

Annex

# Official Journal of the European Communities

No 1-310

English edition

## Debates of the European Parliament

---

1983-84 Session

Report of Proceedings  
from 12 March 1984

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

<b>Sitting of Monday, 12 March 1984</b> . . . . .	<b>1</b>
Resumption of the session, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 1 — Employment, transport, energy, p. 5 — Transport (Council statement), p. 10 — Transport, p. 13 — Road safety, p. 19 — Closure of the session, p. 23 — Annex, p. 24.	

#### 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.

*Resolution adopted at sitting of 12 March 1984 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 104, 16. 4. 1984.*

## SITTING OF MONDAY, 12 MARCH 1984

### Contents

1. Resumption of the session . . . . .	1	<i>Mr Klinkenborg; Mr Gabert; Mr Turner; Mr Baudis; Mr Carossino; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Scamaroni; Mr Moreland; Mrs Ewing; Mr Contogeorgis (Commission)</i>	13
2. Agenda <i>Lord Bethell; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Bange- mann; Mr Siegler Schmidt; Mr Schwencke; Mr von der Vring; Mr Curry; Mr Siegler- schmidt; Sir Fred Warner; Mr Turner; Mr Johnson; Mr J. Moreau; Mr Rogalla; Mr Prag; Mr Van Minnen . . . . .</i>	1		
3. Employment, transport, energy — Report (Doc. 1-1476/83) by Mrs Scrivener <i>Mrs Scrivener; Mr Arndt; Mr Langes; Lord Douro; Mr Baillot; Mr Rossi; Mr Lalor; Mr Alavanos; Mr Contogeorgis (Commis- sion); Mrs Scrivener; Mr Contogeorgis; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Seal . . . . .</i>	5	6. Road safety — Report (Doc. 1-1355/83) by <i>Mr Baudis</i>	15
4. Transport (Statement by the Council) <i>Mr Fiterman (Council); Mr Seefeld . . . . .</i>	10	7. Closure of the session . . . . .	23
5. Transport — Report (Doc. 1-1347/83) by Mr <i>Klinkenborg</i>		<i>Annex</i>	
		<i>Mr de la Malène; Mrs Ewing; Mr Balfour; Mr Pranchère; Lord Douro; Mrs Ewing; Mr De Pasquale; Mr Enright; Mr Moorhouse; Mr Antoniozzi; Mr Prout; Mr Romualdi . . .</i>	24

### 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 17 February 1984.<sup>1</sup>

#### 2. Agenda

**President.** — At its meeting of 15 February 1984 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed.

<sup>1</sup> Approval of Minutes — Membership of Committees — Petitions — Referral to committee — Documents received: See Minutes.

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

*Monday:*

— Mrs Scrivener's report on three regulations on specific measures in various sectors. The debate on the report will be followed by a vote;

— statement by the President-in-Office of the Council of Transport Ministers in conjunction with the Klinkenborg report on transport infrastructures — followed by a vote;

— report by Mr Baudis on road safety, followed by the vote;

— continuation of the vote on the motion for a resolution contained in the Ligios report on the tax on wine, concerning which I have received a request

**President**

from the Liberal and Democratic Group for the establishment of a quorum, but we shall deal with this when we come to that item;

- report by Mr Price on the amendments to Parliament's Rules of Procedure — the vote will be taken on Thursday;
- then if possible, the report by Lord Bethell on the destabilizing activities of Eastern countries' secret services. The vote on this report will be taken on Tuesday evening.

If it is not possible to complete this agenda today the remaining items will be held over until the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

**Lord Bethell (ED).** — Mr President, can you be any more precise about whether my report will be taken today or not?

**President.** — Lord Bethell, I would love to be able to tell you, but your report is at the end of the agenda and I do not know how much time will be taken up by the statement on transport policy by the President-in-Office of the Council. There are a number of uncertain factors. Your report is at the end of today's agenda, but you can be sure that if we run out of time your report will be on the agenda first thing tomorrow morning.

*Tuesday:*

- the report by Mr Luster on freedom of education in the European Community has, on a proposal from the chairmen of the political groups, been included as a separate debate after the reports by Mrs Péry and Mr Schwencke on higher education, Items Nos 4 and 5 on the draft agenda.

