962/83) to the Council by Mrs Dury, Mr Glinne, Mrs Dupont, Mr Van Minnen and Mrs Salisch on behalf of the Socialist Group :

Subject: Migrant workers

In view of the increased incidence of racism in Europe and the exploitation and exacerbation of xenophobic sentiments in the course of recent election campaigns, would the Council state which Member States have not yet adopted laws to prohibit xenophobic or racist acts,

Does the Council intend to launch a European Campaign against racism and xenophobia, particularly by considering what measures could be taken to discourage xenophobic sentiments.

**Mrs Tove Nielsen (L).** — (DA) Mr President, I am very sorry that after so much time spent working on this subject we are having to hold the debate at such a late hour, since this is a subject which really did take up the attention of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. We had various meetings on the subject and we held a hearing where we listened to the views of organizations concerned with migrant

## Tove Nielsen

workers in the different countries. The Committee on Social Affairs also accepted a large number of amendments, and the result of the vote was the report before you this evening. Moreover, there are more than 60 amendments tabled, and these will be voted on tomorrow. All this is clear evidence that this a subject which is of the greatest concern to the Members of this House.

I would remind you that Parliament started debating this subject as long ago as 1973, when it held a debate on migrant workers. Ten years later we are forced to note that neither the Commission nor the Council has yet made any move to do any of the things Parliament called for in 1973, and the problem has become greater since then.

The migrant workers came to the Community at a time when we needed their labour. There were a lot of vacant jobs which we could not fill ourselves or which our own workers were perhaps unwilling to take because they were not always so well paid. We needed these migrant workers regardless of whether they came from one of the Community countries, from a country with which we had bilateral agreements or from a third country. The fact is that there are different categories of migrant worker, with different rules for each category, and that makes the whole problem even more difficult. However, we were glad to accept them because we needed them. I emphasize this because we must not forget the human aspect.

Now we have a different economic situation, one of recession. We have an astonishingly — I might even say disturbingly — large number of unemployed; in other words there is a lack of jobs in Europe. If we forget the human aspect we get what we deplore in this report — the growing racism of which there are signs in certain parts of the Community. Some people obviously think that those from other countries can now just go home again because we no longer need them. This gives rise to a large number of problems, and on purely humanitarian grounds it is unacceptable. Regardless of what country in the world they come from they are humans. It is human beings who are involved, and these human beings have a justified claim to be treated as humans, just as we would ourselves like to be treated.

Ten years after 1973 we are therefore calling upon the Commission and Council to draw up a statute laying down proper conditions for the large numbers of migrant workers in the Community. However, I should like, as rapporteur, to make an appeal to the migrant workers, because there is something required of them too if they are to make anything worthwhile of their lives once they themselves have taken the decision, at some stage, to settle in one of our Member

States. If they really want to live here they must themselves do something to integrate into our society. However, they frequently come up against barriers, and we know — and we have written this in the report — that laws and directives cause some problems which make it very difficult for migrant workers to obtain the rights to which they are entitled. Particularly when they are unemployed it is so important for them to know what rights and opportunities they have. Anyone who knows the situation will agree that this is so.

There is something else that must be borne in mind, and that is the problem of the second and third generations. This causes educational problems, but problems need not be a bad thing — just something which we must solve to the satisfaction of all concerned. We must get the second and third generations integrated into society, and this raises some linguistic problems. There is another problem with a lot of women, for many of the migrant workers come from countries where the cultural tradition is different from that in Europe. Their tradition need not be worse than ours, and we must learn to respect each other as human beings. In the country I come from the problem is perhaps not so great, since many of our migrant workers come from, for instance, the Nordic countries, and their total number is not very great. In any case, the cultural tradition in the other Nordic countries does not differ greatly from the Danish tradition. In other Member States the problem is much more noticeable, and for women in particular there can be problems to which we must give consideration.

Mr President, the Liberal Group will not be speaking in the ensuing debate, as I have promised to speak on its behalf at this stage. When you stand at a workplace, earning your wages performing a piece of work, you are contributing to society, and it is our firm belief that migrant workers should have both the right to vote and the right to be elected at local authority level, and there are Member States which have already accepted this. We feel it is a human right to be able to determine the course of the society in which one has chosen to live.

Let me close by saying that, if migrant workers want to return to the countries they came from, this must be a free choice. We do not believe in direct or indirect pretexts for sending them home.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Gaiotti de Biase (PPE)**, *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport.* — (IT) Mr President, I too deplore the fact that this debate has to take place so late, since we have run behind schedule, and will

## Gaiotti de Biase

try to use up the smallest amount of time possible for my speech. The stance taken by the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport with regard to Mrs Nielsen's report is already clear from the document voted on by the Committee itself and the amendments that were tabled. I will therefore confine myself to a general reference to the guidelines which the Committee has decided to put forward.

First and foremost we wished to emphasize that this problem involves not only the protection of a sector, but the very image of a society. We should realize that geographical mobility is destined to become an increasingly typical characteristic of future society and that we should therefore adapt our way of life, customs, laws and interventions accordingly. We must construct a European society which is capable of meeting this challenge. What is needed is not the occasional random measure or act of generosity or aid, but a systematic response to this social transformation which cannot be ignored.

Secondly, the Committee wished to emphasize an issue over which it has specific jurisdiction, i.e. the cultural integration of immigrants, which goes by the name of 'schooling' but which really represents a much more complex problem of which there are various aspects, all of which fundamental. With regard to schooling for the children of migrant workers, we must admit that, since the directive concerning the children of migrant workers from Community countries is practically ignored, the case of the children of those coming from non-member countries is even worse, since they do not even come under this directive. We hope that the chance that we are trying to give to the children of migrants from Community countries (for example bilingual schools, whose aim is to both facilitate social integration and avoid destroying ethnic identity, and which undoubtedly involve, difficulties and represent a challenge to our teaching system and methods) can also be provided for the children of migrants from non-member countries.

We should, however, also realize that it is not enough to educate immigrants' children. Unless the parents are provided with education, the children's schooling remains only a half-hearted gesture involving contradictory effects. As a teacher I will never forget what the son of a migrant worker from southern Italy once told me, who was living in his native country, and was therefore in an ideal educational situation. He said: Coming to school estranges me from my father. We must take great care to avoid creating the rifts within a family which schooling can cause. When we influence the children we must therefore simultaneously influence the parents: schooling cannot be efficient unless it is directed at the whole family nucleus.

Finally there is the problem of maintaining the ethnic identity of groups of immigrants by exploiting their contacts with each other to the full. The accountants will, as usual, say that all this costs too much money. We have pointed out in our amendments, however, that the Community Council of Ministers for Education has recently shown concern at the high rate of unemployment amongst European teachers because of the fall in population. Here we have the chance to draw up programmes involving a very low teacher/pupil ratio, i.e. few pupils to each teacher, so that this problem within the Community can be solved.

The Committee points out that there is much to do, and much can be done, in the Community by relying on specific programmes in this sector. This programme on migrant workers opens up many possibilities.

Finally the Committee has decided to support and reinforce the opinion of those who are in favour of making available an efficient framework legal instrument to regulate the whole issue, including those aspects which do not directly concern our Committee, as mentioned by the rapporteur, i.e. the right to vote, social security, housing and the legal status of women. All these aspects should be welcomed by this Assembly as elements of the open society which we hope the European Community will become.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Papaefstratiou (S)**, *chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment*. — (GR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am particularly happy that now, after quite some time, the thorough report by Mrs Nielsen has come up for discussion in plenary session and I hope that by its vote Parliament will adopt a positive attitude towards the problems of migrant workers and migrants in general.

You can understand my sensitivity on this matter, on the one hand because of my position as Chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment: in this position I have been able to observe closely all the discussions, preliminary studies, proposals and conclusions made by the committee on this complex problem; on the other hand my sensitivity also comes from the fact that I am Greek because Greece is a country where for many decades a section of the population has been working and often doing well but has always been living in foreign countries.

We are all aware of the importance of the problems of migrants, but at the same time we think of the obstacles and difficulties encountered in an attempt to deal with them. How should it be possible to harmonize, and that for the better, the various systems and legislation which hold in the member countries with respect to the status of migrants if we consider that often at a national level, that is in a more particular and concen-



### Papaefstratiou

trated area, no solution has yet been found to the problem? There are many details surrounding the serious matters which daily occupy the lives of migrant workers, matters of education, health, social security, and also often religion, but recently the unpleasant phenomenon has been observed that migrants are the victims of racist manifestations, that they make up the highest number of unemployed and that they still suffer difficulties in integrating into the host countries.

The economic crisis brings additional problems which it is our duty to point out. What has our Community done? There has been no shortage of efforts and good intentions, which shows that the matter causes concern in all the European institutions and in the governments of the Member States themselves. But unfortunately, ten years after our efforts began, despite the Council vote of 21 January 1974 and the action programme of 1975, everything shows that the question has unfortunately been neglected. The European Social Fund, with the limited financial resources at its disposal, and the inevitable priorities given to various needs must not delude us into thinking that it could be the most suitable means of taking measures on migrant employment. Then what is the importance of the proposed measures in the Nielsen report? As we can see, the report ends by proposing to the Council and the Commission that they draft a directive by means of which the action programme concerning migrant workers will be modernized, at the same time giving priority to signing and rectifying the convention which concerns the legal status of migrant workers in the countries of the Council of Europe, and also to harmonizing the social directives in the Member States which concern the living conditions of migrant workers.

However, I believe that the importance of the proposals contained in the Nielsen report extends to the following points: in the first place, it shows us the will of the European Parliament to make progress in tackling and solving such a serious problem. Secondly, this motion fills all the requirements necessary for the European Communities to become the driving force which will set in motion the political will in every Member State so that all the States, within a relatively short time, will agree on an overall approach to the problems of migrants.

Our colleague Mrs Nielsen said that we should excuse her for being hoarse owing to a cold. We heard her well, and we listened very attentively. I hope that the Council of Ministers will hear the voice of the European Parliament and will be moved to deal with the problems of millions of our fellow men who live near us and with us and face the gravest problems.

**Mr Ouzounidis (S).** — (GR) Mr President, it is indeed a very good thing that such a serious question

should come up in Parliament, namely that of migrants, which concerns 15 million people who are not moving around but are migrants with permanent homes in mainly industrial countries of Europe. Those 15 million usually work in hard, dirty and unhealthy jobs, that is to say they are left those jobs which the indigenous population usually refuses to do. For that reason they are certainly not easy to replace. Meanwhile, after some years of hard work and after a certain age, particularly in periods of unemployment, they are no longer sought after even for the jobs mentioned above.

This leads to an increase in the current of repatriation and to the transfer of unemployment, and other social problems, from the host countries to the countries of origin. That is to say that the countries which are hit hardest both in periods of economic recovery and in periods of decline are the poorest countries, because in the first case they lose their best driving force, mainly young people, whom they see, once they have prepared them to enter the production process, leaving for richer countries. In the second case, the older people and all those outside the job market return home, relieving the industrial countries but transferring unemployment to the poorer countries.

Therefore, the Community, in cooperation with the host countries and the migrants' countries of origin, will have to help in creating the right conditions for smooth voluntary repatriation and to create jobs in the countries of origin.

In attempts to help migrants adapt properly to the place where they are living and in planning for the smoothest possible repatriation and rehabilitation, the migrants themselves can play a positive role by means of their organizations, which have first-hand knowledge of these problems and enough experience. Therefore we must recognize their role and support them financially. At the same time, everything must be taken into consideration and we should listen to all suggestions made during the various stages of the work to solve migrants' problems. We consider the concern for integrating the immigrants socially and legally as being a positive step. However, at the same time, they must be given the freedom and the opportunity to develop their own way of life and their own culture if they wish, and to learn their own language and about their own civilization.

The present reality is disappointing. No attempt has been made by the host countries to adapt correctly, and on the other side, the immigrants do not have the opportunity, to experience and to develop their own way of life. Thus they remain on the margins of society forming the subproletariat of the country where they are living, even in the second generation. On the labour market it is difficult for them to lay claim to jobs in the same way as the indigenous population.

### Ouzounidis

We suggest that Parliament should support financially and take part in the Fourth European Congress of Immigrants in Stockholm. As far as we know up till now, the only countries which have shown interest in taking part in its work and helping it financially are Greece and Sweden. The results of this Congress could be of use for dealing with such a serious problem as this. At the same time, the European Parliament, in cooperation with the host countries of immigrants, should have a campaign to find out public opinion about the role and contribution of the immigrants in those countries in an attempt to deal with the racist tendencies which have taken on dangerous proportions recently in Europe. We also suggest that 1984 should be made the year of the immigrant.

Finally, I would like to stress once again that no decision aimed at solving problems must be taken without consulting the interested parties. We believe that only the substantial participation of immigrant organizations can ensure that any measure taken is just and successful.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (PPE) — (IT)** Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is a well known fact that at least two fundamental aspects are now associated with immigration. The first is the prevalence of migrant workers from non-member countries as compared with those from Community countries, and the second is the growing presence of young people who are second and third generation immigrants, needing to integrate socially, culturally and professionally, and requiring better living conditions and respect for human rights.

Immigration has created, and continues to create, many problems both in countries of origin and in host countries, because of profound differences in traditions and ways of life.

Migrant workers are called upon in periods of economic expansion, driven away again in period of economic depression and crisis, are often without any form of social security or national insurance, and are ill-prepared for the requirements of occupational mobility; they are therefore more vulnerable in the present difficult situation.

In many cases the rapid developments in migrant flows caught the governments of the Member States ill prepared to receive the migrant workers, who have had to deal with all kinds of legal and social problems to do with recognition of remuneration guarantees, work contracts, social security and trade union rights.

It is obviously inconceivable that Member States of the EEC should implicitly or explicitly allow immigration, while at the same time shirking the responsibility which this entails in terms of social infrastructure, low cost housing and aid for schooling and integration.

It was only in 1971 that the EEC decided to lay down certain principles governing the free movement and social security of migrant workers and their families, since by immigration this time involved all its Member States.

This was only the first stage. Subsequently the Commission of the European Communities created an action programme to assist workers from non-member countries, in response to the demands of trade union organizations and associations of migrant workers taken up by some Euro MPs and made into Parliament resolutions.

This was the first attempt to form a framework programme which would include social policy guidelines of a general nature, instructions on the reception of migrant workers, and family, housing, education, vocational training and social participation policies.

While this action programme was being worked on by the Commission, some associations became convinced that some fundamental principles should be defined in a more binding and concrete way in a systematic and specific statute for migrant workers.

These proposals, which were submitted in preceding sessions of the European Parliament, were discussed by the appropriate committees, but did not get beyond the preparatory stage, so that no final document has been adopted. In the present session, the need for a statute was reiterated in further motions, including my own of November 1977.

It referred to the need for Community consultation on immigration policies, and also took into account the question of non-member States, because the Member States were proceeding so slowly in their harmonization of social legislation, and called on the Commission to draw up a framework report as soon as possible on the state of the migrant worker problem, which would describe the stage reached by initiatives from the Commission itself, highlighting problems concerning social security, trade union rights, political rights, schooling, the quality of life for the families of migrant workers, social and cultural integration, integration in employment of the new generations and illegal immigration.

The situation of female immigrants who were already disadvantaged and discriminated against in their countries of origin, and now have to cope with the further frustrations and unease of their situation as immigrants should also not be forgotten in this context.

Most of the problems I have referred to appear in the Nielsen report, and once more I draw the attention of the Commission and the Council of Ministers to them, and request concrete initiatives.

As regards the amendment which I am submitting to this House, whose aim is to ask the Commission for the long awaited framework report on the whole

**Cassanmagnago Cerretti**

problem of migrant workers, it seems to us essential that the harmonization of legislation on migrant workers and the coordination of immigration policies should be preceded by a fact-finding survey.

I sincerely hope that the Commission and the Council of Ministers will follow this Assembly's guidelines, and will not shirk the responsibilities posed by this problem.

**IN THE CHAIR: MR JAQUET***Vice-President*

**Mrs Elaine Kellet-Bowman (ED).** — Mr President, I greatly regret, both personally and on behalf of my group, that we as a group are unable to support Mrs Nielsen's report. No rapporteur in my experience can ever have tried harder to reflect the views of her committee than she did, and yet the committee saw fit so to amend her report that not one single paragraph of her original report remains — not even a half paragraph! The result is a highly complex report which, in the English version, especially as regards paragraph 15, does not make sense, and for this she is in no way to blame.

However, our objections go beyond the form of the report to the actual proposals. We do not favour the introduction of a directive, as suggested in paragraph 16, which would define a legal status for migrant workers. This is an extremely sensitive subject. The situation in each country is entirely different as to the situation of the migrant workers, their cultural background and their aspirations, and the appropriate solutions differ accordingly. A directive is too rigid in that it involves finding common standards for problems which differ widely.

I very much doubt if the movers of the original amendment appreciate the practical difficulty of extending to migrants from third countries the 1975 action programme for migrants. The prime beneficiaries of this would be the Turks in Germany. But the something which would solve this problem would be entirely inappropriate to the situation in the United-Kingdom. We have a very large number of migrants from many Commonwealth countries who came to Britain 20 or 30 year ago to stay for the rest of their lives. Their mother tongues are numerous, extending over hundreds of dialects and sub-dialects of the Indian subcontinent. Our policy and their desire has been to integrate. But the whole thrust of the 1975 programme is to keep migrants in touch with their country of origin. This policy would introduce a wrong priority for Britain's third country migrants and would divert attention and resources from what we really need to do, and that is to make a success of the aims of the 1975 programme for Community migrants.

We do appreciate that in many ways migrants are discriminated against. We do want them to have equal access to social security rights and benefits, as well as the appropriate civil rights and rights of residents. We think that the best way to bring this about is through the moral pressure of a recommendation. This would be valuable because it would define the desirable levels of rights and benefits of migrants in the Community, but it would not have the heavy-handed approach of a directive. It would then be up to the Commission and the European Parliament to follow up on the recommendations.

For rather similar reasons, we do not think that a statute for migrant workers is desirable. What would be the value of this? What legal status would it have? We feel that the danger would be that a migrant worker statute would raise the hopes of migrant workers, but would actually prove valueless as a means of enforcing their rights in the courts. It will be interesting to hear the views of the Commission on this, since the Commission will presumably be responsible for drawing up the statute and seeing that it is observed.

We would also want to issue a word of warning on the question of repatriation. Again this is a very emotive subject and one which Parliament should be very wary of. The Community would seem very inhumane if it gave a high priority to repatriation, and we are glad therefore that paragraph 12 firmly rejects enforced repatriation.

My group originally moved a very simple amendment to the motion, which is still there buried within paragraph 19. We want to know from the Commission what plans it has to cope with the question of migrant labour, now that the economy of the Community is no longer able to support the migrant population of 10 years ago. Without hearing from the Commission first, we believe it is wrong for Parliament to put forward so many and such diverse solutions. As a group therefore we cannot support the report.

**Mr Adamou (COM).** — *(GR)* Mr President, we consider Mrs Nielsen's report as a good thing for migrants and their problems. However, we would like to emphasize some points and to make certain observations. As part of the more general crisis of capitalism, manifestations of xenophobia, of racial discrimination and of racism are flaring up once more and are growing more violent. Manifestations of violence and terrorism against immigrants appear almost every day in the countries of the EEC. These are made worse by those forces which apart from anything else attempt to blame the consequences of the crisis, and particularly unemployment, on the immigrants in the first place. We believe that migration is a structural and not a coincidental feature of the economies of the

**Adamou**

countries which have taken in immigrants. Hitherto all analyses, even those carried out by people who do not agree with us, have proved that unemployment is neither caused nor made worse by the existence of immigrants. Today, in the countries of the EEC there are 12 million immigrants, who are divided conveniently into one group of 9 million and another of 3 million, that is into a group of immigrants from member countries and a group of immigrants from countries outside the Community. Thus a second division of the workers is made. We condemn these divisions and we believe that the unity of all workers — nationals and immigrants — is the decisive element in their struggle to defend their rights.

A few words now about the Greek migrants, who amount to more than 300 000, and the discrimination against them. First of all, the vaunted principle of free movement of labour within the Community will only hold for them from 1988. That is to say there are limitations, time limits on residence permits and reduced allowances, which in many cases are not even paid out. The education and training of their children and instruction in their mother tongue are not provided. We condemn all discriminatory practices not only against Greeks but against all immigrants, and we would ask the relevant institutions of the Community to take measures to eradicate it.

Finally, I wanted to say that we have tabled some amendments in this connection to Mrs Nielsen's motion which we believe could improve it, and we therefore call upon all our colleagues to vote for them.

**Mr Remilly (DEP).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I have pleasure in congratulating Mrs Nielsen for her excellent report on the problems faced by migrant workers and their families in the Community.

The report represents considerable research and preparation work. I believe that it will have a future place as an important source of information.

The numerous resolutions on this issue which have been tabled during the last few years make it clear that action of one form or another is necessary at Community level. One of the fundamental points of the report is the need to introduce basic social justice for migrant workers and their families.

The Parliament does, I believe, recognize the major contribution which foreign labour has brought to the economic development of the host countries and also recognizes that in spite of the studies carried out into the problems of migrant workers during the last ten years, there has hardly been any improvement in their situation.

There are signs of mounting racism which are a cause of great concern. Parliament rightly calls for measures to abolish all traces of xenophobia and racism.

The number of migrant workers originating from non-member countries is estimated at between 12 and 15

million. Their presence in the Community is a well established fact. Unfortunately, so are the circumstances in which they live, their lack of rights and security at both social and educational level. The fact that they are discriminated against is also a matter of fact.

My Group has always expressed its deep concern at the present employment crisis and its serious consequences for young people. We are equally concerned that the rate of unemployment amongst young migrant workers is very high. This particular aspect has not been sufficiently emphasized in Mrs Nielsen's report. It should be noted that under the terms of the new social fund, which was adopted exactly one month ago, the problems of migrant workers continue to be seen as a matter of urgency. Aid from the fund is granted for expenditure caused by allocations for facilitating the transfer and integration of migrant workers and members of their families.

Mr President, the problems of migrant workers and their families living in the Community are numerous and varied. We believe that this report helps to draw our attention to the fact. Although we do not agree with some points, we believe that on the whole we can support Mrs Nielsen's report.

**Mr Buttafuoco (NI).** — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment today sets before Parliament Mrs Nielsen's report which deals with a very serious problem: that of migrant workers in the Community.

The Community now has six million migrant workers, not counting their families, so that all together there are at least 13 million migrants. These workers and their families are cut off from the political and social organization of their own countries and are not properly integrated into those of their host countries, which do not yet have regulations to encourage their total integration.

Let me mention employment, although I must say here that I am delighted to learn of the Commission's decision to establish a permanent office for the purpose of monitoring the progress of the integrated operation for Naples. This is a matter which we were first to bring before this House, thanks to Mr Almirante. As I was about to say, the Community is at present going through a difficult period as regards employment. Many countries which until recently enjoyed a particularly prosperous economic situation, which allowed them to employ migrant workers from other Member States, are now compelled because of the severe economic recession to cut down on jobs, particularly those filled by foreign workers, with the result that this is the category where there is most unemployment and which is suffering most from the effects of the crisis.

**Buttafuoco**

As Mrs Nielsen justly remarks — and we must compliment her on her excellent work — we must take it upon ourselves to make sure that migrant workers — amongst whom there are many of my fellow-countrymen from the south of Italy, Sicilians and Sardinians in particular, who have formed proper communities which are very well integrated into the working environments of their host countries and are much respected and appreciated — obtain the legal status to which the Treaty refers in Articles 7, 48 and 220.

The Commission and Council should make a study of the legal status of migrant workers without delay and, once formulated, the recommendations should be implemented immediately. We claim the right of migrant workers to enjoy the same civil rights as the residents of their host countries, whether they originate from Member States or from non-member countries. This differentiation between the two should not, however disappear straight away so as not to provoke reactions which may even be hostile, thus bringing about not a general improvement in the conditions of migrant workers, but a worsening of the situation which, in the end, would have repercussions on the people of the Community, and in particular my fellow-countrymen who work in other Member States.

I will conclude by emphasizing that every worker in the Community must, wherever he lives in the Community, be made to feel a resident with the same rights and duties as any other resident.

We will therefore support the report which has been so excellently prepared by Mrs Nielsen, and will illustrate our position further when voting on the amendments.

**Mrs Dury (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, I have just heard Mr Remilly's speech on migrant workers and was reflecting that if Mr Remilly's tone had prevailed during the recent electoral campaigns in France — and I am particularly addressing his own party — I believe that we would not have had occasion to witness this excess of xenophobia and racism provoked by these electoral campaigns.

The question which I wish to ask the Council does in fact concern the increase of racism and xenophobia. Three or four days ago, in the region of Strasbourg, two North Africans were 'beaten up' — this is the term which must be used even though its translation may cause difficulties — simply because they were North Africans. A short while ago, a North African was thrown out of the window of a train in France. This was done by five drunken soldiers from the Foreign Legion. I should say that these episodes are only the tip of the iceberg as regards racism and xenophobia.

I should like to ask the Council of Ministers to inform us of the initiatives Europe intends to take to put an

end to this racism and xenophobia. I believe that they form a threat to democracy, and if we are not careful, we may find ourselves contributing to this serious breach of the fundamental principles of the European Community. My question, to which unfortunately I have had no reply, was aimed at finding out which countries had adopted legislation against racism and xenophobia. France and Belgium obviously have, but we realize that this is not enough. Such legislation is necessary, but should be paralleled with much more important legislation on the actual situation of migrant workers. This is why I have supported, and still support, Mrs Nielsen's report.

Nevertheless I should like to go over what has been said. Migrant workers have contributed to the development of our economies. They are currently considered as beings apart, foreigners who stand in our way because unemployment is rampant in our countries. I believe that our first priority is to fight against unemployment, not the immigrants. We should bear this in mind. As Europeans, we must act firmly against xenophobia and racism, or we shall be betraying the principles which guided the creation of this Community.

I had prepared a speech on this problem. Nevertheless, I have preferred to speak spontaneously, because I am struck by the contrast between the formal speeches here and the reality towards which we are not reacting adequately and firmly enough. There are not many of us here this evening. Nevertheless, I hope that we will be able to read in the newspapers tomorrow that an alarm has been raised in this Parliament against the racism and xenophobia which we reject, and that we are ready to act and do everything in our power to put a stop to it in Europe.

**Mr Frischmann (COM).** — *(FR)* We are also disappointed that nearly ten years after the Council's adoption in January 1974 of an action programme to assist migrant workers the results so far achieved are so meagre. The elimination of all discrimination to do with living and working conditions, and in particular equal treatment for workers originating from Member States, still represents an objective for all the Member States. The social consequences of the crisis are weighing considerably on migrant workers and their families and there seems to be a worrying recrudescence of manifestations of racism and racist crimes. We of the Communist and Allies Group, unlike Mrs Kellett-Bowman, therefore feel it a matter of the utmost urgency that a proper statute for migrant workers should be adopted at Community level since 75% of these workers originate from non-member countries and since they are not therefore covered by Community legislation, and are left without protection against exploitation, indeed excessive exploitation, by their employers. Is this too much to ask?

**Frischmann**

Without wishing to portray France as exemplary, we feel that its immigration policy embodies some useful principles. The laws and regulations laid down since 1981, whose aim is to offer the immigrant population stability, to control migrant flows and to search for new forms of cooperation with the immigrants' countries of origin, seem to us to form a sound basis for suitable coordination of the immigration policy in the Member States.

This discussion on Mrs Nielsen's report is therefore of great current interest.

Obviously we should have liked to find more explicit condemnation of the part played by the former colonizing nations in organizing the massive flow of underpaid workers towards the industrialized countries. We should have also liked to find a more specific denunciation of those who exploit illegal labour and who deliberately speculate on ignorance, fear and poverty. Not all migrant workers' organizations demand an extension of their right to vote, even at a communal level, since this might force an artificial integration.

Having said which, we would emphasize the positive nature of the basic demands set out in the motion from the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment directed to the Council and the Commission, which calls for the adoption of a directive to properly update the 1974 action programme, and for its rapid and effective implementation throughout the Community.

I am therefore willing to vote for the motion, provided that amendments do not distort the general tenor of this report and motion.

**Mr Eisma (NI).** — *(NL)* Mr President, the rapporteur was obliged to spend three and a half years on this report, and we do not envy her. We have had a large-scale hearing all for the sake of this report. Furthermore, this is one of the reports to have given rise to the largest number of amendments in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, which is perhaps a reflection of the concern which the Members of Parliament feel about this issue. Unfortunately, I must even at this stage of debate in plenary table 17 further amendments and this is, I think, a conservative approach, but a conservative approach of which I see no signs on the part of Mrs Kellett-Bowman, who has now announced on behalf of the Conservatives that they do not intend to support the motion, although they have failed to table any amendments in plenary session. Is that democratic I wonder?

Mr President, if we as European Community fail to make any substantial progress towards solving the social, economic, political and cultural problems of migrants, this will aggravate certain dangerous tendencies such as intolerance and discrimination against migrant workers, which are already in evidence in many countries. As far as possible our minorities or

migrant policy — or whatever we wish to call it — must take its place within the overall policy applying to all the inhabitants of the European Community. All that is achieved by introducing too many specific measures for particular minority groups is that they are put into a special position, which is exactly what they want to get out of so that they can become fully-fledged members of the society in which they are living. In the view of D 66, the least we can do for migrants as regards political rights is to grant them the right to vote and stand for election at local level.

Specific measures are, however, appropriate as regards education, since migrants are at a disadvantage in certain respects. Steps should be taken to make up for this disadvantage and to prepare them to play an active part in society, and this education should not be based on the assumption that they will subsequently return to their countries of origin. Our aim cannot be to send the foreign workers home during the current period of relative economic difficulties, after having made use of them, although this is what certain countries would appear to have in mind with their measures. In my country at least, we often hear talk of paying people to clear off. Migrant workers, if they return to their country of origin voluntarily, should, for a certain period, also continue to enjoy their social benefits, as well as being reimbursed for the cost incurred. It will be difficult enough for them to get by in their own countries anyway.

A multicultural society will, I think be a major task for the Community to contend with, and the directive as proposed by the rapporteur in paragraph 16 of her report does not strike us as an appropriate instrument. We call for a revision of the action programme. It will be difficult enough for the Commission to get the Member States to agree on the points contained in paragraph 16 of Mrs Nielsen's motion, and we would be pleased if the Commission could tell us how it proposes putting these ideas into practice.

**Mr Viehoff (S).** — *(NL)* Mr President, Mr Eisma has just been discussing a directive which he is not very happy with. At any rate as far back as 1977 a directive was adopted concerning the education of children of migrant workers. This directive should have taken effect in 1981. At the beginning of 1981 — at the initiative of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport — prepared a report because we had grave suspicions that scarcely anything had been done in most Member States to implement the directive. Investigations then showed that these suspicions were justified.

Following this report the Commission assured us that the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport would be the first to receive the report of the Member States which was scheduled for 1982. We waited for this report and we thought it would

**Viehoff**

come by the end of 1982 but it did not. We then queried the Commission and were told that we would probably get the report in the early summer of 1983 but again no report was forthcoming. There was still no report in the third quarter of 1983. I ask myself whether we cannot conclude from this that the Member States — or at least a number of them — have failed to implement the directive and I also wonder whether it is not time for the Commission to bring the matter before the Court of Justice. One further comment on the statement by Mrs Nielsen, who would make an appeal to migrant workers to adapt themselves to the cultures of their host countries. How can you ask people to adapt if there is no way of communicating with them because nothing has been done about their language problems?

*(Applause)*

**Mr Ceravolo (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President, it has taken four years for this the issue which was the subject of one of my motions listed first, I see, in the list of documents recorded by Mrs Nielsen in her report to be reintroduced. Naturally my Group will vote in favour of the motion. Nevertheless we would, however, call on the Commission to state its view plainly.

We have been told in the past that a statute for migrant workers was not necessary, because it would come about automatically with the introduction of the free movement of persons in Europe; all that was needed was for the Treaties to be respected, and in any case a whole series of measures to deal with and resolve migrants' problems already existed.

Unfortunately we can see that, overall, the situation is getting worse since the problem does not lie in single deficiencies, but in this threat towards the weakest link in the Community chain, i.e. the migrant worker, in a crisis situation which is acute and which will probably remain acute, at least for the short term. We therefore call on the Commission, which we have often appreciated for acting courageously in some sectors in the past, to adopt a clear stance on this statute for migrant workers, even without the Council's blessing. This might give political encouragement to these migrant workers and the political forces which are fighting for them to persevere in their battle until they win.

The second problem is the question of the passive and active vote in municipal elections. In local elections, problems concerning the home, school, recreation and social services are dealt with. All this constitutes part of the workers' patrimony! We call it 'social patrimony' since it consists of workers' money, or rather public funds, which also contribute to training for migrant workers. It is therefore absurd to exclude workers from the places where it is decided how to use part of this 'social patrimony' and where influence can be exerted.

I would therefore ask Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti to withdraw the amendment establishing a date for drawing up a report on the subject: i.e. by the end of 1984. If we sanction this postponement, any sort of initiative will only be taken in 1985 at best. The situation is serious and it is impossible to wait any longer. I am sure that Mrs Nielsen will adhere to what has been decided by the Committee on Social Affairs.

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — I must say I think this has been an important debate, to come back to the discussion which took place right at the beginning. I think it has been an important debate. I think it is somewhat unfortunate, as many Members have said in the course of it, that it is taking place so late and, indeed, with a House that is as thin as it is. It is perhaps inevitable at 10.40 p.m. on a Thursday evening that the House is not full, but I am bound to say that on an issue which affects so many people within the Community, the Commission would have hoped for a better House and also we would have hoped for a more representative debate. It has been very interesting sitting and listening to it to see the demands that have been made. I got the impression that while I find myself in very considerable sympathy indeed with a great deal of what was said in the course of the debate, I could not help wondering as I listened to it how representative it was either of the views of the Member States themselves or indeed perhaps of political groupings that exist within the Parliament itself, which we perhaps did not hear as much from this evening as we tend to on this issue from time to time.

The European Parliament's interest and concern for the situation of migrants has been unwavering over many years. Mrs Nielsen's comprehensive report is the latest in a whole series of major contributions to the development of Community policy in this area. It will, I am sure, like some of its predecessors become a point of reference for future discussion. The Commission congratulates Mrs Nielsen on the scope of her wide-ranging report. I congratulate the Parliament too for holding this own-initiative debate. It is timely that Parliament should in the report, and in this discussion, highlight a number of very serious problems in a policy area about which none of us can fail to be deeply concerned.

Mr President, as Parliament well knows, it is to the general economic and unemployment situation that we must turn to find the main underlying cause of the particularly acute problems which migrants themselves, and indeed policy-makers at all levels are now facing. The sad fact is that the prospects for an early and sustained recovery are at best fragile and as long as our economies remain stagnant and as long as unemployment continues to climb, the risk increases

**Richard**

that the situation of migrants will deteriorate disproportionately. This simply reinforces the need for firm adherence to certain clear principles in our handling of these matters, principles which ensure that migrants, as vulnerable and as often under-represented groups in society that they are, are not required to bear an unfair share of the burden of the crisis and that progress towards the integration of immigrant communities in their host countries is not halted and is not allowed to slip backwards in precisely those difficult circumstances which make progress all the more important.

We must also take care that the understandable pressures and hostilities which are engendered in our societies by the employment crisis bringing pressure in turn on local authorities do not lead to an undermining of the principle of free movement, which is and must remain one of the core elements of the Community. There may appear to be a contradiction between the high importance which the Commission attaches to safeguarding this principle and our contention that it is the sociological problems of integration which face existing migrant groups throughout the Community that demands our most urgent attention. In fact the two are closely linked. The failure to cope with the problems of integrating existing migrants would be the greatest disservice we could do to the cause of free movement.

Could I say too, Mr President, that when I talk of existing migrants I mean those who have come from third countries too and not just those who move around from within the Community. Now, although the distinction between Community migrants and migrants from third countries is a legal one, that legal distinction is one which as a Treaty-based organization we must respect. The social problems and their possible solutions are not so easily divisible in the Community and non-Community baskets. The problems in the field of education are a good example. Third-country migrant groups are not separable, in my view, particularly in that area from the Community's concern.

Could I take this opportunity, having mentioned education, to reply more specifically to the oral questions put by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and others about the teaching of children of migrant workers. Let me refer first to the practical action of the Community in this field. As the House knows, a major programme of pilot schemes is now under way. That programme concerns the methodology of reception, teaching of the language and culture of origin. It includes intercultural education, teacher-training, the production and distribution of teaching material. The Commission is preparing a report drawing on the experience gained from those schemes since 1976 and this should be available before the end of this year. I hope it will be possible for Parliament to have a look on the basis of the newest data that we have got available.

Under its new rules the European Social Fund, I hope, will continue to be able to support actions geared to the specific needs of migrant workers and the members of their families. The guidelines will make more explicit the priorities for fund intervention in this as in other areas.

I turn now to the field of legislation. A Community instrument is currently being drafted which is specifically directed towards the pre-school education of migrant workers' children. We are now waiting for the opinion of the advisory committee on freedom of movement for workers. As to the existing directive on the education of migrant workers' children, the Commission report on the application of the directive is in the final stages of preparation. It will take stock of the measures taken in the Member States covering all migrant workers' children, whether they are Community nationals or not. The Commission will make its report available to the Parliament as soon as it is ready and at the same time as adopting the report we will consider whether there is any case for launching the procedures provided for by the Treaty for the enforcement of Community law.

With reference to the second oral question linked with this debate, tabled by Mr Frischmann and others, the Commission would invite honourable Members to look at its general proposals for combating unemployment, to see how we have tried to take into account — indeed, I think we have taken into account — the particularly difficult position of certain disadvantaged groups, including the migrant population. I have already mentioned the continuing and increasing role of the European Social Fund in this area. The House is well aware that the burden of dealing with what is an insidious and a rising tide of xenophobia, hysteria and racism can really fall nowhere except on the Member States. The Commission has stated, and we re-state now, that it deplors the growing trends in the Member States towards discrimination against the migrant population. We shall continue to use the power that the Treaty gives us to see that Community law is enforced. Most of the important Community obligations in this field — the most important example being Regulation 1612/68 — are directly applicable in the Member States, and these override contrary national laws or practices.

Greek workers are, of course, in a somewhat different position under the law for as long as the transitional period lasts, until the end of 1987. We have had full discussions in both the Technical Committee and the Advisory Committee on the Free Movement of Workers on the problems which may arise for Greek nationals during the transitional period.

We are continuously monitoring the situation with the Member States and we do take appropriate action in any cases of infringement of the Accession Treaty



**Richard**

provisions which come to our notice. Unfortunately, I have to say to the House that enforcing the law is far from being enough, as Mrs Nielsen's report itself makes very clear. It is hardly practicable for me to comment in great detail tonight on all the items in the resolution or in the amendments. There is a great deal of it with which the Commission would wholeheartedly agree. I would simply caution the House against any over-optimistic assumption that where the Parliament and the Commission agree, rapid and far-reaching changes are inevitably going to follow. The Commission, like the Parliament, lacks the means to put its views immediately into effect. If there has been any action, it has been mainly in the Council. It is rather too easy, however — if I may again sound a slight note of caution to the Parliament — simply to criticize the Council, although I do think they deserve some criticism in this field. I do not think it helps to ignore the genuine difficulty of many of the decisions we ask the Council to take. Without in the least suggesting that Parliament or the Commission is somehow at fault or that it is erroneous to champion the migrants' cause and to insist on a much fuller respect for migrants' rights, there is no point in our talking as if the Council or the individual member governments were systematically hostile to migrants' interests. I do not think they are. I think they have a dilemma, and that dilemma is a reflection of the conflicting demands and pressures that there are in the individual governments of Member States. It is a feature of our...

**Mr Harris (ED).** — I wonder if Mr Richard could clarify the Commission's point of view on this, because I think he has reached a very important stage in his argument. Is he saying that he goes along with the thesis that migrant workers have permanent rights in a country where they happen to be working even though the economic situation in that country has changed, i.e. if their job disappears do those rights continue? I think this is probably the nub of the problem. Let me hasten to add that I endorse wholeheartedly most of what the Commissioner has said up until now.

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, all I can say to the honourable gentleman is that he should not endorse it too quickly, until he has heard the rest of what I have to say. Secondly, of course they have rights. The rights are enshrined in Community legislation. Not only do they have rights which are enshrined in Community legislation, but it is the Commission's duty to enforce these rights in the event of being breached.

*(Applause)*

This is precisely what we shall continue to try to do.

In the days when I was in the House of Commons I enjoyed this as much as the honourable gentleman

now seems to, but I am bound to say it is not as appropriate for this legislative assembly as it might be for some others.

It is a feature of our democratic system that there are conflicting demands and pressures on Member States and on their governments. We must hope, however, that they do not simply respond to those political pressures without reference to what we believe to be fundamental standards and fundamental principles. A large part of the Community's role consists in reinforcing those standards and principles to ensure that they do not get diluted or washed away. Parliament's resolution contributes considerably to that process. The whole series of hearings and meetings with migrant organizations which have gone into the preparation of this resolution help to make it a very weighty text. The Commission intends to make its own contribution in this area soon, following a comprehensive review, and the work just done by Parliament has proved, and will I am sure continue to prove, most valuable.

I have considerable sympathy with Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti's amendment. She seemed to be asking for a framework report from the Commission. In the course of that report one of the issues — this may be a partial answer at least to Mr Ceravolo — that we will have to consider is the question of the legal status of migrants. I must say to the House, however, that there will be great difficulties in this area of legal status. There is a question first of all about Community competence. Secondly, there has been a draft directive on illegal immigration which touches on some of these issues before the Council since 1979. I am afraid we have not made a great deal of progress with that, and it is nowhere near as fundamental as the sort of issues on which some speakers in this debate have been calling for action this evening.

Nonetheless, the basic demand that seems to have been expressed in this debate is whether or not it would be right and sensible to try and enshrine the rights of migrant workers in some kind of legal instrument. I certainly will give the undertaking to the House that we will consider that question in the course of the review which Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti is asking for, and I will also give the undertaking to the House that the review will not take too long and that in due course we will put our views before Parliament.

**Mrs Viehoff (S).** — *(NL)* I am used to letting people finish speaking before I put questions to them. Clearly Mr Harris is not — he was given leave to speak three times. I would like to ask the Commissioner just one further question.

**Viehoff**

I have not quite fully understood what his answer was to my question: what is happening as regards the application of the directive on children of migrant workers and what will the Commission do if this directive is not implemented. I have heard him say that the Commission cannot always do what it would like to do because it does not have the money. In my view it does not cost money — although it does involve time and effort — to point out to the Member States that they must live up to their obligations and implement the directive. Perhaps it is not always a pleasant thing to do, but nevertheless I would like the Commissioner to tell us what precisely the Commission's intention is.

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, I thought I had answered the point in the course of my speech. The position is that we are at the moment drawing up a report on the application of the directive, which is in the final stages of its preparation. Now that report will take stock of the measures that have been taken in the Member States. It will cover all migrant workers' children, whether they are Community nationals or not. We will, of course, make that available to the Parliament as soon as it is ready and at the same time as we adopt that report the Commission will consider whether there is any case for launching the procedures provided for by the Treaty for the enforcement of Community law in this respect. So, I suppose the short answer to Mrs Viehoff is that when the report is out — which, as I say, is not going to take long — then Parliament will be in a position to judge precisely what further legal steps might or might not be appropriate.

**Mr Enright (S).** — It is not really a point of order. Under the procedure and the Rules I am allowed to ask a question of the Commissioner. I wish to ask him if the splendid statement he has made this evening is the view of the entire Commission. It has been very good indeed. Can he assure this House that, in fact, the whole Commission is behind him and he has not been stabbed in the back by some others?

**President.** — This is not Question Time, Mr Enright.

**Mr Edward Kellett-Bowman (ED).** — Two points of order, Mr President. One is that I think you will find that it is the custom for the Presidency to allow questions to be put to the Commission if they are prepared to answer them.

My second point of order is that it is your duty, Sir, as guardian of the rights of this House, to challenge the Commission if they stand up and say that speeches which have been made from every corner of the House are not representative. That surely cannot be. That was said at the beginning of the Commissioner's statement and I think it is your job, Sir, to correct the Commission if they make remarks of that nature.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

The next item was supposed to be the oral question with debate, tabled by Mr Sieglerschmidt and Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the exercise of the right to vote of citizens who live in other countries at the time of the election of the European Parliament on 14 and 17 June 1984. I would remind the House that Parliament decided this morning that if the Council were not present this evening the matter would be postponed until the December part-session.

**Mrs Dury (S).** — (FR) The report by Mrs Nielsen was also accompanied by a number of other oral questions to the Council on xenophobia and racism. Since the Council is not here to answer my question, can I ask for it to be carried over to the next part-session?

**President.** — Very well, Mrs Dury.

**10. Reduction of working time**

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-909/83), drawn up by Mr Van Minnen on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-846/83 — COM(83) 543 final) for a recommendation on the reduction and reorganization of working time.

**Mrs Tove Nielsen (L).** — (DA) On a point of order, Mr President. I should like today's minutes to show that there is a mistake in the report on the reduction and reorganization of working time. My name is included in the unanimous vote in favour of the Commission text in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. The fact is that I did not vote in favour of the Commission proposals, and I should like this to be put right in the minutes.

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman (ED).** — I have precisely the same point, Mr President, because I did not vote for it either and I am also down as having voted for it.

**President.** — I have noted your comments, Mrs Nielsen and Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

**Mr Van Minnen (S), rapporteur.** — Because I had a point of order first, I would like to have the answer of the Commissioner to the question of Mr Enright, unless that is out of order.

**President.** — I am sorry but the matter is closed.

**Mr Van Minnen (S), rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, although one might not think it from the surroundings here this evening, the topic we are

## Van Minnen

discussing is one of the central issues of our Community. The issue is the *reduction of working time*, in which connection what is needed is a completely different form of solidarity than practice of the principle at a personal level, as so many Members are doing at this moment. However, this is no reproach to the few dozen colleagues who together with myself are doing overtime this evening, including Commissioner Richard.

Our subject is the reduction of working time, and I hope that we will not long have to continue speaking about it in the future tense and in the conditional mood. Reduction of working time should have been introduced long ago and the old generation of this Parliament — if I may be so free as to use the expression — was concerned with the subject ten years ago and already held it to be an urgent matter. At that time there was even a widespread strike movement in the Federal Republic of Germany which was aimed at forcing through reduced working hours and in concrete terms the 35-hour working week. At the time the attempt failed. Now, on the threshold of 1984, it is high time for us to force through a reduction in working time at Community level. Naturally we all know that in the past few years a substantial amount of work and working time has been done away with, but always in the interests of rationalization and economy: in recent years workers have paid far too high a toll to the economic crisis as far as their right to work is concerned.

Reduction in working time as understood in the report which the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment has presented to you is reduction in working time with among other things the direct and unambiguous objective of creating new jobs. Whatever you may think of the details, the thread running through this report is that working time must be reduced with a view finally to making a substantial contribution to the redistribution and re-creation of employment for more people. At the same time the report stresses that the problem must be tackled at Community level, because given the undeniable fact that our Community is an open market there is no room for half measures, for reducing working hours in some regions and not in others. After all, even in a large Member State like the Federal Republic of Germany, you cannot simply reduce working hours in Bavaria. Bavaria is not an island. In a somewhat smaller country such as the Netherlands, you cannot simply reduce working hours in Friesland. Friesland is not an island. Neither, however, can you simply reduce working hours in the Netherlands or in the Federal Republic of Germany alone, because these countries are not islands within our European Community.

Reduction in working time as we understand it here is something completely unambiguous. It is not a reduction which for practical purposes amounts to an exten-

sion, such as in the Netherlands public sector negotiations where the upshot would seem to be that 2% more work will be got out of 2% fewer workers. This is *intensification of working time* and the danger is that a few hours less work will be absorbed by increases in production at the expense of the workers themselves.

Neither can reduction in working hours as we understand it be compared with the models which exist in various places — in cities such as Amsterdam, and Utrecht, where agreements have been reached between the authorities and public sector employees. We are speaking of a reduction in working hours in which funds also have to be made available by the national authorities. If the Commission is serious about reducing working time at Community level it should not confine itself to instituting proceedings in the case of national authorities which subsidize certain firms. Rather, it should institute proceedings against national authorities which refuse to finance a reduction in working time.

Mr President, colleagues, we must devote our attention not only to the Community approach but also to setting up the necessary Community framework. The European Commission and Mr Richard have opted for a recommendation, at once courteous and urgent.

The Committee on Social Affairs and Employment believes that if this is of no avail a directive — somewhat less popular but also far more binding — will have to be introduced. We all have serious obligations to fulfill: Parliament must adopt this report, the Commission must take it and make improvements; the Council must not prevaricate, it must not continue to look for excuses, it must take action. And it is up to the social partners to put the plan into practice.