**Mr Chambeiron (COM).** — (FR) I am surprised by this proposed amendment to the agenda for this session and the request for inclusion of the report which Mr Luster calls 'Freedom of education ...'.

**President.** — No, you have misunderstood what I said. It will not be included with the other reports. There will be a separate debate.

**Mr Chambeiron (COM).** — (FR) Nevertheless, it has been included in the agenda, I think.

Besides, I cannot really see the connection because, if I understood correctly, you have just said that it is a separate debate, but the fact that this report appears immediately after those of our colleagues Mrs Péry and Mr Schwencke clearly indicates that there is meant to be a parallel. For myself I cannot see the link between these two documents. I am so surprised by this proposal, Mr President, that I should like to remind you that for some months now we have been strongly urged, particularly in committee, to give preference to reports on opinions and consultations with the Council over those based on motions for resolu-

tions. Mr Luster's report is without any doubt based on various motions for resolutions. And even a very rapid reading of the report shows how much difficulty the rapporteur had — and he did not succeed — in finding a legal basis to justify the Community nature of his approach.

I think that we have here a political or even electoral manoeuvre, and I find it very regrettable. There can be no doubt that it is trying to lend weight to certain forces in France which are trying to go against the policy of the French Government. I say it is regrettable because I do not think that Parliament will increase its standing by discussing a report which the majority of our colleagues did not even know existed until today: it is a very weighty report and I think that in view of the importance of the matter it would be desirable for our colleagues to have some time to consider it.

For the information of the Assembly I should like to add, Mr President, that the French Government has opened a dialogue with representatives of private education in France and I think that this dialogue can be brought to a successful conclusion.

In view of the difficult nature of the problem I ask the Assembly not to agree to inclusion of this report in the agenda and to wait for things to quieten a little.

**Mr Bangemann (L).** — (DE) Mr President, I think we should try to conclude our proceedings by the time of the elections, and in fact as early as possible before that date, so that we can discuss these questions at our ease. There is no doubt — and I am sure Mr Chambeiron overlooked this fact — that a real connection exists between these two reports and the Luster report, which incidentally has been ready in the Legal Affairs Committee for months, as Mr Chambeiron is surely aware.

The subject-matter is the same. The debate on these reports will no doubt be different. While the first two reports are more likely to give rise to a fairly peaceful debate, the debate on the Luster report will no doubt be somewhat more lively. But I do not think that Mr Chambeiron's views will be different from those of my group. If I have rightly understood the statements he and other colleagues from the Communists and Allies Group have made, they fight harder than anyone for the freedom of the individual. From all I have heard, the Communist Group stands up for freedom in all areas and is not to be outdone by anyone in that respect. So I wonder why it does not — though I am sure it will — call for the freedom of education too.

I cannot imagine a Communist being against free schools. I do not think anyone here could imagine that. So we will have a very comfortable and friendly debate on the freedom of the individual in education too. That will do credit to this Parliament, and I am

**Bangemann**

quite sure that Mr Chambeiron will make a most productive contribution to the debate. That is why I think we should put this report on the agenda.

**Mr Sieglerschmidt (S).** — (DE) Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group, I too had intended to move that this report be taken off the agenda, but that has already been done. So I now move that you hold a separate vote on it, on whatever day the debate is held; for if a report of such fundamental importance is put on the agenda out of the blue like that — and I hope Parliament does not do so for we can always vote on it during the next part-session — we should at least have an opportunity to discuss it properly first in the groups and to table amendments.

**Mr Schwencke (S).** — (DE) Mr President, the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport requested almost unanimously that Mr Luster's report is not debated jointly with the Péry and Schwencke reports.

**President.** — Mr Schwencke, that was not proposed either. We are only voting on whether to place the Luster report on Tuesday's agenda, as proposed by the Bureau.

*(Parliament adopted the proposal to place the report on the agenda)*

**Mr von der Vring (S).** — (DE) Mr President, you have overlooked the fact that Mr Sieglerschmidt also tabled a motion for a resolution. We have just voted to include this report in the agenda. But Mr Sieglerschmidt asked that this should be done not on Tuesday but at a later date, for you still have to fix the deadline for tabling amendments, and surely that cannot be this evening!