We cannot afford to postpone reduction in working time any longer. Innovation, the robot invasion, efficiency, productivity — these are concepts which industry has no problem in dealing with. As long as machinery has to be renewed or modernized difficulties rarely arise. However, our duty — and this is the task which we take upon ourselves in *reducing working time from the human angle* — is to see that man does not become an afterthought in the economic process.

*Mrs Van den Heuvel (S), deputy draftsman of the opinion of the Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women in Europe. — (NL) Mr President, I am speaking on behalf of the Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women in Europe and at the same time on behalf of my Group, and I hope that you will take this into account in allotting me time to speak.*

As spokesman for the Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women in Europe, where I am deputizing for Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul who cannot be with us this evening because she is attending a congress of her

**Van den Heuvel**

party, I would like to take as my point of departure the comments addressed by the rapporteur for the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment to the Commission concerning the fact that the resolution we are discussing here indicates that there has been a clear option for a Community policy as regards reduction of working time.

However, Mr President, the Committee of Inquiry has to state that Parliament's wishes for a concrete initiative and for a clear statement of the policy concerning a reduction in working time have not been respected. The final point — the lack of concrete objectives — is all the more dangerous because in this way the cohesion of the entire policy may all too easily be lost. The women in the European Community know all too well that in the absence of a clearly formulated policy there is a good likelihood that they will end up getting the worst of the deal.

In the opinion it addressed to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, the Committee of Inquiry underscored the view that if women genuinely wanted to benefit from a reduction of working time this reduction would have to be drastic. Otherwise there is the great danger that women may be no better off than before; on the contrary, domestic tasks — which are still mainly done by women — could become all the more burdensome because, for example, family members with more free time at their disposal make greater demands as regards care and attention which — I would like to repeat — is expected mainly from women.

The amendment which calls for reducing working hours to a maximum of 35 hours per week is fully in line with the philosophy of the Committee of Inquiry. How precisely working hours are to be reduced is also of great importance to women. The question left open in the Van Minnen motion for a resolution on the form of this reduction — there is mention of daily, weekly and annual working time — is answered by the Committee of Inquiry in no uncertain terms. It is essential for women that this choice be made. Only reduction of working time on a daily basis makes it possible to combine work inside and outside the home. Only when daily working time is reduced can the work be fairly distributed both inside and outside the home. Only if this takes place can we speak of emancipation of both men and women. Women do not want to be told how to live and do not want to be forced to behave in accordance with the standards set by men today. Women wish to live as human beings, both in the labour market and as regards their environment: to be available for their children, for family life and for voluntary work.

It is particularly disappointing for the Committee of Inquiry that there was no response to its demand for the participation of women in the working process in connection with the objective of reducing working time with a view to creating new jobs. Reference was

made to basic social rights, mass purchasing power and the promotion of the interests of the lowest paid. All these are very desirable things and I admit that very many women belong to the last-mentioned group. Alas, women have become wise through bitter experience. We know that, even though it is suggested that measures be taken which apply to both sexes in general, in practice the measures are often geared mainly to men. This is why we emphasized the need to mention women specifically. Unfortunately not even the Committee on Social Affairs and Education seems to have grasped our point. Now to my other role, i.e. as spokesman for the Socialist Group and as deputy for my colleague Mrs Salisch, who is attending her party congress, I have just a few words to say.

We have tabled an amendment which we consider very important with a view to defining clearly the reduction of working time in quantitative terms. The Socialist Group urgently calls on Parliament to stipulate a maximum of 35 hours in the resolution. The proposal of the Committee on Social Affairs and Education is disappointing to my Group as regards the concrete Community measures contained in the resolution. The resolution correctly points out that the Commission has not acted on the lines set out in an earlier resolution adopted by the European Parliament. However, Mr President, the demands which the Committee have put to the Commission are somewhat scanty. The Commission is urged 'to develop proposals on the harmonization of policies relating to working time on the basis of the report by the Member States and to propose an appropriate framework directive'. The wording could hardly be more cautious. Obviously, however, this was the only formula on which the Committee could agree.

My Group does not wish to be an accomplice to this misleading use of language and prefers to speak clearly.

The Socialist Group urges the Commission to adopt a directive which will be binding on the Member States and which will make reduced working hours a reality, in the interests of all men and women in Europe. While we are waiting for clarification from the Parliament, from the Commission and perhaps from the Council — but perhaps I should also say while we are waiting for the new elections in which Parliament may emerge with a different political composition — we Socialists will have to make do with the little that is offered to us and will vote in favour of the motion for a resolution.

**Mr Van Rompuy (PPE)**, *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.* — (NL) Mr President, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs supports the draft recommendation which the Commission has submitted to the Council. The recommendation states — and the point is fundamental for us — that economic growth cannot

## Van Rompuy

come about without investments, without measures aimed at restructuring the economy, without a lasting recovery of industry. However we also agree that, even in the event of economic growth a redistribution of available work will be necessary in order to create additional jobs. Economic growth alone will not be enough. Yesterday we heard Mr Michel Albert — whose report we will be discussing repeatedly in the coming months — state that 1 % economic growth leads to an increase in employment of a mere 0.3 %. However if we want to implement a substantial reduction in working hours — and he suggests a figure of 1.9 % per year — then 1 % economic growth will be accompanied by a growth of 1.1 % in employment. However — and this is fundamental for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs — we must ensure that under no circumstances should a reduction in working hours lead to an increase in unit costs.

It is here that we disagree with Mr Van Minnen's report because he assumes that one can always reduce working hours while maintaining mass purchasing power at the same time. This is an illusion. Unfortunately a reduction in working time must always be accompanied by a related incomes policy otherwise the operation will be a negative one with undesirable economic repercussions.

In recent years some models have been developed in which working time has been reduced and I would like here to mention the example of my own country. The fact is that there are few examples in which a substantial reduction in working hours did not have adverse effects on competitiveness. In my country working hours are being reduced by 5 % in 1983 and 1984 with a pay cut of 3 %, and yet labour costs are still expected to increase. In 1983 hourly wage costs in industry increased by 6 %, and the figure will be 9 % in 1984. Accordingly we must be very careful with these operations to avoid undermining the competitive position of industry. Thus great flexibility is essential and we must do all we can to respect the independence of the social partners; a Community framework must be outlined which will make allowances for the different positions of the Member States. Vigilance is essential because a reduction in working hours can be a useful instrument but it must be coupled with an incomes policy and under no circumstances should it lead to an increase in production costs.

This is the most important amendment which I personally will table in respect of the Van Minnen report because in my view it is nowhere taken into account and because the underlying assumption is that purchasing power can be maintained.

Furthermore a reduction in working hours should not be applied exclusively on a daily or weekly basis but should focus on part-time work — an area in which Europe still lags far behind the United States, where 17 % of the active population are working part-time as opposed to 12 % in Europe. This means a differ-

ence of five million persons. 2.5 million vacancies could be created for five million young people, for example, if preference is given to young people in the allocation of jobs. This means that unemployment among young people in Europe could be reduced. At present they make up 26 % of all unemployed. This percentage could be reduced to 11 %, which would be in line with the Community average for workers in all age brackets. Thus a greater stimulus should be given to part-time work in Europe. It is also an effective means of introducing young people to the labour market and it is the direction we should be moving in. These suggestions are also contained in the draft recommendation to the Council.

Mr President, the Van Minnen report contains many positive features, but it is essential for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs that an amendment be approved calling for an incomes policy and stating that a reduction in working hours must not lead to an increase in production costs. If this amendment is approved, I will be able to support the report; otherwise it will be pernicious and will fail in its objectives.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE).** — *(NL)* Mr President, the Commission recommendation on the reorganization and reduction of working time is the outcome of several activities in this Parliament. I would like to remind you of the Ceravolo/Beumer report of autumn 1981 and again of the Ceravolo report in May this year, which was discussed in Parliament and also approved. It is heartening to see that these actions and reports, which were partly written by our Group and all of which have been approved by our Group, have not been in vain. The results now lie in front of us in the form of a Commission recommendation. We are also satisfied with the content of this recommendation because it contains principles which have always been upheld by our Group. Once again I would like to emphasize these principles so as to make quite clear the precise standpoint of our Group in this discussion on the redistribution of work and the reduction of working time.

Firstly we would like to make it clear that a reduction in working time is not a fundamental solution to the economic crisis. Reduction in working hours is a solution which treats the symptoms. It is a way of absorbing the consequences of the economic crisis and making them more bearable. However, it is an essential instrument because we know that even with 3 % to 4 % economic growth — a level which we will certainly not reach before 1986 — it will be impossible to eliminate unemployment among the 12 million European citizens affected. Such high levels of unemployment are socially unacceptable. A redistribution of work provides an opportunity to spread the available work over a greater number of people and so to reduce unemployment. This thinking is contained in the recommendation and it has our support.

**Maij-Weggen**

A second principle of my Group is that the redistribution of work must be regulated by the social partners in the form of collective labour agreements. The authorities — national and European — must confine themselves to issuing recommendations and to determining the basic framework so that the social partners can work on a coordinated basis. The recommendation is in line with this principle and this is one of the reasons why we support it. Thirdly, we agree with the reservations set out in the recommendation. We too believe that redistribution of work should not adversely affect competitiveness in industry, but rather should strengthen it. This possibility may exist whenever the reduction in working time is coupled to an extension of industry's opening hours.

We too believe that the redistribution of work must be organized in a flexible manner, taking into account the requirements of the industrial sectors concerned and the possibilities open to workers. We too believe that the redistribution of work must be coupled to an appropriate incomes policy — and here I fully agree with the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs — in which the worker must also accept the consequences but in which the lowest-paid must be protected.

Finally we also support the view that the reduction in working time must be substantial if it is to be effective. I think that a reduction of working time of at least 10% by 1986 — introduced in a flexible manner — will be necessary if we are to create anywhere near a substantial number of jobs.

All these elements are contained in the Commission's recommendation and virtually all of them are confirmed in the report of my colleague Van Minnen. We will approve the Van Minnen report. I must stress that my Group lays great store by this report, which moreover is almost fully in line with the Christian Democrats' wishes. Where these wishes have not been respected we have submitted a number of amendments and we hope that they will be approved.

In conclusion, Mr President, let us hope that the Member States and the social partners in the Community will use this recommendation during their negotiations in the coming year. Let us also hope that the burden of unemployment can be lightened and, finally, that the new vacancies will be occupied mainly by young people, because it is they who are suffering most from unemployment.

**Mr Patterson (ED)** — Mr President, it seems to my group that a kind of economic death wish has gripped Parliament's Committee on Social Affairs and Employment as expressed in the van Minnen report. I may say that that goes for the *ad hoc* Committee of inquiry into the situation of women in Europe as well. Only the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs

seems to have partially escaped from this death wish and also, I must add, to some extent the Commission.

Why do I say death wish? Quite simply because what we are being asked to do is to support the proposition that you can cure unemployment by paying everyone the same amount of money for doing less work. That is not a proposition which commends itself on common-sense grounds. It would lead to the bankruptcy of European industry and to unemployment at levels so much higher than the present ones as to defy conception. It is quite obvious that if European industry becomes uncompetitive we shall lose out in world markets, we shall lose out to the Japanese, the Taiwanese, the South Koreans, and no interests will be served whatsoever.

The Commission, to its credit, has not fallen for this gross error. The Commission's arguments are more complex. First, it does recognize that the competitiveness of European industry is a key factor. Its first principle seeks to secure this by pointing out that unit costs should not rise when working time is reduced. The question is, how is this to be done? As I understand the Commission's proposal, it will be done by a more efficient use of capital equipment, by more shift work, by a more flexible use of working time. So far so good, and it is quite attractive. But there are three critical questions which have to be asked. First of all, what evidence do we really have that unit costs can be held down, that, as Commissioner Richard himself once put it and as I put it into an amendment, sharing work means sharing income? I see no signs of the European trade-union organization, or indeed the Socialist Group here, accepting that proposition, although Commissioner Richard himself does.

Secondly, will this sharing of working time actually produce more jobs? To do this logically, unit costs would not merely have to remain stable, unit costs would have to fall. Otherwise, you are merely paying the same people the same amount of money for working more efficiently over less time. I see nothing in the Commission's proposals which actually show how unit costs can be brought down rather than held steady.

Finally, and this is my real criticism of the Commission's end product, they say, if the costs of industry tend to rise, of course the Commission or the national governments or somebody will come in with taxpayers' money to bribe employers to introduce this reduction in the working week. I see no benefit whatsoever in relieving the costs on companies and putting them on to the taxpayer, because, in the end, it is always the same people who pay.

Those are my three main criticisms of the Commission proposal, and I shall be very interested to hear Commissioner Richard explain how the Commission intends to get round them.

**Patterson**

As for Mr Van Minnen's report, I will spend very little time on it. It is totally out of touch with any reality whatsoever, and that is why I have put down three amendments pointing out the case for unit production costs being held or reduced, the case for income-sharing and the fact that cutting working time does not necessarily create jobs.

I want to end by being slightly more constructive and saying that I do agree with some of the propositions. First, I agree that Community action should be taken. It is nonsense for national governments to try and solve unemployment on their own. Secondly, the key to the whole matter is to produce a more flexible labour market, not a reduction in working time but a reorganization of working time. Here the Economic and Monetary Committee has got it right: what we should do is to make part-time work more attractive — not, as the Commission's directive would seem to do, by making it less attractive for employers to take on part-time workers. We need a more flexible approach to retirement and we need projects such as job-splitting. But much more than all this, what we must do is to get rid of the red tape, the disincentive to taking on labour which more and more regulations in the labour market produce. That is what UNICE has said in its evidence, and I beg the Commissioner to take it on board and not to press ahead with these proposals, which would lead, as I say, to the bankruptcy of European industry.

**Mr Damette (COM).** — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the French Communist and Allies have long regarded the reduction of working hours as a present-day economic and social need. I stress economic and social, since we do not see such a measure as a means of combatting economic difficulties or of easing unemployment but as an essential aspect of a policy aimed at growth and technological progress and at improving workers' skills.

The growth we need today calls for a different form of work, one which is more highly skilled, responsible and of a higher technical standard. This implies a shorter and better paid working day. Nothing would be more absurd than a reduction in working hours which weakens purchasing power — this would worsen the crisis and the spiral of unemployment and austerity.

We are pleased that France is working towards a 35-hour week by 1985, and that government bodies are taking the lead. It would be even better if this trend were to catch on throughout the Community.

For this reason we are gratified at the step forward which the Commission has just taken. It is a hesitant start, certainly, but in the right direction. We must go one stage further and demystify the glib declarations of good intent.

For the same reason we are in agreement with most of the report by our colleague, Mr Van Minnen. He was right to ask the Commission to show a little more

firmness and to call on the Community to take positive action on this matter. That is precisely what we have been proposing for some time. We have put forward concrete proposals for Community action in a sector of industry with a view to setting up pilot operations on a European scale for reducing working hours. These would be combined with the technological changes now being made and with an attempt to improve vocational training. But that is a matter to which we shall, I hope, have occasion to return.

**Mrs Tove Nielsen (L).** — (*DA*) Mr President, it is now just after 11.30 — nearly midnight — and while sitting here I have calculated that I have in fact been at work for nearly 15 hours. This is no problem I do it voluntarily. I am quite happy about it, but there are others who would prefer to work fewer hours, and this is exactly the kind of flexibility we need to accommodate the differences between people. There are people who want to work more than the eight hours which many regard as normal, while others prefer to work fewer hours.

We in the Liberal Group do not like this obsession with the idea of a general reduction in working hours based on the assumption that work will then be found for the unemployed overnight. We are sick and tired of it because we should like to see our energy put into a more productive way of finding work for people, and we do not think that this is the right way to go about it. In our view, the way to achieve a healthy economy is to invest in undertakings in which there is a future and which can manufacture products of the right quality and price for the large-scale market. In other words, we must be competitive, and here we are really lagging behind. Only when Europe becomes more competitive can more jobs be created. What is needed is imagination, a creative spirit and the will to act rather than a blind assumption that there is a given amount of work and a given number of people to be provided with jobs — there are not enough jobs for everyone, just reduce working hours so that we all work a little less. This is a defeatist policy which we cannot accept; we therefore oppose it. For this reason it is absolutely impossible for the Liberal Group to vote for the Van Minnen report. Furthermore, it is full of contradictions mainly due to the fact that we did not have an opportunity to look into the proposal — which is most unfortunate. It is not the fault of the rapporteur — I should like to point this out immediately — he did what he could and he also made it clear that it was a socialist text. As we had no opportunity to make a serious examination or propose amendments to the text, the text before us is purely and simply socialist. It is clear that we, as Liberals, cannot accept this.

We have not tabled any amendments because we feel that it would be irrelevant in view of the socialist slant of the whole document; the text should, in our view, be completely rewritten.

Tove Nielsen

We have talked today about a centre for small and medium-sized undertakings of which there are an incredible number in our Member States. Let us just give an example — take an undertaking with 10 accompanied workers. By saying that you will give each person an hour less you think that you can provide work. What actually happens in an undertaking such as this is that they can manage with the number of workers that they already have, because the reduction is not sufficient for them to be able to employ an extra person. Even if we were able to reduce the hours by 3, 4 or 5 a week, we would not produce more jobs, because there is one question — and this is the key to the whole problem — that we have not taken into account at all. Are people qualified? We should do much more about vocational training to ensure that there are qualified people because, even with the general reduction in working hours which we seem to set so much store by, there is still a shortage of well-trained and well-qualified people to do the work.

What really astonishes me is that the Socialist Group wants a directive on a reduction in working hours. I cannot imagine the Danish Social Democrats going along with the idea of imposing a directive on the Member States, given that in Denmark, and in many other Member States, working hours are traditionally the province of the two sides of industry. It is really not a matter for legislation. It is the business of the two sides of industry, and I can almost guarantee that in any case three Danish Social Democrats with their commitment to the trade union movement in Denmark, will not be able to accept imposition of a reduction in working hours on the Danish trade unions. It may well turn out to be what they want, but they prefer to have the right to make the decision themselves.

Mr President, I should like to end by saying that through economic recovery and an improvement in competition we should be able to provide additional and new jobs for those who have none and maintain the jobs we have. This is a policy with a future. The policy we have before us here is defeatist.

**Mr Van Minnen (S).** — *(NL)* Mr President, as rapporteur I would like to ask Mrs Nielsen a question. She has spoken about 'the Danish Members'. I see her as a Liberal. Did she mean the Danish Liberal Members or was she suddenly speaking on behalf of her country? Has she suddenly become a Danish Socialist at the same time? What are we to believe?

**President.** — Mr Van Minnen, as the hour is late I would kindly ask you not to put questions.

**Mr Eisma (NI).** — *(NL)* Mr President, naturally we completely agree with the Commission that there is a

need for industrial restructuring as explained in the document. What we need is a resumption of investment activities in the innovatory industrial sectors, in the field of energy and the environment. These are important elements in an economic upswing. But we do not agree that unemployment will be reduced if all these conditions are satisfied. As best, unemployment will level out.

Because of automation and the increasing use of robots no growth in the number of jobs is to be expected even in the event of economic growth. Moreover there is a lot one could say about the type of economic growth we are striving for but this would lead us to stray too far from our subject.

Let us try to have a hard look at the realities and not delude ourselves with the idea that the unemployment problem can be solved by encouraging economic growth. Unfortunately the Commission's document all too strongly awakes this impression.

The only way to help the 14 million jobless Europeans and the many millions who we believe will be joining them in the coming years, is to reduce working time.

Our assumption is that a reduction in working time will be accompanied by substantial pay cuts. We do not take it for granted that — by virtue of productivity increases and savings in social benefits following a reduction in working time — pay can remain at its old level or that purchasing power will be unaffected.

Moreover, Mr President, here we are in this Parliament discussing a reduction in working time, but nobody who is here at present applies it to their own situation. We all work more than full-time and none of us even consider applying a reduction in working time to ourselves. In other words we are setting a bad example for the European citizen.

Now I come to the question as to whether a reduction in working time is socially feasible. Will solidarity between workers and non-workers be great enough to lead to a large-scale redistribution of work and to the associated pay cuts? This is a question which we have not answered and I think it indicates our scepticism. The policy will be most easy to apply in the case of young people, but it is not correct to restrict it to them. The endeavours of employers, trade unions and governments in Europe to reduce working time have had scanty results indeed. One feels ashamed when one reads in the Commission document how the social partners and the governments react in this connection. Is it possible under these circumstances to implement a policy with longer-term objectives? Will we have to leave the 14 million Europeans out in the cold? Or should we wait until some kind of revolution starts among the non-working population to bring about an equitable distribution of work?



## Eisma

Mr President, flexibility as regards the redistribution of work may be desirable, but we attach priority to a reduction in working time on a daily basis. However if other methods are also to be considered — such as part-time work, early retirement or training leave — we think that leave for training purposes is preferable because it offers the most opportunities as regards filling the posts as they become vacant.

Reduction in working time can only be successful if it is applied at European level. For this reason a recommendation is insufficient. The Commission's argument in this connection has not convinced us. If the European Community genuinely wants to take initiatives then a Directive is essential. In this respect we fully agree with Mrs Van den Heuvel.

Even if some reduction in working time can genuinely be achieved, there will still be millions of people without work in the future. Unfortunately we have to be realistic about this. We must aim at a society in which the ethos of remunerated work no longer dominates and in which social recognition is also given to those who do unpaid voluntary work. We will be discussing this next month in connection with my report. Then the gap between the working and the non-working population will become narrower. We think that this will be a greater help to millions of jobless than dangling before them hopes of paid work which will not exist in the future.

**Mr Brok (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, thank you for reducing our working time by shortening my speaking time, and I also thank the Bureau, which, in its wisdom, has arranged things so that we can appreciate the reduction in working time in the 15th hour of our daily work!

Reducing working hours can only be a secondary measure to combat unemployment, since unemployment can only be eliminated through economic measures.

We cannot reduce working hours in a way which stifles competitiveness, since this would be counterproductive. Working time must be reduced in a flexible way: the 35-hour working week has different objectives and uses unemployment as a pretext. I regard the shortening of working life as the prime objective — including part-time working job-sharing, and the shortening of the working week and the working year — and believe that the reduction of working time should be implemented by both sides of industry, because that is the only way in which appropriate and diverse rules can be found which are flexible and vary to take account of regional requirements, sectors of different industries and firms of different sizes.

In my opinion the main task of the European Community and its Member States is to introduce an outline social security policy. Management is, in its

blinkered way, opposed to any shortening of working hours and the unions, which insist on a 35-hour week, are hell bent on a collision course and are thus preventing any real solution for workers within the Community!

*(Applause)*

**Mr Ingo Fredrich (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the key question is whether a reduction in working time which is nationally ordained can help reduce unemployment. Sadly, practical experience suggests that this approach increases the pressure to rationalize and thus to create a more concentrated type of work which never increases the number of jobs available.

*(Applause)*

The right way to maintain the number of jobs while stimulating the economy is to organize work flexibly. Let people decide individually whether to work 10, 15, 20 or 25 hours a week with their nominal earnings adjusted accordingly. Their real earnings will not vary all that much because the risks and financial burdens imposed by the present sliding scale of taxation would mean that the real differences in earnings would not be unduly large. Government restrictions whereby only a certain number of hours could be worked would be socially unacceptable and would be a step backwards in that they would inhibit the individual's career prospects. Apart from all other considerations, flexible arrangements would be a realistic contribution.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, might I begin by congratulating Mr Brok for having proved the case in relation to the reorganization of working time? His working time was reduced, but the number of points that he got in in the time that he had available was so great that his productivity clearly increased, and I congratulate him.

First of all, I want to congratulate the rapporteur, the committees concerned and the House in general for the speed with which this matter has been dealt with, in order that it might be brought before today's plenary sitting. I hope that the Council will appreciate Parliament's efforts as much as the Commission does and itself adopt the recommendation on 8 December.

There is a great deal of mythology growing up around this whole subject. The Commission has never pretended that the reorganization or reduction of working time is a panacea which is going to cure unemployment. What we *have* said — we said it in our communication and our Memorandum and indeed in our latest set of proposals for a recommendation — is that it is a useful adjunct and a useful weapon in the general fight against unemployment.

**Richard**

Some people appear to have misread the draft recommendation and seem to believe that the Commission has retreated from the position on wage compensation which it took in the Memorandum. I would make it perfectly clear to the House that the Commission's position has not changed. Sharing work does mean sharing incomes — of course it does. But the extent and the balance of that sharing remains to be worked out primarily by the social partners, and particularly in the light of productivity negotiations which may indeed be part of the overall settlements. If the reduction of individual working time is to have the effect that we all want, that is, to reduce unemployment, then unit labour costs simply cannot be allowed to increase.

Apart from that clarification, I agree with the rapporteur that there is very little need for us to go into the general debate and look at the substance of the issue again today. What I would like to do is to reply to the criticism that important points in Parliament's resolution of April have not been taken into account in the draft proposed by the Commission.

The main thrust of the complaints made by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and the Committee of Inquiry into the Situation of Women in Europe is that the Commission is not specific enough in the proposal it has made. First of all, the Commission's overall concern at this stage is to see the establishment of a coherent but broad policy framework at Community level, into which work-sharing measures in the Member States can be inserted in accordance with national legislation and individual national practice. It is quite deliberately a very flexible approach. In our view, the essential thing at this stage is to create a positive political climate in favour of the reduction and reorganization of working time as a policy instrument for combating unemployment.

A broad policy framework avoids the risks one encounters if one lays down too much detail.

These are the risks of failing to do justice to the whole range of possible actions which the social partners — after all, it is they who will have to play the major role in this area — might be wishing to carry out in taking up the challenge of using working-time changes to create new job opportunities. It is particularly important in this difficult economic climate that there should be room at the negotiating level for flexible responses which can offer the best chance of finding the delicate compromise between sometimes apparently conflicting objectives. It is not an easy matter — indeed, the Commission has never pretended otherwise — to safeguard or, even better, create employment and, at the same time, promote the competitiveness of firms and safeguard fundamental social rights.

I was asked a question by one Member as to whether there was any evidence that unit costs can be kept

down. There is evidence now emerging in Belgium and also in Holland that it is indeed possible to do it.

One of the Commission's specific criticisms is also that the draft recommendation does not contain an explicit Community yardstick against which reductions in working time might be measured. According to the Commission's proposal, public authorities are invited to take the lead, and to give their guidance, support and cooperation in a variety of ways, according to individual and national circumstances, in order to bring about a reduction in and a reorganization of working time sufficiently substantial to lead to positive employment effects. In order to achieve this objective, an acceleration in the underlying trend in the reduction of individual working time will be necessary in the years immediately ahead. Where appropriate, governments should set quantified objectives at national level.

The idea of setting a Community target is an attractive one. I personally find it attractive, at any rate, and it is one which the Commission considered very carefully. Clearly a closely coordinated reduction at an agreed pace right across the Community would offer the best insurance against the distortion of competition. But it would not be ideal, in our view, from other points of view. The relevant economic and market conditions vary a lot between individual Member States. Moreover, in a number of Member States there is already an active policy to reduce working time in order to create jobs. This makes it difficult, if not impossible, to fix a reference point in time to which a Community target could be related. I believe, therefore, that the approach chosen by the Commission is the most realistic one, and I am fortified by the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

We should also bear in mind the extreme unlikelihood, to say the least, of Member States agreeing to bind themselves to a common target. Indeed, I think we would do well if we could persuade the Council to adopt the recommendation in its present form. The extra political impulse that it will give will be very helpful.

The committee also reproaches the Commission with not including any practical measures by the Community, as proposed by Parliament, in its resolution in April. I must say that neither the resolution nor the report before the House today are specific about what such measures might be. I think the earlier argument I made about avoiding too great a degree of detail in order to leave plenty of scope for innovation also applies in this context.

Our draft recommendation states that Member States should report annually on working time developments and policies, so that the Commission can draw conclusions for the further development of Community poli-

**Richard**

cies in this area, as and when appropriate. The committee has expressed the view that the Commission should develop proposals on the harmonization of labour policies and propose a framework directive. I think it is too soon to say anything about that possibility. While the Commission would certainly not rule it out for the longer term, I believe that given the wide differences which still exist in the Community with regard to working time, it is much too soon to talk of directives now for the reduction of working hours. In other related areas directives are entirely appropriate. I recall, for example, our proposed directives on voluntary part-time work, temporary work and parental leave. These can help to contribute to the aim of redistributing available work.

Finally, may I say that I think that what we want to avoid at almost all costs on the part of the Council on this whole question of working time is silence. Judging by the first informal exchange of views which Ministers had in Athens at the end of September, I am reasonably convinced that opinion in the Council has begun to shift, and that there is now a fair possibility of a recommendation being adopted before too long. This will undoubtedly fall short of what many of us would have liked to see. But we should in no way underestimate the value of the momentum which can be created by even a very general commitment taken at European level. This is what I think it is realistic to hope for, and it is what the Commission is working towards.

**Mr Van Minnen (S), rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, let me start by saying that I am happy with the positive approach of the Commission, also as regards — that at any rate is my interpretation — the orientation which the Committee on Social Affairs and

Employment gave to the recommendation. However, two essential questions remain unanswered.

The first is that I have not yet heard the Commissioner's opinion as regards the idea contained in the Parliament's draft resolution — it will not be adopted until tomorrow — that if the recommendation does not work the Commission — i.e. you yourself Mr Richard — are duty bound to adopt other measures to present a genuine Directive.

The second unanswered question is to what extent a reduction in working time with undiminished purchasing power is an illusion. This question was aired by Mr Van Rompuy and Mr Patterson and they wrongly thought that they were fit to answer it themselves. Yet again I would like to point out to the House and to Mr Richard that these arguments in our resolution were taken from analyses made by the Commission itself and that these analyses led me to adopt the fundamental point that productivity increases as a result of innovation and technical development can indeed help reduce working time and thus are good for the workers; this is an analysis made by the Commission itself which states that mass purchasing power and the promotion of the interests of the lowest-paid workers can be safeguarded.

Accordingly this perspective must also form part of our conceptual framework.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.<sup>1</sup>

*(The sitting was closed at 12 midnight)*

<sup>1</sup> Agenda for next sitting: see 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 'Grenada'**

- GALLAND (Doc. 1-1020/83)
  - LADY ELLES (Doc. 1-1032/83)
  - HABSBURG (Doc. 1-1042/83)
  - FUCHS (Doc. 1-1047/83)
  - FANTI (Doc. 1-1058/83)
- replaced by Amendement No 1 which was **ADOPTED**

\* \* \*

**MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'Lebanon'**

- d'ORMESSON (Doc. 1-1040/83)
  - de la MALENE (Doc. 1-1043/83)
- replaced by Amendment No 1 which was **ADOPTED**
- LIZIN (Doc. 1-1046/83): **ADOPTED**
  - SEGRE (Doc. 1-1062/83): **REJECTED**

\* \* \*

**MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'Cyprus'**

- FANTI (Doc. 1-1067/83)
  - BOURNIAS (Doc. 1-1068/83)
  - PLASKOVITIS (Doc. 1-1069/83)
- replaced by Amendment No 1 which was **ADOPTED**

\* \* \*

**MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'Shipbuilding'**

- FERGUSSON (Doc. 1-1031/83): **REJECTED**
- THÉOBALD-PAOLI (Doc. 1-1051/83): **ADOPTED**

\* \* \*

**MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'Human rights'**

- d'ORMESSON (Doc. 1-1010/83): ADOPTED
- ISRAËL (Doc. 1-1024/83): ADOPTED
- RABBETHGE (Doc. 1-1035/83): ADOPTED
- PERY (Doc. 1-1056/83/REV.): ADOPTED

\* \* \*

**ADONNINO MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1008/83 'Convergence of economic policies'): ADOPTED**

\* \* \*

**MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'Natural disasters'**

- GHERGO (Doc. 1-1009/83): ADOPTED
- GLINNE (Doc. 1-1049/83): ADOPTED
- HERMAN (Doc. 1-1057/83): ADOPTED
- FANTI (Doc. 1-1059/83): ADOPTED
- ADAMOU (Doc. 1-1060/83): ADOPTED
- PEDINI (Doc. 1-1012/83): ADOPTED
- DENIS (Doc. 1-1061/83): REJECTED

\* \* \*

**LIBERAL AND DEMOCRATIC GROUP MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1033/83 'European Union'): ADOPTED**

\* \* \*

**FANTI MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-1064/83 'European council meeting in Athens'): REJECTED**

\* \* \*

**DENIS MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-937/83 'Sahel drought'): ADOPTED***Explanations of vote*

**Mrs Poirier (COM).** — (FR) I speak on behalf of Mr Vergès, who is unable to be present.

I will not review again the details of the situation in the Sahel countries which are hit by drought, rather I will limit myself to giving a few examples from the last meeting of the FAO held in Rome just a few weeks ago.

Here I address my remarks in particular to the Commission and to the political forces in this Parliament which tended to minimize the problem at the last part-session.

Poirier

Mr Saouma, the Director-General of the FAO, stated: 'It is necessary to intervene without delay if a catastrophe is to be avoided in the 22 African countries concerned, where the food situation can deteriorate in the coming months and affect 150 million people'. In spite of the efforts made to date by the various study and aid bodies, the desert is advancing, the cultivated areas are declining and the number of people starving is increasing substantially.

The Ethiopian Ambassador to the FAO said in the Italian press that help was forthcoming, but that often it arrived too late. We cannot remain unconcerned in the face of events in the Sahara, and I request all the political forces in this Parliament to vote in favour of this resolution, because it is not possible...

**President.** — Your speaking time has expired, Mrs Poirier.

**Mr de la Malène (DEP).** — (FR) I wish to say that we will vote in favour of this resolution, but I should like to make one brief observation.

I recently visited various countries of Africa and the Sahel. I saw the gifts, and I saw where they came from. I saw that the food aid sent to these unfortunate populations came from North America, Canada, Australia and Western Europe. I saw nothing from Eastern Europe. I wish to say this as we cast our votes.

(Applause from the right)

\* \* \*

#### VIEHOFF REPORT (Doc. 1-797/83 'Status of au pairs'): ADOPTED<sup>1</sup>

##### *Explanations of vote*

**Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED).** — There has been a certain amount of argument on procedural grounds about the admissibility of this report emanating primarily from members of my group. They were quite right to raise the procedural aspects, but I want to make it absolutely clear not only that the group is sympathetic to this report but also that I personally, and I believe many of my colleagues, take the subject very seriously. I consider that there is a compelling need to get the status of *au pairs* on a sensible footing that will be clearly understood throughout the whole Community by both parties, the host family and the *au pairs*. One cannot legislate against irresponsibility on either side, but one can legislate to avoid misunderstanding. I have had a number of examples brought to my notice in the United Kingdom, and particularly in my own constituency, where there has been considerable misunderstanding as to the obligations and the rights of either the host family or the *au pairs*.

If the House adopts this resolution this afternoon, I hope the Commission will take it very seriously. I have had quite a lot of correspondence with the Commission in which they have been very sympathetic but have said that they have got a greater order of priority. I would like to see them attach more priority to this subject. I believe it to be a very important one. One is dealing with a lot of young people whose lives in another Community State can be marred if they get a bad experience, and the same can apply to the host families. This is, therefore, really an appeal to the Commission to take this subject seriously.

**Mrs van Hemeldonck (S), in writing.** — (NL) Even if young persons looking for a job can provide evidence of sound vocational training, it increasingly happens that potential employers find that they are insufficiently familiar with foreign languages and with the economic and cultural aspects of other countries.

<sup>1</sup> See Report of Proceedings of 27 October 1983, p. 243, and Report of Proceedings of 28 October 1983, pp. 268-270.

van Hemeldonck

The children of rich people have no problems in this respect since they come into contact with foreign countries from a very early age, through their nannies, their elitist schools or holidays abroad, and in some cases this is rounded off by a relatively long period spent at a foreign school before they come onto the labour market. Among workers' children, however, the situation is different. In the case of children from less-well-off families, contacts with other countries seldom go beyond a cheap holiday with the unrivalled European railway pass for young people, staying either in youth hostels or camp sites. At best, their finishing school is a year as an *au pair* in order to learn a foreign language and to get some idea of the customs and practices of another country.

This is why we Socialists attach such great importance to the idea of regulations governing the employment of *au pairs*. Minimum rights to medical care in the case of illness, accident insurance and protection against exploitation must be laid down in legislation, and *au pairs* must have the possibility to follow courses of study in the language of the host country. We welcome the Viehoff report, which should make arrangements of this kind possible, and will be glad to vote in favour of the motion.

\* \* \*

**BONACCINI REPORT (Doc. 1-988/83 'Economic situation in the Community'):  
ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was :

- IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 6 and 7 ;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 5, 8 and 9.

*Explanation of vote*

**Mr Kyrkos (COM), in writing. — (GR)** We shall vote in favour of the Bonaccini report with the following reservations :

- 1) It must be pointed out that any success in reducing inflation is due to sacrifices made once again by the workers since, of the fall of seven percentage points in the average inflation rate, four points are due to a fall in labour costs. (COM(83) 628 final, page 8). And this of course is unacceptable.
- 2) The decline and unfavourable development of international trade and high interest rates have made the situation worse for developing countries, and have made it intolerably difficult for them to service their debts, whilst the dangers of world-wide bankruptcy and economic disaster have become clearer and more perceptible.

From the measures suggested for economic recovery we would draw your attention to the following :

- 1) As for structural changes, the Commission should carry out medium and long-term studies, both qualitative and quantitative, which will make it easier to evaluate the results of such structural changes.
- 2) Promotion of European exports is directly related to investments in new and high-level technology but it also requires an increase in the purchasing power of the developing countries. This increase cannot come about if it does not become easier for these countries to service their debts, which depends on the facilities for financing which they have.

Kyrkos

3) A reduction in European interest rates is vital for investment recovery and the fight against unemployment. The political will to reduce them exists. However, there are also limitations. European interest rates cannot be reduced to the necessary level whilst US interest rates remain at present levels. And it is not enough for us to express pious wishes that they be reduced: US interest rates and the exchange rate of the dollar against other currencies cause a flow of capital to that country which allows it to finance its huge defence programmes. As long as the arms race continues, American interest rates will remain high with all the consequences involved for both the Community and the world economy. It is clear for us that the basic requirement for recovery and the reduction of unemployment is a reduction in present American interest rates.

In this area the EEC must bring maximum pressure to bear and take initiatives to limit armaments, which can bring about not only a reduction in American interest rates but also consolidate the climate of peace and certainty for the future.

Finally, we should say that a reduction in working hours must not lead to a reduction in salaries and wages, and that public procurement policy should be pursued as a development incentive for the less well developed countries of the Community.

\* \* \*

#### ROGALLA REPORT (Doc. 1-903/83 'Tax Harmonization'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was:

- IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 2, 4, 6 to 9, 13 and 14;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 3, 5 and 10 to 12.

#### *Explanations of vote*

**Mr Møller (ED).** — (DA) It is difficult for me to express my views on this subject but I nevertheless feel I ought to. Since I am a supporter of harmonization — which all sensible people must be — it automatically follows that we should have the same tax burden throughout the free-trade area. The question, however, is whether, in a free-trade area with a free market, the harmonization of taxes and duties should be imposed from above, or whether we should not be thinking along the lines that, if we have free trade anyway, the harmonization will come about of its own accord as a result of the free trade. If a country such as mine, for instance, has higher taxes than other countries on a number of goods, its goods will no longer be competitive enough and there will be too much cross-frontier trade. Danish shoppers pop over to German South Schleswig and buy goods there instead of buying them in Denmark, with the result that the shopkeepers in Danish North Schleswig will press the Danish Government to reduce the taxes. Harmonization must come about as a result of the free-trade area and not as part of it. Harmonization will be one consequence of what we have set out to achieve, just as another consequence will be that our conditions of competition will be more or less the same everywhere, since any country which cannot remain competitive will lose out in the free-trade area. I am therefore unable to vote in favour of imposing harmonization by means of resolutions.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) We, the Members from the Communist Party of Greece, shall also vote against the Rogalla report. Moreover, by acknowledging the need to impose a special regulating tax in Greece, the Commission itself accepts that Greece should be exempted from any fiscal harmonization. Thus the Commission itself realizes that the principles and regulations of Mr Rogalla's motion conflict with our country's interests. The consequence of bringing the customs tariffs of our country into line with those of the Community are particularly unfavourable, such as the increase in our trade deficit, and they will only get worse with fiscal harmonization.



**Alavanos**

Finally, we have reservations about the rejection of the zero rate because now there will be a new burden on ordinary people. For precisely that reason we shall vote against the Rogalla report.

**Mrs Castle (S).** — I shall vote against this report because it is a part of an insidious and continuing move to force the United Kingdom into line with other countries with entirely different social and economic policies. In particular, it is designed to force us into the dear food league — those countries who believe the consumers are still not paying enough and want to tax them more and still more. It is part of an attempt to force us into putting value added tax on food. The Commission has set its heart on that. I would have thought that the Conservatives, in view of their zero rating amendment having been rejected, would vote against this proposal too.

This Community is harmonization mad. I do not want to harmonize with monetarist governments. I want my country to be free and to have intelligent and constructive social and economic policies. It has a right to form its own corporation tax. It has got a right to have its own wealth tax if it wants it. What is democracy about if not that freedom of choice in social and economic policies?

I am going to vote against the report.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Welsh (ED).** — My group accepts the need for a common market. We are in sympathy therefore with the main thrust of the Rogalla report. However, we cannot accept that Britain should be compelled to charge VAT on food and essential commodities, and that is why my group will abstain.

However, I do find that this debate has been a little like Hamlet without the prince! We just heard the right honourable lady, the Member for Greater Manchester North, express her passion on this issue once again. Why can she not exert her redoubtable eloquence on her own group who voted against it?

*(Applause)*

Where were the right honourable lady and her honourable friends when we discussed it in committee? Why was she not supporting us then, because let the record show, Mr President, that not one member of the British Labour Party bothered to turn up? Where was the right honourable lady when this was debated? She was not here. Let the record show that not one British Member of the Socialist Group bothered to turn up for the debate either. Where are the right honourable lady's amendments? There are none! Where are the right honourable lady's friends today? There are none! Let the record show, Mr President, that when it comes to defending the interests of British people in this place, the Conservative Group do it and the right honourable lady can only talk about it!

*(Sustained applause from the centre and from the right)*

\* \* \*

**BEUMER REPORT (Doc. 1-777/83 'Turnover taxes'): ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was:

- IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 11/rev. to 15;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 5, 8, 16 and 18 to 20.

*Explanation of vote*

**Mr Welsh (ED).** — I very much regret that Parliament has adopted this particular directive. It is not workable and I believe that the compromise that was put together by the rapporteur cannot possibly be actually put into practice. I therefore think that it is quite monstrous that the Commission should have accepted it in the loose way that they did. For that reason, and because we are interested in having a taxation system that works, we are going to vote against this resolution as we have already voted against the directive.

\* \* \*

**J. MOREAU REPORT (Doc. 1-907/83 'Tobacco taxes'): ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was :

— AGAINST all the amendments.

*Explanation of vote*

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (*GR*) Greece is the major tobacco producing country in the Community, but entry into the EEC, instead of facilitating Greek tobacco exports, has created additional problems and has led to an increase in the penetration of foreign tobacco into the Greek market. Pushing through measures to restructure tobacco cultivation in Greece has contributed substantially to the decline of whole areas. With the measures designed to harmonize taxation on cigarettes, the situation will get worse, and there are already various reforms in national legislation which exempt Greek tobacco manufacturers from obligations to use tobacco produced within the country. In this respect we think that the European Parliament would do well to lay more emphasis on the principle of Community preference instead of seeking to impose measures which would benefit the big American multinationals.

For this reason the Members from the Communist Party of Greece will vote against the Moreau motion.

\* \* \*

**CURRY REPORT (Doc. 1-987/83 'CAP'): DEFERRED UNTIL SITTING OF 18 NOVEMBER 1983**

\* \* \*

**DAVERN REPORT (Doc. 1-990/83 'EAGGF guidance section'): ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was :

— IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 2 to 4;

— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1, 5 and 6.

\* \* \*

**PATTERSON REPORT (Doc. 1-906/83 'Community's structural funds'):  
ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was :

— IN FAVOUR of all the amendments.

*Explanation of vote*

**Mrs van Hemeldonck (S), in writing.** — (NL) I intend to vote in favour of this proposal, since I share the rapporteur's view that during this time of crisis the Social Fund should be doubled, particularly in the light of increasing unemployment among women and young people.

However, I should like to say that I find the proportion of the Fund to be used specifically for women disturbing, since past experience has shown that, relatively speaking, the economic crisis affects women most seriously, but that policy in this area has not done anything about this.

What if the Member States systematically fail to set up or support projects for the benefit of women? Will the Commission be able to take or propose initiatives?

And what does the Commission think of the existing projects? All too often the thresholds are too high and the criteria applied unrealistic. Small-scale practical projects which take direct account of the situation and needs in a particular area or sector get nowhere, because the process of financing is too slow and unrealistic and bound up in too much red tape.

We hope more projects for the benefit of women will be promoted and supported over the next year and that steps will be taken to speed up the financing process, so that excellent training and retraining programmes will no longer come to nothing because of the advance financing problems and Eurobureaucracy.

\* \* \*

**DE PASQUALE REPORT (Doc. 1-930/83 'Community's structural funds'):  
ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was :

— AGAINST all the amendments.

*Explanation of vote*

**Mr Nikolaou (S), in writing.** — (GR) I shall restrict myself to certain remarks on the European Regional Development Fund concerning the particular nature not only of Greek regional problems but also of the problems of many other disadvantaged regions of the Community.

First of all, a real increase in the efficiency of structural funds, particularly the Regional Fund, is inconceivable unless two particular conditions are fulfilled :

— absolute priority must be given to combatting regional imbalances as part of the principle of approximating the economies, which up to now has been neglected in a provocative manner;

— at the same time there should be a significant increase in the ERDF's resources.

Nikolaou

Mr President, if industrial decline is to be dealt with as part of the ERDF and in fact as the second main aim, as the Commission proposes, then the resources of the fund must be doubled in real terms as part of a multiannual guideline programme.

The second remark concerns geographical concentration. The proposed replacement of national quotas with indicative quantity margins could turn out to be positive if the calculation of these margins is based on real economic and social indicators in the regions concerned and not on the quantities proposed by the Commission in 1981.

From the Greek side, we persist in our reservations as to whether the amount of 15.97% is sufficient, and we would reiterate our opposition to the fact that the areas of Athens and Thessaloniki are excluded from the financing offered by the quota section of the ERDF. It is enough to point out that the most thriving Greek region, Athens, has a per capita income equal to 55% of the average per capita income in the Community.

Thirdly, on the coordination of policies, we believe that *only* a flexible framework of coordination, which will allow governments to bring their *own* opinions to bear in deciding on options for dealing with their regional and development problems, can be effective.

Fourthly, we agree with the Commission's proposal that there should be a transitional period should for replacing individual projects with concentrated intervention on a broader scale. However, we think that this transitional period should be extended to five years to allow time for the adjustments required.

The fifth point is that the Commission is setting up a new 'qualitative criterion' as a general condition for the right to withdraw budgetary items from the ERDF in the future. This is the criterion of 'qualitatively better programmes'. We disagree with the introduction of this new qualitative dimension quite simply because it is completely impossible to define such general criteria objectively. But we disagree for another reason: because we believe that, since the less well developed countries are particularly unable to prove the quality of the programmes submitted for financing with statistical data, in the final analysis resources will be absorbed chiefly by the economically stronger countries.

\* \* \*

**THAREAU REPORT (Doc. 1-923/83/A 'Community's agricultural structures'):  
ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was :

- IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 2, 4, 6, 15 and 20 ;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 1, 5, 7 to 14/rev., 16 to 26 and 28.

*Explanation of vote*

Mr Eyraud (S). — (FR) I will not make a statement of vote in writing, because I have a number of things to say, in particular to the Conservative Members whom I see on the opposite benches and who have reappeared, as if by chance.

*(Applause from the left)*

Ladies and gentlemen, do not of course expect me to tell you that I am not going to vote in favour of the excellent report by my fellow member and friend, Bernard Thareau. The considerable work he has put into this deserves to be underlined. Nonetheless, I tabled several amendments designed to improve it, in my view. They received his support personally though of course not as rapporteur. The majority on the right felt obliged to reject

Eyraud

them, thereby showing its inconsistency. What was involved in fact? First, in paragraph 19, the adjustment of price support by taking account of the volume delivered by the holding and the number of units of family manpower on the holding. Second, in paragraph 29, the reorganization of production, the reduction of inequalities between regions. Thirdly, in paragraph 31, different treatment of the same product depending on its importance in the economy of a region and the possibilities of changing production systems or otherwise. Fourthly, consideration of part-time farming and the inflation differential.

Finally, a ceiling on aid in holdings exceeding a certain income level. Consequently, it is the same majority within this Parliament which demands savings in the CAP when the budget is being discussed and which refuses them when they are proposed in the form of effective structural measures. That's logic for you!