**President.** — Mr von der Vring, the Bureau, or rather the group chairmen, proposed that the Luster report be entered as a separate item on the agenda. That is all we have just voted on.

*Wednesday:*

I propose that Mr Battersby's report on the discharge for olive oil be included in the joint debate on agricultural matters after the Vitale report on olive oil.

**Mr Curry (ED), Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.** — Mr President, I wish to address myself to the whole series of agricultural debates. As you will be aware, the Committee on Agriculture of this Parliament has worked overtime to bring a very large number of reports to this Parliament so that we can decide our opinions before the summit meeting scheduled for the coming weekend. We have discussed these matters on the basis of Commission proposals, as is our constitutional function, but it now appears that there is the chance of a very significant change in

those proposals. The news coming out of the last few days' meetings is that as far as the monetary compensation amounts are concerned, which is really an extremely burning issue, there appears to be emerging some sort of new proposal, and that as far as the price levels are concerned, new proposals also appear to be emerging. It is very important for this House to know, Mr President, whether or not the proposals we shall be discussing are actually to remain the proposals of the Commission or whether, shortly after delivering our opinion, we shall prove to have been whistling in the wind because the entire nature of the proposals has changed. So may I express the hope that a Member of the Commission — either the President of the Commission or the responsible Commissioner — will, before we begin our debate, inform us as to the status both of the Commission's original proposals and of what appears to be an emerging presidential compromise, so that when we take up an enormous amount of the time of this House on agriculture, we do so usefully and not simply as an exercise in rhetoric.

**President.** — Mr Curry, I think your question is an extremely fair one. I have to inform you that the President of the Commission intends to make a statement concerning document COM(83) 500, to put it in these terms, on Wednesday morning, but some people have seen, like you, that there is some shift in the field of discussion, and if there were a Member of the Commission who could furnish a reply straight away, I should welcome an answer to Mr Curry's question.

As that does not appear to be possible, we shall have to wait.

**Mr Sieglerschmidt (S).** — (DE) Mr President, would you please inform us what the deadline is for tabling amendments to the Luster report? Is it 3.30 p.m. or 3.45 p.m.?

**President.** — The deadline for tabling amendments to all the reports on tomorrow's agenda has been fixed at 12 noon tomorrow.

**Sir Fred Warner (ED).** — Mr President, Item 14 on the agenda contains a number of proposals for the disposal of dairy surpluses. I should like to draw your attention to a motion for a resolution on the same subject, Doc. 1367/83. It had been the understanding of the signatories of this resolution that it was postponed from the last part-session to be brought forward in this part-session. I see that it has been crowded out by the press of business to which Mr Curry has just alluded. I think that is rather a pity, and I hope there will be a possibility of bringing it forward again in the life of this Parliament.

**President.** — Sir Fred, may I ask which document you are referring to?

**Sir Fred Warner (ED).** — It is Document 1-1367/83, a motion for a resolution with request for topical and urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 48, on the disposal of dairy surpluses. It was passed over in February, because it was then said that it would be suitable to include it in tomorrow's debate. But it now seems to have been crowded out of tomorrow's debate.

**President.** — It is difficult to convert a report which is still on the Rule 48 list into an item to be dealt with in a normal debate. It should have been transformed into questions to the Commission or Council or amendments, which as far as I know, has not happened. As long as it stands as it stands I cannot include it in this debate.

*(The President read the amendments to Thursday's agenda)*<sup>1</sup>

*Friday:*

— the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) has requested that the Hord report on veterinary products and the Van Aerssen report on the establishment of a Euro-Arab university in Spain, entered as reports without debate, be taken with debate.

Pursuant to Rule 34 (2) of the Rules of Procedure, these reports have been removed from the agenda and referred back to the competent committees for re-examination.

The Liberal and Democratic Group has requested that the Chambeiron report on the Geneva Convention, also down without debate, should be taken with debate. The same procedure applies: referral back to committee.

**Mr Turner (ED).** — Mr President, on behalf of the chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee, may I say that on the Chambeiron report we have already unanimously decided in favour of it, and that there is not the slightest point in sending it back. Therefore I think it is a mere delaying tactic and may I ask to have this matter debated on Friday? As someone has asked for a debate we are perfectly happy to have it debated but not to send it back. There is no point.