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Provan (ED).** — First of all, I would like to congratulate Mr Thareau on the amount of work that he has put into this report. It really is a very significant document, and anything that I might say from now on is not intended to detract from the work Mr Thareau has done.

It is unfortunate, however, that this resolution was originally submitted to the Committee on Agriculture on 11 April, the whole report being intended as an advisory document to the Commission on what we, as a committee of Parliament, believed should be the basis for reform of the structural proposals now coming before us. I say that advisedly because the Commission has actually put forward its proposals before Parliament has presented that advice to the Commission. It is in those circumstances that I must say to Mr Thareau that unfortunately, because of these procedural considerations, my group will have to vote against this report.

**Mr Edward Kellett-Bowman (ED).** — This House is dealing these days with a great number of reports in the agricultural field and agriculture occupies much of our thoughts and work, particularly leading up to next June.

Now this House does not quite have a majority for what might be called the farmers' party. In fact, when the House is full, the vote in the House tends to be for a reform of agriculture. That would be the true opinion of the European Parliament. This afternoon we had a situation where we felt that a fast one might have been pulled, but at the same time I would compliment the European People's Party which managed to fill its benches unusually full. This produced an imbalance of the House and its views on this particular delicate subject.

*(Cries of 'Is this an explanation of vote?')*

I am just giving an explanation of my vote at several times on agricultural subjects.

I would say to Mr Barbi that it is important that there should be a full House to deal with matters as important as agriculture, particularly at the present time. That was not the case earlier this afternoon.

## SITTING OF FRIDAY, 18 NOVEMBER 1983

## Contents

## Votes

- |   |     |   |     |
|---|-----|---|-----|
| 1. <i>Mr Gabert; Mr Curry; Mr Provan; Mr Curry; Mr Barbi; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Patterson; Mr Edward Kellett-Bowman; Mr Enright; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Patterson; Mr Konstantinos Nikolaou; Mr Van Minnen; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Patterson; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Glinne; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Prag; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Patterson; Mr Van Minnen; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Van Minnen; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Van Minnen; Sir Fred Catherwood</i> . . . . . | 287 | <i>tion); Mr Moreland; Mr Haferkamp; Mr Markopoulos; Mr Moreland; Mr Markopoulos; Mr Purvis; Mr Markopoulos; Mr C. Jackson</i> . . . . .  | 293 |
| 2. <i>European Social Fund — Report (Doc. 1-986/83) by Mr Papaefstratiou</i><br><i>Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Purvis; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Patterson; Mr Ceravolo; Mr Haferkamp (Commission)</i> . . . . .  | 290 | 5. <i>EEC-Cyprus — Report (Doc. 1-978/83) by Mrs Baduel Glorioso</i><br><i>Mr Rieger, Mr Ziagas; Mr Kallias; Mr Bournias; Mr Haferkamp (Commission)</i> . .   | 296 |
| 3. <i>Air pollution — Report (Doc. 1-922/83) by Mrs Squarcialupi</i><br><i>Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Griffiths; Mr Mertens; Mr Sherlock; Mr Eisma; Mr Haferkamp (Commission)</i> . . . . .   | 292 | 6. <i>Agenda</i> . . . . .  | 298 |
| 4. <i>Technology — Report (Doc. 1-976/83) by Mr Markopoulos</i><br><i>Mr Markopoulos; Mr Adam; Mr Purvis; Mr Markopoulos; Mr Haferkamp (Commis-</i>   |     | 7. <i>Adjournment of the session</i> . . . . .  | 298 |
|   |     | <i>Annex</i><br><i>Mr Dalsass; Mr Clinton; Mr Enright; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr McCartin; Mr Tolman; Mr Provan; Mr Moreland; Mr Blaney; Mr Di Bartolomei; Mrs Lizin; Mr Marshall; Mrs S. Martin; Mr O'Donnell; Mr Treacy; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Alavanos; Mr Baillot; Mrs Pantazi; Mr Alavanos; Mrs van Hemeldonck; Mr von Wogau; Mr Bonaccini; Mrs Dury; Mrs Elaine Kellett-Bowman; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Albers; Mr Estgen; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Fich; Mrs Dury; Mr Vernimmen; Mr Moreland; Mr Konstantinos Nikolaou; Mr Beazley; Mr Patterson; Mr Bonde; Mr Bøgh; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Skovmand; Mr Estgen; Mr Kyrkos; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Papantoniou; Mr G. Fuchs; Mr Vankerkhoven; Mr C. Jackson</i> . . . . . | 299 |

## IN THE CHAIR : MR KLEPSCH

*Vice-President**(The sitting opened at 9 a.m. 1)*1. Votes <sup>2</sup>CURRY REPORT (DOC 1-987/83 'CAP') <sup>3</sup>*Paragraph 20 — After adoption of Amendment No 43*

**Mr Gabert (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I have heard that the group chairmen met this morning and found a compromise on the basis of the events of yesterday. I would ask that the House, too, be informed of this compromise, since we know nothing about it.

*(Applause)*

What happened yesterday was not fortuitous, it was a political affair, and nothing has changed since then. I should therefore like to know what the group chairmen discussed this morning and what conclusions they reached.

**President.** — Mr Gabert, I sympathise with your request, but of course it does not really come under the Rules of Procedure. I take it, however, that the rapporteur will have something to say here.

**Mr Curry (ED), rapporteur.** — Mr President, this morning for the first time ever I did take part in the meeting of the group chairmen. They discussed the problem we had yesterday. There was a certain amount of discussion as to why we had the problem, but the only point to emerge was that we should press on with the vote. At the meeting there was no text circulated; there was no discussion on a compromise; it was mainly concerned with procedural matters. I can reassure my colleague that there has been nothing cooked up behind his back, despite all our efforts to do so.

*(Laughter)*

**President.** — I take it then that the group chairmen were unanimously of the opinion that we should continue voting today.

*(After voting on all the amendments)*

**Mr Provan (ED).** — Mr President, on behalf of my group, may I ask for a roll-call vote on the final vote

on the Curry report? I think it would be important to establish who in the Community and who in this Parliament is sufficiently interested to see reform of the common agricultural policy after some of the fine words that were said yesterday.

**Mr Curry (ED), rapporteur.** — It is actually on a textual matter which I think will help the House. As you know, there was a Woltjer amendment with references to oils and fats and Parliament voted against those references. In paragraph 10, there is a sentence which begins: 'In this connection, considers that the imposition of a tax on oils and fats should be adjusted.' Clearly, there is something of an inconsistency. May I suggest that it might help the House if paragraph 10 were to be interpreted as: 'In this connection, considers that any tax on oils and fats should be adjusted.' That does not state that we have one or that we do not have one. It simply gives a guideline on how it should be applied *should* there be one. I think that would smooth some of the rough edges and would, perhaps, help all Members of this House. It would accommodate everybody's concern.

*(Applause)**(After the adoption of the motion for a resolution)*

**Mr Barbi (PPE).** — *(IT)* Mr President, I should like to point out that, although it is Friday, we do have the legal quorum, correctly referred to by Mr Provan.

Although I may not always appreciate the motives, I always deplore the fact that Members are absent because of the way in which we are obliged to work, the long distances involved and the equally serious difficulties of air connections. But I deplore even more the fact that, for reasons which are beyond me, some Members of this House tried yesterday to sabotage the work of Parliament, and I am therefore very happy that we have succeeded this morning in getting this important report through.

*(Applause from the centre and the left)*TOVE NIELSEN REPORT (Doc. 1-811/83  
'MIGRANT WORKERS')*After recital C and the rejection of Amendment No 8*

**Mr Tove Nielsen (L), rapporteur.** — *(DA)* There is a lot of good sense in many of the amendments tabled, e.g. on xenophobia and racism, things we are against. If I cannot commend all of them, it is because I feel the same sentiments have already been very clearly expressed a number of times. I have no objection to the actual language used.

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — Mr President, I can explain what happened in the last vote. You are speaking so fast that by the time the English version comes over saying 'votes for', you have moved on to the votes against. My group wanted to vote in favour of that

<sup>1</sup> Approval of Minutes — Petitions — Motions for Resolutions (Rule 49 of the Rules of Procedure) — Verification of credentials — Membership of Parliament — Procedure without report (Rule 99 of the Rules of Procedure: see Minutes.

<sup>2</sup> See Annex.

<sup>3</sup> See CRE of 17. 11. 83, p. 498.

**Patterson**

amendment, but we did not get our translation until you were taking the votes against. So could we please have it more slowly?

**President.** — I can hardly accept that in this case since we went into some detail with the rapporteur and everyone knew what he was doing. We will take the voting more slowly Mr Patterson.

**Mr Edward Kellett-Bowman (ED).** — Mr President, with the greatest of respect, it always happens when you take the voting. I deliberately listen to you with one earphone on and one earphone off in order to try and understand your German, which I do not really understand, rather than miss the opportunity of voting the way I wish to do.

**President.** — Mr Kellett-Bowman, I can of course conduct the voting at a slower pace — that is nothing to get excited about. The thing is, most colleagues do not even raise their hands. That is the real problem!

**Mr Enright (S).** — Mr President, just to back you up, I think you are going at the right pace. But then you are not used to teaching backward children, so you have to take it very slowly for them over on that side.

*(Laughter)*

IN THE CHAIR : MR VANDEWIELE

*Vice-President*

VAN MINNEN REPORT (DOC. 1-909/83 REDUCTION OF WORKING TIME)

*Recital E — Amendment No 16*

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE).** — *(NL)* On behalf of my group I should like to ask the author of the amendment, Mr Patterson, whether he agrees that this amendment should be an addition and not a replacement for recital E. If he agrees to this recital we can vote for the amendment. Otherwise we shall vote against.

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — I certainly agree with Mrs Maij-Weggen, if she is going to vote for us as a consequence.

**Mr Konstantinos Nikolaou (S).** — *(FR)* With your permission, might we have the rapporteur's opinion?

**Mr Van Minnen (S), rapporteur.** — *(NL)* I was trying to attract your attention, Mr President. In this case I leave it to the plenary.

*Recital F — Amendment No 17*

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE).** — *(NL)* I should like the same procedure for Amendments Nos 17 and 18 as for Amendment No 16. If these two amendments are added we can accept them. If they are to replace the

original texts, we must vote against. Thus, if Mr Patterson accepts that they be additional, we can reach agreement.

**President.** — It is an odd procedure, Mr Patterson. My question is: Do you want to make an addition?

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — I am prepared to accept that.

**President.** — Mr Patterson, you will appreciate that an effort is being made to treat the amendment not as a replacement of the existing text but as an addition. Can we have your opinion as rapporteur?

**Mr Van Minnen (S), rapporteur.** — *(NL)* Yes, I appreciate that that is the position, Mr President, and it surprises me somewhat. I must as rapporteur be against, and follow the line taken in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, but there we were dealing with amendments for deletion and replacement. However, if, for instance, I read Amendment No 17 as additional, it is of course quite reasonable to say yes, that is a wholly acceptable text. Only, I must refer the texts as additional to the judgment of Parliament; this possibility was not considered at the committee's meeting. If what is wanted here is to delete the original text or replace it with the text of the amendment, I must repeat as rapporteur that I am against. There is no other solution.

**Mr Glinne (S).** — *(FR)* Mr President, we really must stick to the rules. An amendment tabled as a substitute text in Committee cannot, in the course of a plenary sitting, become an additional text.

**President.** — If an amendment is tabled to amend a text, this cannot be done during the sitting. You can only adopt or reject the amendment. You cannot combine the two, since this would make things difficult for the rapporteur. He must represent the thinking of his committee and remain objective. Let us not get involved in a procedural debate, but vote on the amendment in the usual way. You can only adopt or reject.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE).** — *(NL)* Mr President, that ruling is undoubtedly inconsistent because we approved this procedure for Amendment No 16 and now we are rejecting it for Amendments Nos 17 and 18. I just wanted to point out this inconsistency, as do the Socialists.

**President.** — Mrs Maij-Weggen, you must be sporting. The Chair did not want to raise any difficulties on what is regarded as an exception. But you may not now invoke that as a precedent. The Chair did perhaps make a slight mistake, but the plenary ratified it. I would ask you not to press the point. You can vote the amendment in the usual way — and that is an end of it — or reject it.



**Mr Prag (ED).** — I really must query your interpretation. If you look at the interpretation given to Rule 74 in our Rules of Procedure, what Mrs Maij-Weggen was clearly proposing was a compromise. That is perfectly permissible in the interpretation given to Rule 74. It is your decision as to whether it is accepted or not, and not the rapporteur's. You make the decision.

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, let us not now embark on a procedural debate. I shall read out the text of the amendment :

'To replace this recital with the following text'.

'Replace'. So it is the word 'replace' that is to be voted on.

*Paragraph 6 — Amendment No 10*

**Mr Van Minnen (S), rapporteur.** — (NL) This is an amendment which I can read in so many different ways that I gladly leave it, together with the votes, to the plenary.

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — The last but one line of the English text of this amendment talks about 'unit wage costs'. I think this must be a mistranslation for 'unit production costs', which is something quite different. Could I ask Mrs Maij-Weggen to clarify it, please ?

**President.** — Mr Patterson, it is not in order for you to question a Member about a text. You may, however, address the rapporteur.

**Mr Van Minnen (S), rapporteur.** — (NL) I understand Mr Patterson's question. If the procedure so permits, I pass the question on to Mrs Maij-Weggen, who has doubtless also understood.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE).** — (NL) Mr President, it is not a matter of translation. However, in the whole context of the recommendations and of Mr Van Minnen's report it would be more correct to speak of production costs than wage costs. So in principle Mr Patterson is quite right. With the agreement of the rapporteur I think that we could perhaps substitute this word in the text, which is quite all right in the other languages.

**President.** — Mr Van Minnen, I have here the French text. Which is the original text? Is it the Dutch ?

**Mr Van Minnen (S), rapporteur.** — (NL) Certainly it is, and I have the original text right here.

**President.** — Just one moment, Mr Van Minnen. Mrs Maij-Weggen, the French text admirably renders your idea, but in extended form. What we have is : '*les couts salariaux par unite de production*', and you say it should read : '*produktiekosten*.' Mr Van Minnen, is

that what you have in your original text to the committee ?

**Mr Van Minnen (S), rapporteur.** — No because the original text is not the same, Mr President. Since we are being given this interpretation, I must say as rapporteur that I leave it to the House. This motion was not discussed in committee. But I very much agree with Mrs Maij-Weggen and Mr Patterson when they say that if you consider this report according to the logic of the report, the words 'production costs' are the more appropriate.

**President.** — Fine, Mr Patterson, it shall be done as you wish. As a follow-up to this debate a check will be made on the correct terminology in all the languages.

**Mrs Van den Heuvel (S).** — (NL) I have the impression that the author of this amendment before the House is trying to alter the text. I think that this is out of line with regular procedure. The Dutch text, which the original, says 'wage costs per unit product'. In my opinion this is what we should be voting on, and nothing else !

**President.** — Mrs Van den Heuvel, I can set your mind at rest. The French text of the amendment reads the same. The rapporteur leaves it to the plenary to decide the matter.

*(After the adoption of Amendment No 10)*

**Mr Van Minnen (S), rapporteur.** — (NL) Just one question to clear things up. What you are saying, I take it, is that the original text of the amendment tabled by Mrs Maij-Weggen is adopted.

**President.** — I can confirm that it is indeed the text tabled by Mrs Maij-Weggen.

## IN THE CHAIR : MR ESTGEN

### *Vice-President*

*(After the adoption of the motion for a resolution)*

**Sir Fred Catherwood (ED).** — We have, coming shortly, a debate and a vote on the protocol for Cyprus. I think it would be most unfortunate if this got left off today's agenda in view of what has happened in Cyprus. I think it would be an enormous encouragement to the legitimate Government of Cyprus if we were able to pass this particular vote today, and I would like your assurance, Mr President, that we shall get to the Cyprus debate and take a vote on it before we conclude.

**President.** — Sir Fred, I cannot take up your suggestion for the moment. I would prefer to get through the agenda first, and then we can see how things are.

## 2. European Social Fund

**President.** — The next item is the report by Mr Papaefstratiou, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on the outcome of the conciliation meeting with Council on the review of the texts relating to the form of the European Social Fund (Doc. 1-986/83).

**Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE).** — (*GR*), *rapporteur*. Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the proposed resolution I wish to present to you on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment concerns the results of consultations with the Council of Ministers relating to the texts concerning the reform of the European Social Fund. This report was prepared in accordance with article 38, paragraph 4 of the Regulation.

First of all I would like to stress that in the context of the present severe crisis, the reform in question was a serious effort to broaden the scope of the Social Fund, with the aim of solving the two basic problems that the Community is facing at this time. In other words, the problem of local and sectoral inequalities apparent in certain regions within the Community, and the problem of unemployment, which has both organizational and random characteristics. Bearing in mind, then, the enormous importance of this reform, whose rules will be applied diachronically and which, according to our forecasts, is likely to make especial impact on employment, particularly for young people, there was a unanimous call, in the resolution approved on 17 May 1983 and contained in the excellent report by my colleague Mr Barbagli, to begin applying the consultation procedure established by the agreement of 4 March 1975.

As we know, at its meeting on 2 June 1983 the Council of Ministers adopted common orientations for the reorganization of the European Social Fund and communicated this provisional attitude to the European Parliament. In its turn, Parliament noted the important differences compared with the opinion that it had itself expressed, and at once requested that the consultation procedure should be initiated. This was done on the 19 September last.

As is clear from the proposed resolution which I had the honour to present to the House, Parliament limits its demands to the following essential points: That Parliament should participate in defining the yearly orientations of the European Social Fund. That any and all discrimination between the categories entitled to receive grants from the Social Fund should be eliminated. That the economic potential of the regions should be assessed taking into account the per capita GDP as the parameter for granting aid from the Fund. That the Fund's interventions should be more fairly distributed between men and women. That it should be possible to finance certain private organizations,

mainly small or medium-sized, from the Social Fund. And finally, that a directive should be added to the Regulation concerning finance for the provision of services and technical advice relating to the creation of new jobs.

As you can understand, the above points stressed by Parliament relate to the common declaration attached to the present document as an appendix. More particularly, the principle established by Parliament of participation in the Fund's orientation, is also referred to in Council's text, in article 6, paragraph 2 of its decision. In relation to the use of per capita GDP as one of the parameters determining grants of aid from the Fund to disadvantaged regions, Council calls upon the Commission to take account of this factor in the general study it has to prepare concerning criteria for choosing between the various applications, so that a reliable statistical method may be found. This factor is of fundamental importance if, as is also stressed in the text of the common declaration, it is hoped that the Fund will retain the character of a structural organ in the sector of employment and professional education, and if it is to constitute a significant means for the support of employment. For this reason, Mr. President, Parliament regards this point as extremely important and I ask the representative and Vice-President of the Commission, Mr. Haferkamp, to confirm the appropriateness, purposefulness and needfulness of this criterion.

On the basis of what I have said, Mr President, I ask for unanimous approval of the decisions taken by Council together with Parliament's representatives, bearing in mind the urgent need for the European Social Fund to resume operations in response to the needs of those whom we represent.

In conclusion, Mr President, I would like to point out that particularly this year, owing to the very limited time available, there was a brief and summary exchange of views between the Commission and the Committee on Social Affairs regarding the subject of guidelines for the Social Fund. However, we take very serious note of the letter from the Commission's President, Mr. Thorn, dated 17 October 1983, to our Chairman, Mr Dankert, in which Mr Thorn confirms that every year the Commission will consult with the European Parliament concerning guidelines for the Social Fund.

**Mr Purvis (ED).** — We have a logistical problem in getting through the work this morning. I can see that now. Can you tell us how far down the agenda you expect to get, or whether you are going to reduce the speaking-time permitted to the groups in view of the overrun on voting, so that we can get through the lot? We have three or four urgent resolutions which have to be dealt with, I presume. How much further are you going to get?

**President.** — Mr Purvis, I feel, as you do, that we must get on, that we have a lot of political work ahead of us. I cannot reduce speaking time, but I would ask colleagues to adhere strictly to their speaking time and, if they could, to abstain from speaking. In any event I shall continue until 2 p.m. with the agenda we have drawn up. I cannot do otherwise.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE).** — *(NL)* Mr President, on behalf of my group I can endorse, albeit with mixed feelings, the results of the consultations with the Council over the European Social Fund.

The parliamentary delegation put just a small number of points to the Council, points which it saw as being the most important. Four were accepted by the Council and three were more or less rejected.

One positive result was in connection with the participation of Parliament in discussion about Social Fund guidelines. In addition to young people, the Fund will concern itself more with migrants, women and the handicapped. Further parliamentary participation is guaranteed in the matter of drawing up regional criteria. It has also received an assurance that there will be a better allocation of Fund resources in favour of men and women.

But there still remains uncertainty over three other matters, one being the importance attached to gross domestic product in drawing up regional criteria. Nor has the Council agreed to the full participation of private bodies in the financing of projects.

Mr President, for all these reasons our group has mixed feelings but we shall nevertheless support the report by Mr Papaefstratiou, if only because a failure to do so would result in the European Social Fund's being frozen for quite some time. Only last year a great deal of money was left over in the Fund and we think it would be a great pity if this were to happen again. Therefore, Mr President, we will after all vote for the Papaefstratiou report.

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — Mr President, I think this matter is important for three reasons, two of them constitutional. The first is that it marks further progress in Parliament's relations with Council: a successful conciliation is always good for constitutional working of the Community. Secondly, the agreement which we reached on Parliament's contribution to the guidelines of the Social Fund is of great constitutional importance. It shows that where we have budgetary powers, Parliament should also be consulted on those matters which give rise to lines in the budget. That was the biggest change which we succeeded in getting in the Social Fund Regulation, for which we thank the Council. Thirdly, of course, it marks progress for the Social Fund itself.

We were, as the report points out, very anxious to see certain matters incorporated into the regulation and

into the guidelines. We wished to safeguard, for example, the position of the handicapped, of migrant workers, and of women within the Social Fund, and this has been achieved.

Some things have not been entirely achieved, and one, as Mrs Maij-Weggen pointed out, is the matter of private organizations. We wish to pursue this matter, and some points are still slightly unclear - in particular, the matter of per capita GDP. My group is satisfied that the Commission is now under an obligation to take into account the criterion of GDP when working out its statistical basis for the geographical allocation. Indeed, that matter is contained in the closing letter from the Council, so we consider that that is a success, although Mrs Maij-Weggen has her doubts. We have an amendment to that effect, but it may be that Mr Papaefstratiou has some proposals to make which will enable us to reach a compromise.

**Mr Ceravolo (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President, the Communist Group is rather puzzled by the conclusions that have been reached.

For instance, we are aware that the central issue raised with the Council was the criterion of GDP, with a view to allocation of the Fund. However, on this particular point, which, I repeat, was at the centre of discussions with the Council, the Council has undeniably made no concessions. It merely promised, among other things, that it would consider this possibility. The facts, however, were well established and GDP could already be adopted as a criterion given that it is already used for other Community structural funds. In actual fact, the Council has had no wish to do anything and we do not know if the situation will be any different tomorrow.

The Council's wish has been to reserve to itself ample room for manoeuvre in deciding on the distribution of the Social Fund. This point is of great importance since, only a few days ago, at a discussion on criteria for the use of structural funds, it was stated to be one of the fundamental criteria applicable in restoring equilibrium in the Community.

Unless we adopt an objective economic criterion, then instead of promoting a return to equilibrium we shall be fostering an increase in the existing imbalance. Hence, as I say, our perplexity. As to the report we shall be voting in favour, because it makes the point that the above criterion should be accepted by the Council, as Parliament has stressed.

If, however, this report is amended we shall not be able to guarantee a favourable vote. I would ask Mr Papaefstratiou to stand firm on his report.

**Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission.** — *(DE)* Mr President the rapporteur has named certain criteria which he wishes to see applied. They are also enumerated in the motion for a resolution, and the Commission shares his view that these criteria

**Haferkamp**

should be applied. The Commission will do so, including, in particular, the consideration of GDP.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

*Vote*<sup>1</sup>*3. Air pollution*

**President.** — The next item is the report by Mrs Squarzialupi, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the

proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1/260/83 — COM (83) 173 final) for a Council directive on the combating of air pollution from industrial plants (Doc. 1-992/83).

**Mrs Squarzialupi (COM), rapporteur.** — (IT) Mr President, because of the time I am obliged to summarize as much as possible what I have to say on a report and a directive which although they are certainly imperfect are, nonetheless, very important. I should just like to stress a few points. First, the Committee on the Environment reached agreement and voted unanimously in favour of the directive and the resolution and, by a very large majority, all the amendments. Secondly, the Council has already been discussing this important directive for a long time and I would stress that we wish it to take account of the report which we, the legal representatives of the people of Europe, have drawn up. I should like to add that I am in favour of all the thirty-one amendments adopted by the Committee on the Environment.