**President.** — Mr Turner, Rule 34 clearly states that if a report is put on the agenda without debate and 10 Members or a political group ask for a debate that report is automatically referred back to committee. I must apply that rule.

The Committee on Energy and Research has asked that the rapporteur and the Commission should be permitted to express their views on the amendments tabled to the second Rogalla report on solid fuel, which is Item 18 on Friday's agenda. I think that this comes under Rule 34. The request is receivable since,

as no debate has taken place, it only concerns the amendments.<sup>1</sup>

**Mr Johnson (ED).** — Bearing in mind the ruling you just gave on Mr Rogalla's second report, could we envisage the possibility of the rapporteur and the Commission having a chance to comment on amendments which may have been put down to my report on ivory?

**President.** — Mr Johnson, it is the general rule that, during the vote we give the rapporteur the possibility to react to the proposed amendments. It does not have to be limited to yes or no. The ruling I gave on Mr Rogalla's report will apply.

**Mr Johnson (ED).** — Equally, Mr President, I think it is important, given that this report is addressed to the Commission, that the Commission should have that chance as well.

**President.** — In accordance with our Rules, the Commission is always given the floor whenever it asks to speak.

I received from Mr Moreau, Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, a request for urgent procedure under Rule 57 (1) of the Rules of Procedure for the report on the proposal for a decision on loans under the new Community instrument (NCI III).

Mr Moreau has justified the request for urgent procedure by the fact that conciliation procedure may be opened and that the decision should enter into force in May 1984 at the latest.

Parliament will be consulted on this request at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting and if urgent procedure is adopted the report will be entered on Friday's agenda after the votes, that is to say immediately before the topical and urgent debate.

**Mr J. Moreau (S), Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.** — (FR) Mr President, would it be possible for you to find out from the Commission whether Mr Ortoli will be present during this debate?

Should it not be possible for him to be present I think it would be better to defer the debate to the second March part-session.

**President.** — We shall look into the matter and if it is clear that Mr Ortoli will not be present at the debate you will withdraw the request for urgent procedure.

<sup>1</sup> See Minutes.

<sup>1</sup> Procedure without report and procedure without debate: see Minutes.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) Mr President, before you close this item I would like to make a personal statement on a matter of which I have already informed you in writing. It relates to my participation in Parliament's proceedings and specifically to my participation in a committee meeting on 29 February and 1 March. While travelling from Bochum to Brussels for that meeting, although I showed my passport and made it clear to the Dutch customs authorities why ...

**President.** — Mr Rogalla, I have seen your written statement on the matter. I cannot accept it as a personal statement. Moreover, it is not a point of order. The problem must be dealt with by the responsible bodies.

**Mr Rogalla (S).** — (DE) Mr President, this matter concerns Parliament's proceedings!

**President.** — Mr Rogalla, that is not permissible! otherwise all the other 434 Members would have to have the right to comment on political matters ...

(Cry by Mr Bangemann: 'One less!')

... Of course, all the other 433 Members!

**Mr Prag (ED).** — Mr President, this is entirely non-political, I can assure you. It is a matter which I raise with very great reluctance in plenary session. As you may know, I am with Mr Van Minnen co-chairman of an all-party disablement group in this Parliament. For years now we have met with a degree of obstruction amounting almost to sabotage in attempting to hold meetings, particularly with regard to rooms and partly with regard to interpretation. This time the staff has been helpful with regard to a room and also with regard to interpretation, but now the administration has stopped the distribution of notices for tomorrow's meeting. They say we should put them in the Members' boxes in the IPE. We all know that nobody looks in these boxes and that to put them there will ensure that no one attends the meeting. I waste hours of time trying to arrange these meetings. It literally takes two or three hours every part-session to arrange rooms and interpretation and notices.

**President.** — Mr Prag, I think that too is a problem which can be directly dealt with by the President or the Bureau and we should not spend time in the plenary discussing it. If you have a justified complaint we will look into it and see what can be done in order to meet it.

**Mr Prag (ED).** — There is a meeting tomorrow, Mr President, at 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon in Room 2. There is no way of making any arrangements.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

**President.** — That was propaganda, Mr Prag.

(Loud laughter)

**Mr Van Minnen (S).** — (NL) Mr President, you are slightly mistaken. This is a point of order. Last time, in exactly the same circumstances and following precisely the same obstruction where our pigeon-holes are concerned, you promised, in reply to a question I raised, that there would be an enquiry. I am really very curious to know if you can now inform the House of the finding of your enquiry into this nonsensical measure.

**President.** — I shall inform you of this in writing.

(Parliament adopted the agenda as amended)<sup>1</sup>

### 3. Employment, transport, energy

**President.** — The next item is the supplementary report (Doc. 1-1476/83) by Mrs Scrivener, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on:

the proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-1239/83—COM(83) 696, 697 and 698 final) for:

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

**Mrs Scrivener (L), rapporteur.** — (FR) Mr President, colleagues, this debate today is in fact the continuation of the voting during the February session on the proposals for a regulation concerning the financial offset arrangements granted during the European Council in Stuttgart to the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany for the financial year 1983.

You will recall that the European Parliament decided then to apply the procedure laid down in Rule 36 of the Rules of Procedure and to request the Commission to adopt the amendments voted by Parliament. This decision was inspired by the conviction — acquired in consequence of the difficulties encountered in previous years — that the solution to this problem would be more effective if it were within a Community framework — or least as Community as possible — and if it had the agreement of the three institutions.

<sup>1</sup> Deadline for tabling amendments: See Minutes.

## Scrivener

The representative of the Commission, Mr Giolitti, was able to inform us subsequent to the decision that the Commission could adopt several of Parliament's amendments and in particular those relating to the machinery for advances, the obligation on the Commission to report to Parliament and the Council twice a year, the strengthening of controls on the implementation of these measures and the role of the Consultative Committee. On the other hand the Commission expressed reservations on two of the amendments voted by Parliament, dealing on the one hand with the amount of the Community's share in the finance (Parliament asked for a reduction in the rate from 70 % to 50 % of the annual public expenditure), and on the other with the conditions of eligibility for projects (Parliament asked that general expenditure, and more particularly schemes and projects started after 1 January 1983, should not qualify). In these two amendments Parliament did not intend to nullify the particular nature of these measures for the financial year 1983, but it did want the general rules of Community policy to be applied and Community support to be confined to measures which genuinely implement Community priorities.

Whilst it shared Parliament's objectives the European Commission considered that these amendments could frustrate the implementation of the commitments of the European Council in Stuttgart. In accordance with the provisions of Rule 36 Parliament then decided to postpone the vote on the motion for a resolution and to refer the question back to the Committee on Budgets. The Commission has submitted new proposals to the Committee on Budgets through the vice-chairman Mr Davignon.

The Community contribution would be 60 % of the annual public expenditure. As regard the rules on eligibility, no contribution would be made in respect of projects and measures completed before the entry into force of these regulations.

On the other hand it would be possible to finance identifiable measures taken during a certain period to complete a project or programme which had already been started but was still in progress.

Clearly measures taken on or after 1 January 1983 in application of an earlier programme or project could be financed by the Community as long as they were clearly identifiable, and this seems to me to be entirely reasonable.

The Committee on Budgets has studied these compromise proposals and considered them to be entirely compatible with the objectives pursued by Parliament. It therefore proposes that you continue the voting from the February session in favour of the new proposals from the Commission.

The Commission has undertaken to present formally new proposals for regulations in accordance with the

compromise accepted by the Committee on Budgets. It will then be for the Council to take a decision on these proposals. Parliament would perhaps ask that the conciliation procedure be initiated should the Council intend to depart from the realistic and balanced compromise reached between the Commission and Parliament.

I should like to add, Mr President and colleagues, that I do not really consider it necessary for there to be conciliation on this matter.

That, Mr President, is the outline of the matter on which we shall shortly have to vote.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Arndt (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, this is a subject that should really be discussed at much more length in this House, for it is a classical example of the fact that if Parliament clearly upholds a certain position for a long time, it will be successful in the end and that it is quite possible to reach a fairly wide agreement in this House on the question of the payment of these funds. May I briefly point out again that all this started with the request that the money — and I agree that the United Kingdom pays too much — must be paid back at some stage, simply and unconditionally. Even at that time — and I thank the British Members who pointed it out at the time — it was made clear that this money must be paid to the United Kingdom with a condition attached: it must be used to improve the United Kingdom's social infrastructure. That is what we have achieved with these regulations.