I leave to the wisdom of the House the amendment by Mr Mertens, with the statement which has already been made to the secretariat, that in this case the vote should only deal with the part of the text which has been underlined since paragraph 12 has already been amended by the committee.

Mr President, I should like, in conclusion to express the wish that, in future, more time should be given to important decisions affecting the environment.

**Mr Griffiths (S).** — Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group, I should like to say that we are tremendously impressed by the efforts made by Mrs Squarzialupi on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. We think this is a very suitable area of action for the Community because the weather does not respect international boundaries in the carriage of air pollutants across the continent. We will be supporting all of the amendments except for one part of Amendment No 1. So, without further ado, our full support to the Environment Committee.

**Mr Mertens (PPE).** — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in telegraphic style and very briefly,

because we have little time. We are glad that at least this report is being dealt with today and can be put to the vote, for this is the last opportunity for the Parliament to convey its opinion on preventing air pollution, with the urgent request to make a big step forward at the Summit meeting in Athens.

This had been the intention, you will remember, at the Summit meeting in Stuttgart, but it was not successful. Anyone who has studied the problems will know that it is urgently necessary to reach decisions here. We can no longer tolerate the damage done to public health by air pollution or the continuing wide-scale extermination of forests. Further, we cannot bear responsibility for the continuing destruction of valuable cultural monuments.

Our group brought in an unambiguous motion for a resolution along these lines as long ago as the beginning of 1982, and today's report follows these same lines. We are therefore grateful that the Commission has produced its proposals to the Council so quickly — relatively speaking — and in such definite terms. In certain connections, however, we should have liked to go further. For example, we should have liked to see more definite emission values laid down: that has not yet occurred — probably because of a fear that the Council would not agree. Nevertheless, we wish to convey in definite terms our thanks to the rapporteur for her determined effort to bring the matter further.

The purpose of our amendments is to prevent obstacles in the way of new techniques and industries coming into existence. On the contrary, in our view, compared with the filth put out by older plants, they rather clean things up, and we hope that by what we are doing we can promote this trend. We hope that a decision corresponding to our aspirations can really be taken at the Summit meeting in Athens, for that really would be progress.

(Applause)

**Mr Sherlock (ED).** — Mr President, I also must congratulate my colleague Mrs Squarzialupi on the way in which this report has been prepared and presented. I must also underline that it has been done with the greatest cooperation of every member of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. We worked the other day under great difficulty, and in only one practical language throughout, in order to get the report out on time. Having done this, we are treated yet again cavalierly and postponed until this late hour to this small, although very select, House to present this report.

It is a step forward into the pure air which we hope our grandchildren and our great grandchildren will inherit from us. It is a brave step, although a fairly small one, on a road of great advancement for the people of this Community.

I commend it to the attention of those who are wise enough to stay in this House today and support it.

(Applause)

<sup>1</sup> See Annex

**Mr Eisma (NI).** — *(NL)* Mr President, very briefly. Like the rapporteur, we see the Commission's proposal as a gratifying but nonetheless extremely cautious first step towards reducing the emission of noxious substances by factories. We would like the Commission to comment on Amendment No 17 by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection which concerns the financing as a whole. In that amendment the committee proposes the creation of a new Fund and we should very much like to hear the Commission's opinion. We also consider it of the utmost importance that decisions be taken on the future updating of the categories of plants covered in Annexes I and II, together with a list of pollutants. Just as important is the influence of Parliament, as proposed in Amendment No 27. Here too we should like to hear the Commission's opinion.

Finally, Mr President, we can well understand that the Commission formulates its proposals in mild terms so as to have a better chance of getting them through the Council. Even so, we hope that this time the Commission will be prepared to go a little further, that it will take up the committee's amendments and argue them forcefully with the Council.

**Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission.** — *(DE)* Mr President the Commission is glad that this matter will be put to the vote today — particularly as the Council of Environmental Ministers intends to discuss it at its next meeting, and this is due to take place on 28 November. No one disputes that one of the main causes of air pollution in all countries of the Community is the emission of injurious substances by industrial plant. These substances are very numerous, and so are the categories of industrial plant.

This draft directive is a definite and important step towards carrying out the Community's environmental action programme. I wish to stress that according to this programme the combating of air pollution by plants with a fixed location is one of the Community's environmental priorities.

This directive is concerned with the introduction into national legislations of certain essential principles for an effective Community policy on the prevention of air pollution. I would stress that we regard this as the first step in a policy which must be progressively developed. The Commission is in agreement with the content of the resolution and could also accept some of the demands put forward in the amendments. That is not, however, the case with some of these amendments. Amendment No 7 would lay down more specifically the national authorities competent to give authorization. At the moment and also in the near future, that is certainly not possible.

Amendment No 13 is submitted in connection with the proposed provisions for threatened areas and

protective zones, and would introduce a special condition for the licensing of plants which lie outside these areas and zones and emit pollutants.

I should like to point out that all plants covered by this directive must observe the strict conditions for authorization laid down in Article 4 of the proposal, and naturally the air-quality standards already valid according to Community law also apply. This applies above all to sulphur dioxide according to the directive of 15 July 1980 on guide values for the quality of the air and limit values for sulphur dioxide and sulphurous particulates.

Some amendments aim at introducing more detailed procedural provisions into the draft directive. Amendment No 19, for example, provides for the suspension of authorization in certain cases, and No 18 would bring not only individuals but also their interest groups into the procedure. We feel, however, that at the moment such provisions would lead to considerable difficulties and possibly to a delay in adopting this proposal.

To sum up, the motion for a resolution contained in the report would provide valuable support to the Commission in the further treatment of these matters, but some of the amendments, for the reasons I have indicated, would not.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

*Vote*<sup>1</sup>

#### 4. Technology

**President.** — The next item is the report by Mr Markopoulos, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on

The proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-600/83 — COM (83) 350 final) for:

- I. a decision adopting a multiannual research and development programme of the EEC in the field of basic technological research
- II. a decision adopting a multiannual research and development programme of the EEC in the field of the application of new technologies (Doc. 1-976/83)

**Mr Markopoulos (S), rapporteur.** — *(GR)* Mr President, owing to the conditions that prevailed and the conversion of Parliament yesterday into a circus, with the result that we wasted a great deal of time which would have allowed us to debate the serious problems we are facing here, I shall try to be as brief as possible.

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**Markopoulos**

Our report, which I am submitting to be voted upon today on behalf of the Committee for Energy, Research and Technology, proposes ways that will lead to the correct formulation of a path towards development in the sector of basic industrial and technological research within the European Community, and in the sector of applying new technologies.

Taking the view that any financing of programmes carried out in the way that it has been up to now will be unable to offer the possibility of realising the leap forward that it aims to bring about, we are calling for a fundamental change of basic structure in the way that the various research programmes function and are interlinked. To be specific, in our report we refer to three central themes which we consider essential poles for the concentration of our efforts.

Firstly, the publicizing of the programmes to all the relevant services in the Community's Member States, so that any interested industry or research institute will have the chance to participate. In parallel, this would make it possible for the Commission itself to set about a reasoned and scientifically well founded selection of the programmes to be financed, thereby avoiding misinterpretations of its intentions so far as the selection is concerned. This, however, can only be ensured by establishing specific rules.

Besides, the wide participation of institutes, industries and, in particular, small to medium-sized enterprises from peripheral regions must be ensured for two more reasons, which are repeatedly proclaimed in this House. These reasons are the regional development of the Community, aiming to raise the level of industrialization in the less well developed Member States of the Community, and the exploitation of their scientific potential both for their own benefit and for that of the Community as a whole.

The second central theme of our proposal relates to the method of supervision, control and exploitation of research. In our report we call for the establishment of a central system for processing research information and conclusions, first of all to facilitate the coordination, guidance and supervision of the various research efforts so as to avoid duplication that leads to waste of time, money and effort. Secondly, there should be a record, but also an evaluation of scientific conclusions to ensure flexibility in possible changes of direction, and thirdly, there should be easy access for all the interested industries so that they can be kept fully abreast of developments and be able to apply the results of research as soon as possible at every stage of the programme.

Finally, our report contains a third central theme which we believe cannot be ignored by a Parliament comprising the representatives of 250 million people. Great schemes for structural changes in research and technology, extending to the modernization of industry, which aim at fundamental transformation of the conditions of trade, cannot be carried out without

due regard to basic social factors. And it is well known that these factors, which are relevant from the standpoint of energy consumption, environmental effects, but above all the great problem of employment for the masses, should not just be taken into account but studied very seriously by every possible scientific means, to ensure that any inevitable adverse effects may be minimized while positive effects may be such, on the whole, as to reinforce the overall improvement the Community is striving for in the living conditions of its peoples.

Mr President, with these thoughts we ask Parliament to approve our report, exactly as presented by the Committee for Energy, Research and Technology.

**Mr Adam (S).** — Mr President, I want to congratulate very warmly the rapporteur on his very diligent approach to the drawing up of the report and on the soundness of the report itself. It is a scandal and it does no credit at all to this Parliament that this important report is taken so late on Friday's agenda.

Improvement of industrial competitiveness is a major objective of the Community framework research programme. Very often we concern ourselves with advanced and new technologies, such as the ESPRIT programme. But basic technologies make, and will continue to make, a substantial contribution to the GDP of the Community. Some Members may question the use of Community funds for these research programmes. But the Community's main trading competitors, the United States and the Japanese, both provide major central government support for research and development which is of direct benefit to their industries. The nature of basic technological research, which is well set out in the report, places it beyond the means of many individual research centres and smaller industrial concerns.

The parallel proposal is designed to ensure that new technologies are applied to specific manufacturing needs. It is deeply disturbing that Europe lags behind other industrial countries. This programme must also be seen as an important weapon in improving industrial competitiveness.

The first programme proposal concerns clothing manufacture. My own first reaction was one of surprise. But there are over two million people employed in this and the allied textile industries in the Community. More importantly, government-supported research and development aimed at developing fully-automated clothing manufacture systems is well under way in Japan, the United States and Sweden. That is the challenge we have to face. It must be emphasized that this proposal involves the pre-competitive stage and that the processes being developed are of benefit to the industry as a whole rather than specific individual companies.

The Socialist Group welcomes the Commission proposals and supports wholeheartedly this report.

**Mr Purvis (ED).** — Mr President, I do not intend to speak at any length, except to say that Mr Seligman has tabled several amendments. I would be interested to know if Mr Markopoulos, as the rapporteur, accepts them as replacements or whether he would prefer to have them as extra paragraphs — particularly 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12. If he is prepared to propose that they be extra rather than replacements, I would accept his ideas.

**Mr Markopoulos (S), rapporteur.** — (GR) Mr President, I think that I should be asked about the series of amendments by you, and not by Mr Purvis. When you call upon me, I shall give you an answer. First, however, there are a number of amendments concerning the text of the Committee's draft.

**Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (DE) Mr President, there is no need to dwell on the importance of promoting research. As already stated here, we must do everything we can not to lose touch with world developments in the field of advanced technologies if we are to keep our own economy competitive.

The Commission welcomes the report and the motion for a resolution and appreciates the considerations contained therein. In our view, the main priority in the Community's high-technology research policy must be given to the promotion of international cooperation. This brings me to a point I want to make about Mr Moreland's amendments concerning the priority for small and medium-sized undertakings. In principle we agree that small and medium-sized undertakings should be brought in, and we are aware that these undertakings have always made a special contribution to the technological development of manufacturing procedures and to the application of research in the field of high technology.

We consider, however, that the highest priority must still be given to international cooperation. With regard to the size of undertakings taking part, technological and economic questions will have to be borne in mind, and it is already apparent that in any average project one large and several small or medium-sized undertakings will be involved, thus ensuring a degree of cooperation among undertakings of differing sizes. It would therefore be difficult, if not impossible, for us to accept these amendments if they were adopted, but the following solution might be entertained in order not to lose sight of the fundamental idea I am referring to. The Commission would be prepared to add a further recital to its draft decision referring to the need to involve small and medium-sized undertakings so far as possible in the implementation of the programme.

Paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution, recommends, albeit in cautious terms, that regional and

local needs be taken into account in the selection and promotion of research projects. This, as you will surely agree, is not an easy matter, since in all research the quality of the scientific work done is of paramount importance. Only then can Community research achieve the aim we are all striving for, which is to help make our economy more competitive.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

*Vote*<sup>1</sup>

*Proposal for a decision I*

*Article 1, paragraph 2, last subparagraph — Amendment No 5*

**Mr Moreland (ED).** — Mr President, in view of what the Commissioner has said, I am prepared to withdraw my amendments, but I do hope he can give us the assurance that there will be a clear preamble. What concerned us was that in the explanatory memorandum a lot of attention was given to the object of helping small and medium-sized companies, and this, I think, many of us in this Parliament agree with, but it is not spelt out in the proposal for a decision.

If this is going to be clear elsewhere, I am quite happy to withdraw my own two amendments.

**Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (DE) On behalf of the Commission I can give the honourable Member the assurance he has asked for.

**Mr Markopoulos (S), rapporteur.** — (GR) Forgive me, I am very sorry, but I would like Mr Moreland's amendments to remain. We cannot withdraw amendments calling for special care to be taken over small to medium-sized firms.

**Mr Moreland (ED).** — Mr President, I gave a statement on this and the Commissioner gave an assurance. I do not think it would be proper for me, with respect to the rapporteur, to go back on my word. I think Mr Markopoulos ought to be happy with the fact that the Commission is going to put the right wording elsewhere in the decision, for that is what we are really looking for.

*Recital D — Amendment No 9*

**Mr Markopoulos (S), rapporteur.** — (GR) Mr President, I reject it because it changes the entire philosophy of the text. While I am calling for free access by all States, institutes and industries, the most important sentence is being cut out and this again restricts the matter of research within a small, secretive framework.

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**Mr Purvis (ED).** — I will maintain this amendment, and I hope the House will support this deletion. However, in case it does not, the word 'freely' in English means 'without any payment', or could mean that. I think the rapporteur probably means unrestricted access, rather than free access. Could he at least confirm that and also that, if by any chance Mr Seligman's amendment does not hold, this will be incorporated in the text anyway?

**Mr Markopoulos (S), rapporteur.** — (GR) I don't know how well acquainted Mr. Purvis is with the amendment. Mr. Seligman's amendment calls for the deletion of an entire paragraph that refers to the possibility for small and medium-sized firms, institutes and industries to have free access. And so far as I am concerned, this is the quintessence of the change I am trying to bring about.

*After adoption of the motion for a resolution*

**Mr C. Jackson (ED).** — Sorry to break in at this point, Mr President, but I understand we shall be stopping business promptly at 2 p.m. May I ask you whether Mrs Rabbethge has requested, as I understood she was going to, that her report on research in developing countries should be referred back to committee. If she has not done so, may I do so at this point, in order that it can be done.

**President.** — Yes, Mr Jackson, I am informed that the Presidency has received the request. We shall consider the request for referral in due course.

##### 5. EEC-Cyprus

**President.** — The next item is the report by Mrs Baduël Glorioso, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on

the recommendation of the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-637/83-8066/83) for a regulation on the conclusion of the Protocol concerning the arrangements to be applied during 1983 in the framework of the Decision adopted by the EEC-Cyprus Association Council on 24 November 1980 establishing the process into the second stage of the Association Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Cyprus (Doc. 1-978/83).

**Mr Rieger (S), deputy rapporteur.** — (DE) Mr President, the Committee on External Economic Relations has approved the Commission proposal with regard to a Protocol concerning the arrangements to be applied during 1983 within the framework of the decision adopted by the EEC-Cyprus Association Council on 24 November 1980 on the procedure for the transition to the second stage of the Association Agreement.

We also adopted the report unanimously, since it was our conviction that improved economic and trade rela-

tions between the Community and the Republic of Cyprus can make a significant contribution to ensuring the unity and integrity of the island, which was the subject of the resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in May 1983. We acknowledge the efforts being made by the Community to strive towards the final goal of a Customs Union with the Republic of Cyprus and relate this to the Community's efforts to forge a common Mediterranean policy for the eastern Mediterranean area, since we realize the overall responsibility the Community bears for the stability of this region.

We also noted, however — and I do not want simply to gloss over this here — that we are not quite happy with the commitment being shown by the Commission and the efforts it is making. We felt that the Community could do more, and certainly in the light of recent events in this region should do more, to strengthen its relations with the Republic of Cyprus.

Yesterday we discussed current events in Cyprus and also adopted a resolution on this subject. In this connection I should like to stress once again that we condemn the action of the Turkish Cypriot side, which has planned to establish an independent Turkish Cypriot state on the island of Cyprus, and that we feel that this conflict can be resolved, particularly along the lines of the efforts being made in the United Nations. We appeal therefore to the Community to do its utmost to have the independence, unity and integrity of Cyprus as a Member State of the United Nations Organization re-established.

The best thing that could happen would be if recent events on the island of Cyprus could somehow be completely set aside, thus ensuring that our aid would benefit the entire population. In the coming days and weeks the Commission will have to study the situation and see whether it feels that this can still be ensured, given the changed circumstances.

I should like to make the suggestion that we insert an additional recital referring to what we agreed upon yesterday in our resolution.

The recent tragic events impose an even greater responsibility on the Community for extending its relations with the Republic of Cyprus. We would link this responsibility with the general developments in the Middle East and also with the fact that the Community is not all of Europe, since we also have a duty to this greater Europe of which Cyprus also forms a part.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Ziagas (S).** — (GR) Mr President, this report by the Honourable Mrs Baduel Glorioso, which refers to part of the overall trade and economic relations between the EEC and the Republic of Cyprus, and which our colleague Mr Rieger has presented today, has acquired a topicality of historic dimensions. And



**Ziogas**

this, because while yesterday's debate is still fresh in our minds — condemnation of Mr Denktash's provocative arbitrary action — today the Community is being called upon, via Parliament and the Commission, to deal with the heart of the matter, in other words to consider the most important aspect of the EEC's relations with the Republic of Cyprus. Let our institutional organs face up to their historic responsibility and adopt a clear and unambiguous attitude to the only lawful representative of the people of Cyprus, the Republic of Cyprus which is recognized all over the world and with which the European Community has concluded an Association Agreement, to enable the trade agreement we shall be voting on today to come into force.

We are truly pleased by the clear position adopted yesterday by the Commission, through its Member Mr Haferkamp. However, I am compelled to recall certain words spoken by the Commissioner when, some time ago, in his last informatory report to the REX Committee, referring to Cyprus he said among other things: 'The Community has behaved towards Cyprus in a small-minded way, bargaining about a few tonnes of dried grapes.' I am also obliged to recall the statements and insistence of the Commission's representative, during the last debate on today's report by the REX Committee, when he asked that the enactment part of the resolution's text should only refer to the word 'Cyprus' instead of 'Republic of Cyprus', on the argument that the general expression 'Cyprus' would appease the leadership of the Turkish Cypriot community while creating no problems during the implementation of the trade and economic agreement.

The first of these situations was overcome by reciprocal promises and concessions to allow the Association Agreement to proceed. However, the second matter, in combination with the latest provocative arbitrary action by the leadership of the Turkish Cypriot community, should lead the Community finally and decisively to cast aside any illusions concerning the politico-economic framework within which its organs should address the Cyprus problem.

The Commission's latest announcement seems to respond to existing expectations. In parallel, the Turkish Cypriot leadership will have to be left in no doubt concerning the grave consequences its provocative action will have for the Turkish Cypriot community, unless it is rescinded as soon as possible.

**Mr Kallias (PPE).** — *(GR)* Mr President, the Republic of Cyprus, the jewel of the Eastern Mediterranean, the island of Aphrodite, the advanced depository of European civilization, has become a land of suffering. Yesterday, our Parliament condemned by an overwhelming majority the new Turkish Cypriot stroke of policy, the new Attila. Up to now the small Republic of Cyprus has shown exceptional spiritual stamina, heroic patience, persistence and self-control, but also

remarkable economic dynamism that enabled it to accommodate with affection and sacrifices the 200 000 refugees uprooted by the Turkish occupation forces from their traditional homesteads.

The Republic of Cyprus has had associations with the EEC since 1972. Unfortunately, the first phase of the association lasted far too long, and is only now, with inexcusable slowness, developing into the second phase, whereas the purpose of the association was from the start to achieve customs union. Again though, the steps taking place today could be characterised as timid and too restrained, because while support for the Republic of Cyprus is a very small burden on the Community, it has a lot to offer Cyprus.

That is why support for the economic development of Cyprus should be more generous, and there should be better facilities for disposing of her products. We should not underestimate the great political and strategic importance of Cyprus, nor ignore the advantages to Europe of maintaining close economic, and even closer political relations with the oppressed, tortured, but always upright, lively and creative Republic of Cyprus. At any rate, however, Mrs Baduel Glorioso's report is noteworthy. Among other things, it also stresses the importance of the EEC's Mediterranean policy.

Mr President, Colleagues, I would like to believe that the draft resolution will be approved unanimously and that a new phase in the relations between the EEC and the Republic of Cyprus is beginning. I also hope that both economic and political relations between the EEC and Cyprus will rapidly become closer, to their mutual benefit.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Bournias (PPE).** — *(GR)* Mr President, our views have already been expressed by Mr Kallias. However, with your permission I would like to make an additional statement on behalf of my colleagues in the New Democracy, who cannot be in the House at this time owing to the departure of their flight.

We wish to express heartfelt thanks to Mrs Glorioso both for her previous report and for that of today. We also take note of what was said today, namely that we do very little for the Republic of Cyprus. Besides, I on behalf of my colleagues, would like to thank Fellow-Members who have remained here until this late hour, to demonstrate their concern for the Republic of Cyprus.

**Mr Haferkamp.** *Vice-President of the Commission.* — *(DE)* Mr President, I have already had an opportunity of stating the Commission's position during the topical and urgent debate on the political situation in Cyprus. What I said yesterday applies to the presentation of the 1983 financial protocol and the proposals for proceeding to the second stage of the EEC-Cyprus Association Agreement. For the Community, Presi-

**Haferkamp**

dent Kyprianou's government is the sole legal government of the Republic of Cyprus. The Commission will continue to pursue systematically the aims of the Association Agreement with the Republic of Cyprus. The Second Financial Protocol will be implemented in cooperation with the Government of the Republic of Cyprus.

Within the framework of the EEC-Cyprus Association Council, talks have taken place at ministerial level on the further process into the second stage of the Association Agreement. On this occasion, the Community stated that it was prepared to take up negotiations on these matters as soon as possible, and preparatory talks will take place shortly.

In the course of this debate, some critical remarks have been made bearing mainly on the fact that in the past the Community has not been particularly generous in accepting agricultural produce from Cyprus. I can only say here that I have tried for years to convince the Council of Ministers that our relationship with Cyprus is more important than endless squabbles over imports of 500 tonnes of table-grapes or 50 tonnes of aubergines. In the present situation, I think it is particularly important to stress that the Community will meet its general political responsibilities and in future will not allow itself to become bogged down in such petty details.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The debate is closed.

*Vote*<sup>1</sup>

**6. Agenda**

**President.** — At the request of the rapporteurs, I propose that we take the vote on the following reports without debate :

Hutton report (Doc. 1-916/83)

G. Fuchs report (Doc. 1-1007/83)

C. Jackson report (Doc. 1-1005/83)

Furthermore, pursuant to Rule 56 (2) first subparagraph of the Rules of Procedure, I propose, at the author's request, to refer the report by Mrs Rabbethge, Doc. 1-1006/83, back to committee.

*(Parliament approved these proposals)*<sup>1</sup>

**7. Adjournment of the session**

**President.** — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.<sup>2</sup>

*(The sitting rose at 2 p.m.)*

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

<sup>2</sup> Motions for resolutions entered in the register (Rule 49 of the Rules of Procedure) — Forwarding of resolutions adopted during the sitting — Deadline for tabling amendments — Dates of next part-session : See Minutes.

*ANNEX**VOTES*

The verbatim report sets out hereunder the rapporteur's opinion on various amendments together with explanations of vote. For details of voting please refer to the Minutes.

**CURRY REPORT (Doc. 1-987/83 'CAP'): ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was :

- FOR Amendments Nos 2, 12, 17, 19 to 21, 23, 24, 28, 32, 43 to 45 (first part), 53, 70, 72, 73, 81, 84, 85, 89, 90, 102, 103, 106, 114, 120, 121, 128 ;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 1, 4 to 7, 9 to 11, 13 to 16, 18, 22, 27, 29 to 31, 33 to 41, 45 (second and third parts), 46, 48 to 52, 54 to 59, 62 to 69, 71, 74, 75, 77, 78, 87, 88, 92, 94, 96, 98, 101, 104, 105, 107, 109 to 111, 115 to 117, 119, 122 to 127, 129 to 137, 139 to 140.

*Explanations of vote*

**Mr Dalsass (PPE).** — (*DE*) Yesterday we were somewhat depressed by the course that developments had taken here. Now, however, we are glad that at last the European Parliament is taking up a stand on the reform of the agricultural policy. This proposal as it now stands is, I think, acceptable to everyone. The Group of the European People's Party will, of course, be voting in favour, and we should be happy if a large majority of the Parliament were to do the same.

**Mr Clinton (PPE).** — I do not propose to submit my explanation of vote in writing : I think that is nonsense, it is there for the optics.

I think we should have as little of this as we possibly can. I feel constrained on this occasion to give some explanation. I explained earlier in the week why I had to vote against the Curry report. I do not want to repeat those reasons. I had hoped that Parliament, by way of amendment, would make the report much more acceptable. Parliament's amendments have not made it much more acceptable, but one amendment that has got through enables me, very reluctantly, to vote for it.

I wish to put on the record that I voted in error for paragraph 33, which agrees to quotas. I do not agree to quotas and, particularly, I do not agree to quotas that are applied in blanket fashion across the Community regardless of the stage of development and regardless of the effects they may have on individual Member States. I am totally opposed to that. I have already emphasized that in the course of what I had to say this week.

Let me say about the performance yesterday that everything possible was done to ensure that no opinion would go from this Parliament to the summit in Athens. Thanks be to God, we overcame that problem and I hope we see no more of this sort of conduct in the future, especially by people who pose perpetually on the pious altar of rectitude and who feed us on the Rules of Procedure.

**Mr Enright (S).** — I just wish to say how wonderful it is to see so many people here on a Friday morning!

*(Applause)*

**Sir Fred Catherwood (ED).** — I would like to say, first of all, that our group are sorry to have inconvenienced the House by supporting the Socialist call for a quorum yesterday but we considered at the time that we had an agreement with other groups to take out all reference to an oils and fats tax and we had just passed the paragraph 10 which still included a reference and there were other references to come. We therefore wanted to underline the seriousness with which we would have taken it had the House voted for an oils and fats tax which we consider, for all kinds of reasons I cannot go into now, would be an extremely foolish tax to recommend to the Commission and Council. We now have the proposal of the rapporteur, which you have suggested, on paragraph 10, where he says that we should consider that any tax on oils and fats should be adjusted. That is to say that paragraph 10 now reads contingently. We understand from our colleagues in the House that that was how they had originally understood it, that it was not a call for an oils and fats tax, that it was what would happen if there were one. We understand that they accept and that you accept.

**Mr McCartin (PPE).** — It is the first time in 4 years that I have done it and I have never objected to anybody else doing it in that length of time either. I am disappointed with this report. Disappointed because this report has tried to go a bit of the road with everybody and has not set out to correct the basic injustices which have created most of the problems. In the milk sector I am particularly disappointed with this report. While it has paid lip service to the getting rid of MCAs, it has done so on the condition that it does not undo the advantages of the strong currency countries. I am disappointed that, as far as the milk sector is concerned, this Community has seen fit to leave the advantage with the strong currency countries in higher prices and cheap basic foodstuffs. It has maintained the position of the strong and prevented the development of the weak. I am very disappointed from that point of view.

This Parliament has spoken so much about economic convergence. In this particular work Parliament could have done something in practical terms for the idea of economic convergence. The country which I represent — Ireland — has proven that it can take lower prices; that it can sustain high costs and nevertheless can be more competitive than other countries. We have refused to give that country the advantage. Lady Barbara Castle has said we ought to give countries like Ireland more money. We do. We ought to give them social aid and regional aid. I will nevertheless vote for this because I think it is important that this Parliament give an opinion. I pin my hopes on the fact that we have made some gesture towards underdeveloped regions which I hope the Council will take note of.

**Mr Tolman (PPE).** — *(NL)* Also by way of exception, an explanation of vote. I shall cast my vote in favour of this report. I am of the opinion that there has been very fundamental discussion of agricultural policy, especially in relation to new policy in respect of quotas and the superlevy, a vital development. I wish also to express my dismay at the fact that, should the question of oils and fats be taken, a strong lobby awaits it. However, I hope that in future there will be more tolerance and no attempt to obstruct developments and votes.

**Mr Provan (ED).** — My group will be abstaining in the final vote on the Curry report. There are several paragraphs that we find are helpful to the reform of the common agricultural policy but there are certain other paragraphs that we find inconsistent with what, I am sure, many in this House want to achieve by way of meaningful reforms. It is not consistent, in fact, still to refer to the objective method of fixing agricultural prices when in fact Parliament is also seeking guidelines whereby prices would be allowed to rise.

Regarding oils and fats : I think my group is now satisfied, having had a great deal of difficulty yesterday in being able to accept what Parliament has done in that sector, especially the way paragraph 22 now reads with reference to GATT and satisfactory arrangements being made with overseas suppliers.

Paragraphs 11 and 12, regarding pricing policy for controlling surplus production, is a major step forward, we believe, for this Parliament.

Paragraph 34, for quotas in the milk section, is also a major step for this Parliament and I believe Parliament deserves a great deal of thanks for the lead it is taking in this matter, because there is no doubt that the milk sector is the main problem area. We do not like, however, the derogations that have been placed in paragraph 34; but to try and get unanimity in Parliament we supported that paragraph because that is the major achievement we are seeking.

**Mr Moreland (ED).** — Last weekend I spent the weekend with Members of Parliament and ministers and I was bullied the whole time with questions like 'Why is this Parliament voting for higher agricultural prices?'; 'Why is this Parliament voting for high levels of agricultural expenditure?'; 'Why is this Parliament voting for high levels and increases of our own resources?'; 'Why is it threatening an oils and fats tax which will put up the cost of margarine, chocolate, baby foods and other housewives' needs?' I might tell you, Mr President, I am not talking about a meeting with British ministers, or British Members of Parliament, it happened to be a meeting with ministers and Members of Parliament from the Christian Democrat group in the Bundestag. I would hope that they are right and that their group here is wrong, because the ideas that they had are the right ideas, which we should be pushing. And unless we are more forceful on this — Athens, whatever it may be in the future — will not be successful because there is no doubt that we have to come to grips with agriculture. This report does not go far enough and I regret I cannot vote for it and like my colleagues, I will have to abstain.

**Mr Blaney (CDI).** — Much work has gone into this report at various stages — committee level, opinions, etc — but the farce that we saw made of this Parliament here yesterday, of which I only learnt the true cause this morning, makes me wonder why we are here at all. The fixing that went on behind the scenes, disregarding the committee's efforts and work over the last months, and the Parliament's efforts insofar as amending this was concerned, were brought to nought by virtue of the fact — to put it bluntly — that the thieves fell out yesterday evening. And so we had the double farce of there being no quorum and it being clearly seen that there was not. And of course there is not a quorum this morning either. But that is not my real objection; my real objection to this report is that despite what has been put into it, what there is of good things said in it, I just cannot, and will not, vote for that which will down the very industry on which my country really depends and that is the agricultural sector, especially milk. I refer to the application of a super-levy and the introduction of quotas. The manoeuvring and the concern of the people in this House for the interests of the Americans in order to avoid a legitimate tax on oils and fats just disgusts me, and I will vote firmly against it.

**Mr Di Bartolomei (L), in writing.** — *(IT)* The governments and parliaments of Europe are becoming increasingly interested in the whole question of reforming Community agriculture, not only in order to cope with food needs but also because of the impact this would have on trade balances and on employment.

Nevertheless, the common agricultural policy is being held up and attacked, and we cannot permit the destruction of the one major policy that we have been able to establish up to the present time.

In this connection the meeting to be held in Athens from 4 to 7 December will be of historic significance, since it will decide how the Community must acquire the resources it needs to extend the process of economic integration, bringing its operation and its influence to bear on other sectors. It will have to come up with programmes for energy, ship-building, the new technologies and social policy in general.

Some countries would like to finance these new programmes by cutting back on agricultural expenditure. It is our contention, however, that while we need to push forward with the construction of new Community policies, it would be worse than a crime, worse than a mistake, to dismantle the agricultural policy. The correct path to follow is that of increasing agricultural incomes.

There is certainly much in the CAP that needs to be overhauled. The first thing that needs to be done is to bring about a vigorous sense of responsibility in the matter of suppressing abuses. We must then cut out aids to production lines for which there are no markets and to assist which therefore is simply throwing money away. We want to see more and more being produced for the markets and less and less for the stockpiles, in such a way that there will come to be less and less need for guarantees, premiums and compensatory amounts.

I hope that one result of the Athens meeting will be to suppress firmly the national egoisms of all the countries concerned.

**Mrs Lizin (S), in writing.** — (FR) I shall vote in favour of the Curry report which, I feel, includes all the main elements by means of which we would like to protect our agricultural policy and the principles underlying it. I feel that Parliament should stoutly reaffirm its position on the entire question of agriculture, that is to say, that we are determined to uphold the principles of the common agricultural policy, to develop our exports, to protect ourselves against abuses in the matter of imports and to work out a sound oils and fats policy. The Curry report faces up to all these problems. I would have liked to see it go further in regard to the measures that must be taken in favour of small farmers and to see it advocate measures in their regard that would lighten the burden of taxation that weighs so heavily upon them. The farmers of the Wallonia region, for example, deserve special consideration in view of the farming conditions they have to contend with in the southern part of Belgium. The report might also come out more clearly on the matter of recommending the imposition of a tax on oils and fats as well as on the question of European support for the domestic production of animal feedingstuffs.

**Mr Marshall (ED), in writing.** — I intend to vote against the Curry report because I fear that this is another attempt by agricultural interests to railroad the Community into unwise policy.

The suggested oils and fats tax is but one example of the misguided thinking which prevails in the Commission. It is an attack on the consumer. What sense is there in imposing a tax which will merely raise the prices of basic foods such as margarine and biscuits? Why should the housewife pay more so that the Community's farmers can benefit? Why should the poor pay more for their margarine to benefit dairy farmers?

Similarly the Community fails to use the price mechanism to restrain surplus production. Quotas are not the answer — the sugar quotas have allowed surpluses of 50 %. The price mechanism is the only sure way to bring supply and demand into equilibrium. Attempts to tinker with it inevitably lead to chaos — as the sorry history of the CAP shows.

Finally, can I sympathize with Mr Curry? He, as rapporteur, has to reflect the views of the committee. I suspect he regards this report as an embarrassment.

**Mrs Martin (L), in writing.** — (FR) Although I am against the application of milk production quotas which freeze the situations and are cumbersome to apply and monitor.

Although we have not had a chance to vote as clearly as I would have wished on the tax on oils and fats.

I shall vote for this report since it paves the way for an overall oils and fats policy, for the control and elimination of monetary compensatory amounts, for stricter control on imported raw materials which are in competition with our own products and for a genuine trade policy.

**Mr O'Donnell (PPE), in writing.** — As a representative of a small peripheral island country whose economy is more dependent on agriculture than any other Member State of the Community, I must vote against the Curry report because of its total failure to recognize the exceptional circumstances obtaining in Ireland in relation to agriculture and particularly in relation to the dairy industry.

The application of the proposed 'super levy' on milk would spell economic and social disaster for Ireland and would be an appalling tragedy for the constituency which I have the honour to represent in this Parliament.

The failure of the Curry report to recognize the fundamental facts of economic life in Ireland, and the rejection by Parliament of the Clinton and other amendments by Irish Members on paragraph 34 leaves me with no option but to vote against the Curry report.

**Mr Treacy (S), in writing.** — I regret that I cannot support this motion for a resolution.

Although the motion proposes that there should be some flexibility in the application of the super levy on milk in disadvantaged regions and in relation to small farmers, it is not clear what criteria will be used to define these categories.

My position remains one of total opposition to the application of the super levy to Ireland, because of our very heavy dependence on agriculture, especially milk production. The only areas recommended for exemption from the milk levy in the motion are mountain areas. This will not solve Ireland's problem.

A door has been opened today in paragraphs 8 and 34 of the motion, but there is still a long way to go before I can be satisfied with Community proposals in this area.

**Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S), in writing.** — (NL) What the average housewife gets out of the common agricultural policy is overwhelmingly negative: it eats up 70 % of the Community budget, produces scandalous surpluses, occasions a sickening waste of food in a world dominated by famine and forces upon the European consumer expensive products at a time when the family budget is increasingly under pressure.

Structural reforms are urgently needed: things cannot go on as they are. Over-production must be checked.

Action must also be taken in favour of the European consumer. He will no longer allow his well earned money to be used to resell agricultural surpluses at low prices outside the EEC, at a time when the Commission is refusing to operate an improved Christmas butter deal within the Community!

It is urgently necessary that agricultural policy should be less supportive of production and more supportive of consumption. The wider consumption of Community dairy products, vegetables and fruit must be encouraged through special food programmes for schools, works canteens and old peoples's homes. And why not a special programme for the millions of unemployed who have to live on an *ersatz* income? They consume less butter and fruit because they cannot afford the prices. Let the agricultural policy do something about that instead of playing up to agro-business.

\* \* \*

#### FANTI REPORT (Doc. 1-927/83 'Cultural sector'): ADOPTED

##### *Explanations of vote*

**Mr Alavanos (COM), in writing.** — (GR) We are steadfastly in favour of the development of cultural cooperation between countries. It would be inconceivable at a time when productive forces are being internationalized and there is a scientific and technological revolution, to support positions of 'cultural chauvinism', especially by a country like Greece which nowadays has many needs to take advantage of scientific and cultural contributions from other countries.

However, the European Members of the Greek Communist Party will vote against the Fanti report, for the following basic reasons :

Firstly, we believe that cultural cooperation should emerge from an intergovernmental cooperation that respects the sovereign rights of each country. There are such vehicles at an international level, such as Unesco. We disagree entirely with the orientation of the Fanti report, that cultural cooperation should come under compulsory supranational procedures of the EEC.

We consider to be both legally unsupported and unacceptable in essence the view that the EEC Treaties provide for full Community action in the cultural sector.

Secondly, we disagree with the compulsory and one-sided orientation of cultural exchanges with the EEC countries. The EEC is not Europe. The cultural cooperation proposed by the draft resolution leads to the division, not the union of Europe. We agree with the comments made by our Danish colleague Mr Bøgh, that Community action in the cultural sector is ultimately anti-Soviet. This is particularly important for Greece, which borders a range of socialist countries.

Thirdly, as emerges from the Stuttgart Declaration, cultural cooperation is not, and could never be an 'autonomous' aim. It is a lever for the promotion of political supranational integration. This is an important factor, of which we take serious note in our negative vote.

Fourthly, we cannot ignore the fact that the class struggle and class contrasts are played out on the field of cultural issues, at national and international level. It is well known that the 'European ideal', or even Greek culture in various distorted forms, have been used both by the conservative forces in my country and by the EEC in attempts to impose policies contrary to the interests of our people. For example, one might sometimes think that in the Peloponnesian War, Pericles was defending the European Community and not the Athenian Democracy. It is characteristic that the Fanti report received congratulations from the representative of the New Democracy. However, we cannot add our own.

Finally, we believe that finance from the common budget should be granted to the aims of *national* cultural policies, not ones based on Community criteria.

**Mr Baillot (COM), in writing. — (FR)** I should like to congratulate my friend, Mr Fanti, on his excellent report. It was extremely useful on the eve of a new legislative period to have the prospects for Community action in the cultural sector presented to the House. All too frequently the Community adopts a technocratic approach — something which we have frequently denounced — when tackling the grave economic problems facing it. This approach does not give enough weight to the human factors which mere figures tend to mask. It does not allow us to consider the societies in which we live, to adopt the detachment necessary to appreciate the greatness of the heritage which we must preserve or to assess the extent of the changes which must be brought about.

Developing the cultural side of our action is certainly one of the best means for combating the disease of technocracy and of asking the decisive questions which our countries, faced as they are with a crisis of great moral implication, have to answer. In addition to the many proposals in favour of cultural activity, what we particularly appreciate in Mr Fanti's report is his defence of pluralism and respect for national and regional cultural identity.

These principles need to be reaffirmed when the levelling effect by commercial factors threatens the cultures of our society. One need only consider the disturbing phenomena 'Dallas' which is a symbol of this levelling.

Mr President, the French Communists and their allies whom I represent, will vote for Mr Fanti's report.



**PAPANTONIOU REPORT (Doc. 1-919/83 'Financial support in favour of Greece'): ADOPTED**

*Explanations of vote*

**Mr Pantazis (S).** — (GR) Today, Greece faces severe overload and organizational problems both in the sector of centres for professional training and in the sector of psychiatric clinics. The lack of any such infrastructure is the main reason why my country contributes so little to the Social Fund. Within the scope of its five-year plan for 1983-87, the present Greek Government has declared its aim to set up and modernize such an infrastructure, while in parallel with the reorganization of the health system, specific activities are envisaged for dealing with the problems encountered in psychiatric clinics. Mr President, since this draft resolution on the one hand confirms the Community's interest in dealing with Greece's special problems, and on the other hand shows that the procedure for taking a new and less well-developed State into the European Community is not just a national matter but also a social one, we shall vote in favour of Mr Papantoniou's report.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — (GR) We shall vote in favour of our colleague Mr Papantoniou's report. However, we wish to stress that one cannot speak of Community interest in the social sector in our country, but only of extremely severe negative consequences. On the one hand, I point to the problem of unemployment which has increased enormously since our accession, and on the other hand to the EEC's interventions in the government's various social measures. As an example, I can mention the Commission's recommendations for policy guidelines for 1984, such as the discontinuation of automatic cost-of-living adjustments.

\* \* \*

**DELEAU REPORT (Doc. 1-901/83 'European centre for SMUS and craft trades'): REJECTED**

Mrs Desouches, deputizing for the rapporteur, was:

- FOR Amendments Nos 1, 3 and 10;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 2, 4 to 9 and 11

*Explanations of vote*

**Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S).**— (NL) I cannot but mention the striking absence of the great spokesman for the small and medium-sized undertakings on the Christian Democratic benches. Evidently it is more important to get media coverage than to discharge one's parliamentary responsibilities.

In my amendment I wanted to draw attention to the difficulties facing women who are made redundant by the big firms and seek employment in the SMUs, where they run into difficulties, especially when it comes to obtaining credit. Parliament has ruled that it has no need to tackle this problem, nor even to consider it. This being so, I shall vote against.

**Mr von Wogau (PPE).** — (DE) With this vote we are concerned with the creation of a European centre for small and medium-sized undertakings in the European Community. No one will be opposed to an institution of this kind, and I think it is important that small and medium-sized undertakings are better represented at this level than has so far been the case.

The arguments and the confusion we have just gone through are to be traced back to the question of the form this institution should take. Should we take on further officials, a director-general and two directors, as was suggested, to represent the small and medium-sized undertakings at this level, or should it be an organization borne by the grass-roots of the Community's middle-class organizations?

We tabled amendments to achieve this aim, but we have not succeeded in bringing about all we wanted to. I shall therefore be abstaining.

**Mr Bonaccini (COM), in writing.** — (IT) I regard the original Deleau document and the efforts it makes on behalf of small and medium-sized undertakings and craft industries as one of the most important economic initiatives undertaken in 1983. Unfortunately, a majority in this House decided to take simple economic and social concepts and squeeze them into a strictly ideological bourgeois straitjacket, thus lumping together in an absurd fashion employers, self-employed people, tradesmen, skilled and semi-skilled workers and so on. I do not have to explain at length how absurd it is to devise schemata of this kind to fit in with some kind of supposed Community logic. We regret therefore that we are obliged to abstain.

**Mrs Dury (S), in writing.** — (FR) We are all aware of the economic importance of small and medium-sized undertakings in the current crisis. 1983, the European Year of Small and Medium-sized Undertakings and Craft Industries, should be marked by a heightened realization of the possibilities and difficulties of and prospects for small and medium-sized undertakings. Opinions may differ on the real impact of this year, and I, for my part, feel that it was inadequate. That is why I fully support the creation of a European Centre for small and medium-sized undertakings and craft industries.

Nonetheless, it must be hoped that this Centre will not exercise its functions in isolation from the concrete national realities. Its task should be based on the two-fold goal of supporting existing small and medium-sized undertakings and facilitating the setting up of new ones.

Many young unemployed men and women experience great difficulty when they attempt to set their own small or medium-sized undertaking; a Community policy in this area is absolutely necessary.

Let us therefore hope that this Centre will not be just another bureaucratic machine but an effective weapon in the struggle to create new jobs and promote economic development.

\* \* \*

**IPPOLITO REPORT (Doc. 1-931/83 'Results of research and development financed by the Community'): ADOPTED**

Mr Veronesi, deputizing for the rapporteur, was:

— AGAINST Amendment No 1.

\* \* \*

**GALLAND REPORT (Doc. 1-935/83 'Reactor safety — nuclear fission energy'): ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was

— FOR Amendments Nos 4, 5 and 22;

— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 3, 6 to 17, 20 and 21

*Explanations of vote*

**Mrs Elaine Kellett-Bowman (ED).** — I rather regret that, on a matter which concerns many people's safety, those who were here when their pockets were affected are no longer in the Chamber.

When considering questions of nuclear energy, it is crucial to consider the psychological aspect of these matters. Not only must all possible safety precautions be taken but they must be seen to be taken and widely publicized. I have in my constituency Sellafield that used to be known as Windscale, a very important nuclear reprocessing plant. One month

ago a television programme raised doubts about certain safety aspects. Within hours the Minister, Patrick Jenkin, had set up a high-powered inquiry under the eminent scientist, Sir Douglas Black, to inquire into the safety aspects raised and advise on what future research and action may be required.

Speed is of the essence in these matters if public confidence in this source of power is to be maintained. I therefore welcome the Commission's efforts in this regard, especially paragraph 3 of the report, and shall be voting for it.

**Mrs Viehoff (S).** — (NL) The first research programme dealing with nuclear energy puts the accent on safety, radioactive waste and dismantling of nuclear plants. I am more and more convinced that all the money for nuclear energy that has to be spent on all these sorts of things only goes to show that nuclear energy is not as good as it is often made out to be. It is curious that electricity companies build the plants but it is authorities, in this case the Community, that has to pay out the money when it comes to safety, waste and dismantling.

As long as this sort of research cost is not charged to the plants, you will get a distorted picture of nuclear energy costs and the real costs are blurred.

Next we have reactor safety. The proposal is in two parts: lightwater reactors and fast reactors. The Commission's position is ambivalent. On the one hand it says we can be satisfied that the operation of existing nuclear plants, as far as safety is concerned, is satisfactory. On the other hand, it says that research must continue and that safety levels must be improved. One may well ask, if safety levels are sufficient, what is the point of raising standards? Or is safety not sufficient? In that case nuclear plants must be closed down. The big question is then what is meant by satisfactory levels?

From the description of the research programmes you get the impression that safety is not all it might be. There is still a lot we do not know and this makes it all the more risky to continue with fast reactors. The funds proposed can be better spent on other objects.

Mr President, I shall vote against this report together with a minority of my group. At first sight perhaps this may seem illogical, coming from someone who is concerned about safety, but all the evidence suggests that there is so much uncertainty that it is simply irresponsible to continue developing nuclear energy. Unfortunately this is not the conclusion drawn by others, Mr Galland. This is precisely what separates those who are for and those who are against nuclear energy!

\* \* \*

#### TOVE NIELSEN REPORT (Doc. 1-811/83 'Migrant workers'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was

- FOR Amendments Nos 1, 7, 10, 14, 19, 20, 22 to 27, 34, 35, 37 to 40, 50 to 53, 55, 56, 60 and 63;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21, 29 to 33, 36, 41, 43 to 49, 54, 57 to 59, 61 and 62.

#### *Explanations of vote*

**Mr Albers (S).** — (NL) In 1975 I was the rapporteur and I have naturally been very interested to hear all that Parliament has had to say. Parliament has made a mistake, if I may say so, in adopting an amendment to Article 1 by Mr Eisma to the effect that the problems have not been satisfactorily tackled by the Commission and the Council; that is putting it much too mildly. The original text, which simply said that the problems were not tackled, was a good text. For we are bound to say that nothing has been done about the 1974 action programme for migrant workers and their families, that things are just as they were, and what we have here in the European Community are groups of workers being set against one another because some are from the Community and others from outside. We have strongly urged that the distinction between workers from outside the Community and those from within should be abolished. This has not happened. And this cannot be emphasized strongly enough by Parliament. Commissioner Richard has said that efforts will be made to do away with the distinction. Let us do our best, Mr President, because groups of workers are being played off against one another.

**Mr Estgen (PPE), in writing. — (FR)** I shall vote for Mrs Nielsen's report on the problems of migrant workers. Although I do not agree with everything it says, like her, I am concerned by certain reactions evident in our Member States.

It is absolutely shameful that certain of our fellow citizens should wish brutally to get rid of a labour force which we were unable to do without during the economic boom.

The sudden upsurge in racist trends and xenophobia evident practically everywhere is a disturbing and scandalous phenomenon. I am therefore, in favour of a coordinated policy on the social, economic, cultural and political situation of migrant workers.

To be effective such a policy must be Community based. Nonetheless I must express certain personal reservations. I am not very happy at the way in which we are increasingly placing third country nationals on a level of equality with Community nationals. If the European Community is to mean anything at all it must be something which its citizens experience.

The citizens of our Member States are in the process of becoming European citizens in the full sense of the word, with specific rights and obligations; this virtual, potential citizenship must be honoured. Of course this does not dispense us from adopting a social and political attitude to nationals of third countries founded on respect, dignity and human rights.

I am also in favour of legal and social integration of migrant workers and I very strongly support the need to provide better means of association within the best countries. I even think that these forms of association for migrant workers should be given official status, that they should be incorporated in a form of higher council for immigrants which would have the right to be consulted on political and social measures to be taken at local, regional and national level directly affecting the interests of migrants.

Nonetheless, at the current stage I am not in a position to give my agreement to extend the political rights (right to vote) of immigrants since the situation in our various Member States is not comparable. With regard to education and professional training I support Mrs Gaiotti's amendment.

**Mr Kyrkos (COM), in writing. — (GR)** We shall vote in favour of our colleague Mrs Nielsen's excellent report, because this is the first time that Parliament has spoken so truthfully about the problems of immigrants working in the countries that receive them.

Cut off from their own country, without the possibility of returning to and being reintegrated into the social area from which they come, the first citizens of Europe, as immigrants should be considered, end up on the fringe of the political, economic and social life of the countries in which they live. And this, because the governments of the host Member States refuse even today to recognize that they have inalienable rights that would enable them to integrate fully into the area they live in. On the contrary, they are used even today as a labour pool, and are employed only when needed and left unemployed when there is a crisis like the present one.

We are voting in favour of Mrs Nielsen's report to encourage a major initiative by the European Parliament aiming to put an end to racial discrimination, to rejection, to the restriction and suppression of the rights of immigrant workers. To open the way so that in the near future we may vote for and propose a charter of rights for immigrant workers in the national parliaments as well, to proclaim that within the Community anyone who contributes to progress by means of work is an equal member of society, regardless of his or her colour or country of origin.

**VAN MINNEN REPORT (Doc. 11-909/83 'Reduction of working time'):  
ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was

— FOR Amendments Nos 6, 7 and 9 ;

— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 5, 8, 11 to 15, 17 to 28.

*Explanations of vote*

**Mr Fich (S).** — *(DA)* I wish to state that the Danish Social Democrats can no longer support Mr Van Minnen's report after what has happened during the vote here. This should not be taken to mean that we are opposed to the Commission's proposal for a reduction of working time. We fully support the Commission's proposal, but Mr Van Minnen's report is not in line with that proposal and we cannot, therefore, support it.

**Mrs Dury (S).** — *(FR)* I know I shall be very unpopular but I wanted to make my statement orally now.

I wish to say that the reduction of working time is one of the keys to a genuine policy for combating the crisis and particularly unemployment, and that we have underlined sufficiently the importance of such a policy at Community level.

Nonetheless, although I believe that we must promote this policy at European level and that we must define a political framework for it, it seems to me that the way in which it is to be applied where conditions of work — increased productivity or reduction in salary — should be fixed by collective negotiation between both sides of industry. I believe that we are too ready to assume that reduction in working time automatically and inevitably implies a reduction in salary.

I should like to make a second comment concerning women. Currently, many women are strongly attracted by part-time work. However, we are all aware of the snags encountered by those who opt for this solution. That is why I believe that the reduction in working time for everyone is a basic question. To those gentlemen whom this concerns let me say: work sharing is as necessary for women as for men and, I believe, gentlemen, it provides you with an opportunity of extending your field of activity.

**Mr Vernimmen (S).** — *(NL)* I shall vote for, but only for tactical reasons. This report does not correspond to any of the aspirations of the major tendencies within the trade union movement, but I appreciate that there was a need for some kind of text prior to Athens. However, this text is confused and obscure, and I do not think that this is at all the right way to exert pressure on the Council.

**Mr Moreland (ED).** — I shall be voting against this report and I shall be voting against it because it is unutterable rubbish! The only thing to be said for it is that it is less unutterable rubbish than the original Commission proposal.

If we want to increase employment in the Community we have to do it by improving working methods, yes. But, to assume that by reducing the working week we shall, as the Commission proposal suggests, have more capital equipment put in more employment is, I suggest, nonsense. You will not find that in any sensible economic textbook being read at any sensible university in the Community.

This report is nonsense. The Commission proposal is nonsense. I would suggest to the Commission that when it was optimistic that it might get through the Council it was talking nonsense. I can tell the Commission that if my Minister dares to vote for this, he will get a few harsh words from me!

*(Laughter)*

And I would suggest that a number of my colleagues, who are members of my national Parliament, will certainly ensure that my national Parliament does not let him do so. It is rubbish, unutterable rubbish! It is typical of the sort of rubbish that we get on part-time employment, temporary work and so on, which does not actually increase employment in the Community. That is what I am interested in. Those are the proposals I want to see and not this paper rubbish!

**Mr Nikolaou (S).** — *(DE)* I simply wish to say that I also shall be voting against it although my reasons are the opposite of those put forward by my colleague, Mr Moreland.

**Mr Beazley (ED).** — I would not have wished to take up the time of the House with a spoken explanation of vote unless I thought it was totally necessary. The reason why I am doing this is that, frankly, I think the proposal is impractical and I think the report is equally impractical. I am not speaking from the point of view of universities and academics, but from the point of view of people who have stood on factory floors and been responsible for costs. The reason why I make this point is that the three conditions which the Commission's proposal makes are like the Holy Trinity, but I am afraid in these particular cases the chance of achieving them are nil because they are mutually exclusive.

In this House I pointed out two years ago, when we were talking about work sharing and other similar matters, that in a time of recession you cannot do what you can do in a time of growth. I would rest my case on the actual performance of one major Member State which was trying to follow ideas of this sort. In fact, the President of that State — and I think it was with the *douaniers* — had to point out that if they wanted to share out work and have more people, the pay would have to be the same and be shared. It was for that reason that I presume Mr Patterson tabled his amendment, which our Socialist colleagues, possibly even from France, rejected despite their experience.

*(Protests)*

The only way, in fact, of employing more people and keeping down costs

*(Continued interruptions)*

is by an injection of capital, and you will not ...

**President.** — Your speaking time is over, Mr Beazley.

**Mr Patterson (ED).** — It should be quite clear by now that my group is going to vote against the Van Minnen report. I said last night that a kind of economic death wish had seized the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment in putting forward this report, and we had hoped in my group that sufficient of our amendments would be passed to reintroduce some sanity. Unfortunately, not enough of those amendments have been passed for my group to vote in favour. Our only consolation is that Commissioner Richard yesterday made it very clear that he also considered much of the Van Minnen report to be rubbish — he was not going to produce a directive and he certainly had regard to unit costs.

Let me say what the area of disagreement is between my group and what appears to be the majority. First, we are in favour of the reorganization of working time where this will produce a more flexible labour market. We are entirely in favour of the better use of part-time work ; but what we consider to be economic madness is paying everybody the same amount of money for doing less work. I ask those Socialist gentlemen over there who are so vociferous, do you want more unemployment or less unemployment in Europe ? If you want less unemployment, then you will avoid at all costs putting up the prices of European goods in world markets. That is the prescription for doubling and tripling unemployment.

*(Mixed reactions)*

Now, you may win a vote here today, but your supporters in the trade unions will know very well where their jobs come from. In the long run, it is the vote of my group ...

*(Continued interruptions from the left)*

... which has regard to the competitiveness of European industry which will be seen to be in the real interests of the working people of Europe.

*(Applause from the right)*

**Mr Bonde, Mr Bøgh, Mrs Hammerich and Mr Skovmand (CDI), in writing.** — *(DA)* Although we also are aware of the connection between the problem of employment and working time and although we appreciate the work which the rapporteur has put into the report, we shall vote against the motion for a resolution. We wish to stress the Danish tradition whereby questions concerning working time are settled by agreement. We wish to take a stand against all attempts to abolish free negotiation in the Member States. We wish to stress in particular that this area falls outside the competence of the EEC.

**Mr Estgen (PPE), in writing. — (FR)** Although the Van Minnen report contains some interesting ideas, I cannot vote for it.

Although it is evident that, to be effective, a reduction in working time must be regulated at Community level, I cannot entirely accept all of the rapporteur's conclusions.

I cannot see how, in the current economic situation, a reduction in working time can be compatible with the maintenance of purchasing power, increased competitiveness on the part of our undertakings and a healthy investment policy. Anyone who thinks otherwise is clearly an incorrigible Utopian.

The problem of creating jobs is far too complex to be solved by what is in fact a simplistic resolution. Of course, in a period of sharp and chronic unemployment we must consider redistributing and reorganizing work, but we must show more imagination and greater flexibility than do our Socialist colleagues.

I am in favour of flexible working hours and retirement. In the long run work sharing is impossible without sharing income.

That is why — against the advice of my political group — I shall abstain in the vote.

**Mr Kyrkos (COM), in writing. — (GR)** The subject of reducing working time touches upon fundamental and deep problems that will bring about important changes and a positive review of the organization of labour, with social consequences to the benefit of working people. For this reason, the movement towards attaining the goal of reducing working time should not be isolated and limited only to the national level, but will have to be adopted on a Community scale by working out a common policy for employment.

I note that the Commission does not entirely share this view, judging by the draft it has submitted. Unfortunately the Commission believes that exhortations to the Member States will on their own be sufficient to bring progress in this direction, and is playing deaf to the appeal for the preparation of a broad Community programme in 'coordinated form' that will ensure a substantial reduction in working time, and for financial support for such a programme. Wishful thinking about the Community's intervention and financial support for these programmes is all very well, but unfortunately no such thing will take place unless there is an increase in own resources.

We shall vote in favour of Mr Van Minnen's proposals, and we find the report both important and useful. However, we would like to point out the following: A reduction in working time should not lead to a corresponding reduction in the purchasing power of the wage-earner, nor imply an intensification of the work itself, in either case with the worker again as the victim. It should not incur social burdens, for example in the sector of social welfare, pensions, etc. It should be accompanied by measures for increasing productivity, so that new jobs will be created, and above all the leisure time gained should be made socially worthwhile, in other words by the preparation of educational programmes so as to give the people of Europe, particularly at the lower income levels, the opportunity to improve their spiritual plane.

**Mrs Nielsen (L), in writing. — (DA)** In my speech yesterday on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group I stated that we were against the Van Minnen report. It is full of discrepancies and unrealistic arguments which have nothing to do with the society in which we live.

Moreover, we should respect the fact that there are countries, like Denmark, where labour questions are a matter for the labour market partners. I shall therefore definitely not vote in favour of the Van Minnen report which calls for a directive on working time arrangements in the Member States.

**PAPAEFSTRATIOU REPORT (Doc. 1-986/83 'European social fund'):  
ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was

- FOR AMENDMENTS Nos 1 (first and second parts) and 3 ;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 (third part) and 2.

\* \* \*

**SQUARCIALUPI REPORT (Doc. 1-992/83 'Air pollution') : ADOPTED**

\* \* \*

**MARKOPOULOS REPORT (Doc. 1-976/83 'Technology') : ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was

- FOR Amendments Nos 1, 5 to 8, 10, 12 and 13 ;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos 3, 4, 9 and 11.

\* \* \*

**BADUEL GLORIOSO REPORT (Doc. 1-978/83 'EEC-Cyprus') : ADOPTED**

Mr Rieger, deputizing for the rapporteur, was

- FOR Amendment No 1.

*Explanation of vote*

**Mr Papantoniou (S), in writing.** — (GR) I would like to give a personal explanation of vote, as Vice-Chairman of Parliament's representative body for relations with the Republic of Cyprus.

I shall vote in favour of the Glorioso report, despite the fact that paragraph 2, which refers to the need for the entire population of the island to benefit from the Association Agreement, has been overtaken by the facts. Indeed, unless Mr Denktash rescinds his unlawful and unconstitutional declaration of independence, the Turkish Cypriot population will forego the economic advantages that it presently enjoys from the Community. Specifically, there will be no more preferential trade facilities for Turkish Cypriot products, and loans and grants made to Turkish Cypriots within the framework of the Community's financing protocol for the Republic of Cyprus will be suspended.

Mr President, it is useful to bear in mind these economic consequences should Mr Denktash fail to rescind his arbitrary action, when we vote on the Glorioso report.

\* \* \*

**HUTTON REPORT (Doc. 1-916/83 'ERDF') : ADOPTED**

\* \* \*

**B. FUCHS REPORT (Doc. 1-1007/83 'Tariff preferences') : ADOPTED**

*Explanation of vote*

**Mr G. Fuchs (S), rapporteur, in writing.** — (FR) A debate on the system of generalized preferences is not exactly the kind of debate that will draw the crowds, so boring and technical does it sound. Nevertheless, the subject is one of the most political subjects one could have and it is at the very heart of the North-South dialogue.



In short, the SGP represents a reduction or abolition of customs duties, subject to certain quantitative limits, in favour of the countries of the Third World. The principle of the SGP, which was accepted at the Second Unctad Conference in 1968 and put into force by the European Community from 1971 onwards, is always represented to the outside world as 'a generous offer'. I should like to begin today by making some comments on this particular expression.

First of all, for the moment it is indeed an offer, that is to say, a unilateral and non-negotiable gesture, and this very fact alone gives the SGP an undeniable political value. Is this offer then a generous one? At the level of principle, it certainly is, since its asymmetrical nature, which does not require that it be reciprocated, distinguishes it from the liberal philosophy which enables the stronger to crush the weaker. In this sense the SGP is without a doubt a theoretically extremely attractive element of development aid. But what is the practical effect of this instrument and what genuine benefit can the developing countries derive from its implementation?

Even today, after more than 10 years of the SGP, I regret that I am unable to give an answer to this question, because, under a barely credible financial pretext, the study that our Parliament has been calling for for a long time now has not yet been carried out.

To get down to brass tacks then, on which concrete amendments on the part of the Commission are we being called upon today to give our opinion in regard to the SGP for 1984? The main item in the industrial sphere is a slight reduction in the number of sensitive products. In the special area of textiles, which is covered by the multifibre arrangement, there is a modulated updating of the bases of reference used to calculate the quotas of the exporting countries, while in the agricultural area there is the effort to equate the rights of the less-developed countries to those of the ACP countries.

Furthermore, the Commission puts forward the important proposal that there should be a progressive implementation of a system of allocating quotas for the imports of sensitive products amongst the Member States, which would, on the one hand, enable these quotas to be availed of more effectively by the developing countries and, on the other hand, would end the absurd situation where certain Member States retain customs duties and others do not.

Finally, the last proposal that should be noted is that envisaging the prospect of relaxing the rules of origin currently in force in favour, on the one hand, of the less-developed countries and, on the other, of regional groupings.

Taking the Commission proposals for 1984 as a whole, your rapporteur can therefore give a favourable opinion. For the future, however, I should like to make two comments by way of conclusion.

Firstly, it is imperative that a certain number of basic surveys and assessments be undertaken. I have already mentioned in this connection the importance of assessing the benefits of the SGP for the developing countries. Equally important would be studies of the consequences of the SGP for industry and employment in the European Community and of the effect on our ACP partners of the way in which the SGP whittles away their relative advantage over the other developing countries *vis-à-vis* ourselves. Without such surveys and assessments, any future offers made by our Community will either be simply leaps into the unknown or will more probably — and this would be utterly deplorable — only result in a standstill.

Secondly, it is essential that greater efforts be made to bring about a balanced industrial development in the developing countries — certainly as far as sensitive products are concerned — so that both we and they can better cope with the kind of new investments that might easily give rise to the kind of uncontrolled competition that would be fatal for all concerned. Obviously, this will call for the establishment of mechanisms for exchanges of information, which will in turn mean that we have to pass from the present Community monologue to a real dialogue. However, would we not all agree that this is only in line with the spirit of the new North-South cooperation towards which the European Community intends to bend all its efforts?

I see the present system of generalized preferences as the first stage in a real industrial cooperation between North and South, a cooperation between States but brought about with the participation of all the social partners. This is the vision, futuristic perhaps but, to my eyes, indispensable, that I have in my mind in presenting this report.

**Mr Vankerkhoven (PPE), in writing.** — (FR) The Group of the European People's Party will vote for the adoption of the proposals relating to the system of generalized preferences.

It is in complete agreement with Mr Fuchs' suggestions, as set out in the motion for a resolution adopted by the Committee on Development and Cooperation, taking account also of the opinions of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on External Economic Relations.

The reason for the system of generalized preferences lies in a determination to bring greater coherence to the development policies of the Member States. This demands at one and the same time that we actively promote the interests of the developing countries, particularly the least advanced amongst them, and also protect the legitimate interests of Community producers. It also calls for harmonization between the Community's development policy and its trade policy in all those sectors of activity that come within the ambit of the SGP.

We feel that the Commission's proposals add up to a degree of progress in working out the rules that can help to bring about the development of the less-advanced countries. In this connection we support the Commission's decision to submit once again its proposals of last year aimed at according to certain agricultural exports of the less advanced countries the same treatment given to ACP exports. We also approve the principle of differentiation between the beneficiaries of the system, which is justified by the two-fold concern to give the poorest countries the greatest advantages and to protect Community industry from an excessive influx of sensitive products from the more competitive countries. We also are convinced that it would be a very good thing if the more competitive of the developing countries were, in their turn, to grant preferences to the less competitive countries. If this policy were carried out, it would make our own system a little less 'autonomous'. We are also fully behind the motion for a resolution when, speaking of sensitive products, it calls for exchanges of information enabling the parties concerned to see more clearly in advance the competition that can arise from the industrialization of the developing countries.

I would conclude by stressing the need, frequently pointed out in the past, for prompt and careful studies to be carried out on the economic consequences of the SGP, as well as its effects on the beneficiary countries, on ACP exports and on industry and employment in the Community.

**Mr C. Jackson (ED), in writing.** — In view of the shortage of time the President has given me permission to make my rapporteur's statement as an explanation of vote.

The programme of financial and technical aid for non-associated countries is the major assistance from the European Community, apart from food aid, for the people in developing countries outside the Lomé Convention. The non-Lomé countries include Asia and Latin America with a population of over 3 000 million, 90% of the total Third World population, including the bulk of the world's poorest people.

Not surprisingly, the European Parliament has over the years placed considerable emphasis on increasing this programme of aid and has, indeed, increased it subsequently. Regarding the report, I wish to make five main points.

First, concerning the Council of Ministers. The committee unanimously condemns the way in which the Council of Ministers made severe cuts in the draft budget for this programme and we urge them to support the amendment adopted by Parliament at the budget first reading. We also condemn the repetition of the decision procedure insisted on by the Council through which a Council committee is empowered to give case by case

approval of projects. This is to the detriment of the powers of Commission and Parliament and causes delay.

Second, some request to the Commission concerning the implementation of the 1984 programme, especially insofar as training is concerned. The lack of skilled resources in developing countries is a major blockage to development and we ask that in 1984 a significant proportion of funds within each project should be set aside to provide assisted training for nationals of the country concerned. In addition we should give priority not to *ad hoc* projects but to projects forming part of wider programmes. I want to emphasize that training has particular merit, not only in being of great importance to the developing countries themselves, but also in being a very effective signal of Community presence and interest.

Our resources from this programme are small in relation to need but training is a sensible aspect on which we can concentrate to ensure our efforts have real effect. A similar request is that we should give more technical assistance for the preparation and implementation of projects, especially food strategies. We have previously emphasized the necessity of giving administrative help to countries where the administrative structure is weak.

Third, matters relating to the effectiveness of the programme. The Committee severely criticized the rate of utilization of funds in past programmes. I know the Commission says that some projects have to be spread over several years, but by the end of 1982 out of a total of 636 million ECU committed in all the programmes from 1976 on, only 230 million ECU had been disbursed. In other words, only 37% of all funds committed since 1976 have been spent. Of the 1976 programme itself, for example, 25% of the funds still remain to be paid out. In the case of 1977 45%. This is a disgrace. We want to help weak administration and developing countries but it seems the Commission also needs to help weak administration in its own building.

I am not criticizing individuals here but there is an urgent need for more staff in DG VIII to deal with this programme and we demand that the Commission takes decisive measures to improve the rate of disbursements. I have proposed that the Development Committee returns to this matter in the near future as it is apparent that the value of this programme is dramatically diminished by the slow utilization of funds. In addition we believe that we require more Commission development officers in the non-associated countries and that we should increase the number of framework agreements.

We understand that there has been little, if any, ex-post assessment by the Commission of projects carried out hitherto. How can we be sure our aid is effective if we do not assess it? How can we learn from our mistakes if we do not discover them? When is the Commission going to start a full programme of ex-post assessment?

Fourth, we denounce the Commission's use of this programme to compensate South-East Asia for the Community's action on its imports of manioc. We had asked for a special fund to be used for this. The current action takes away funds that could be used for the poorest countries.

This leads to my final point. Parliament has always emphasized our intention to help the poorest countries in the world. Most of the poorest people are to be found in Asia and we have called on the Commission to develop existing or new mechanisms for aid for which only the poorest countries would be eligible whether they are in the ACP or in Asia. What action is the Commission proposing to take on this request?

Mr President, with these comments and reservations, we have asked the House to approve the guidelines for the 1984 programme of aid to non-associated developing countries.

**Mr Vankerkhoven (PPE), in writing. — (FR)** Just a few brief remarks to confirm my group's agreement with the main lines of the resolution proposed to us.

We should like to support most especially the paragraph stressing the need to direct our efforts towards the least favoured countries, regions and sections of population.

Like the rapporteur, we regret the position adopted by the Council, at first reading, on the financial envelope for 1984. We appeal to the Council to reconsider its position on this point.

We should also like to underline three points which the rapporteur has himself covered.

Implementation of the programmes raises a number of problems, the result being an unsatisfactory rate of payment. If the Commission wishes to maintain the annual rate of appropriations, it must identify and explain the causes of these delays.

We share too the interest taken by the rapporteur in the problems of training. We are particularly alive to this question since the bulk of development programmes, particularly in the least-advanced countries or regions, are handicapped by a lack of partners on the ground. This makes it difficult not only to follow projects in progress, but even to identify what projects should be started in the first place. This being so, should not the Community give more support to those organizations which are concerned with the training of administrative staff for the developing countries such as, for example, the international union of local authorities?

Finally, we ought to attach great importance to rigorous evaluation, without which we are liable to be misled by pre-conceived ideas, unaware of their impact on the real world.

It is now time to take action on the report drawn up on this subject by my late predecessor, Mr Victor Michel.

In conclusion, we support the motion for a resolution and ask Parliament to adopt it.

\* \* \*

**RABBETHGE REPORT (Doc. 1-1006/83 'Scientific research'):**  
Referred back to Committee

**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 PUBLUF - Lu 1322  
CCP 19190-81  
CC bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/300

---

**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 8595

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**

---

**FOMA**

5, avenue de Longemalle  
Case postale 367  
CH 1020 Renens - Lausanne  
Tél. (021) 35 13 61  
Télex 25416

Sous-dépôt:

**Librairie Payot**

6, rue Grenus  
1211 Genève  
Tél. 31 89 50  
CCP 12-236

---

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

---

**European Community Information  
Service**

2100 M Street, NW  
Suite 707  
Washington, DC 20037  
Tel. (202) 862 9500

---

**CANADA**

---

**Renouf Publishing Co., Ltd**

2182 St Catherine Street West  
Montreal  
Quebec H3H 1M7  
Tel. (514) 937 3519

---

**JAPAN**

---

**Kinokuniya Company Ltd**

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome  
Shinjuku-ku  
Tokyo 160-91  
Tel. (03) 354 0131

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprise:

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

---

**Sales**

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg:

Annual subscription 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-83-011-EN-C