I would also like to emphasize, however, that today's decision by no means signifies that these funds have definitively been released from the budget, for the Committee on Budgets has to take the decision on definitively unfreezing them from Chapter 100, after the Brussels Summit, once it has become clear that a long-term solution is being sought to this question.

Thirdly, I would also say that the Council would be well advised not to let things go as far as a conciliation procedure on this question and really to respect the common position Parliament and the Commission have meanwhile reached. I repeat: the Commission has agreed to adhere to this proposal and not to withdraw it. That means that if the Council does not agree it will have to outvote the Commission unanimously — and I hope that will not prove possible.

So I am assuming that we have taken a decisive step forward on this matter and — seeing that we do not do so very often — I would like to praise the Commission at this point for being so cooperative, because that has enabled us to reach a common position. The Socialist Group will vote in favour.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Langes (PPE).** — *(DE)* Mr President, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party may I



**Langes**

state here that we endorse the Scrivener report. I would like to make it quite clear again — and here I am addressing our colleagues in the Conservative Party in particular — how right we were to refer the whole matter back from the Assembly to the committee, because as a result we have managed to reach a compromise, together with you, which — I am saying this to my esteemed colleague Mr Balfour — also makes it clear that the majority of Members of this Parliament certainly did not intend to rebuff the United Kingdom, but on the contrary wanted to achieve a solution jointly with them which would be tolerable for Europe. We managed to do this because — and here I also thank the Commission and Vice-President Davignon — the Commission was willing to compromise. It surprised us, I admit, but we are always willing to learn, even to learn good things about the Commission.

So may I once more say emphatically to the Commissioners present here: we, the Parliament — and I think all the groups — are assuming that the Commission will adhere to this compromise and will defend it unequivocally before the Council as a compromise between Commission and Parliament. If that is the case then Mr Arndt will be right, we will have taken a major step forward; then we will indeed have achieved something in the field of transport policy which we have not managed to achieve in Europe hitherto. We will have indicated quite plainly that not only have we taken the Council to the European Court of Justice for failure to act but that we are also prepared to use our resources for sensible policy-making.

So we will approve all these proposals before us and hope that we really have made a new start in the field of energy, transport and social policy.

*(Applause)*

**Lord Douro (ED).** — Mr President, I would first of all like to thank the rapporteur, Mrs Scrivener, for her report. It has been a complex, tedious, very detailed matter to deal with and I think she has handled it with great skill.

Mr President, this is a compromise. As Mrs Scrivener has said parts of any compromise are never very desirable to those participating in the compromise. We naturally would have preferred the original Commission proposal of a 70 % Community participation. However, we certainly prefer 60 % to 50 %, which is what the Parliament originally voted for. I would also like to thank Mr Davignon who represented the Commission at the Committee on Budgets meeting at which this compromise was reached and I think his role was extremely constructive. I think we also would have preferred to see Parliament's opinion delivered in February rather than at this session. But nevertheless we are pleased that it has been possible to reach a

compromise. We do not yet know what the reaction of the Council will be. I hope that it will not be necessary to hold the conciliation meeting that is planned for tomorrow afternoon in Brussels. I hope that will be unnecessary because I hope the Council will be prepared to accept this joint Commission/Parliament proposal.

In the meantime, Mr President, we will support the compromise, we will vote in favour of the two compromise amendments, we will vote in favour of Mrs Scrivener's resolution and we very much hope that other groups will do likewise.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Baillet (COM).** — *(FR)* Mr President, we have before us today a report from Mrs Scrivener concerning Britain's contribution. I shall say quite clearly: we refuse to ratify the technique of budgetary regulations and compromises worked out between the Committee on Budgets and the Commission in Brussels.

The only real question which arises in this debate is clear: will the Community finally decide to enforce the principles which it itself adopted, or will it allow the exceptions to become the main rules of the Community? This is the basic question.

To agree once more to pay a refund to Great Britain is to perpetuate the system of the *juste retour* which was instituted in 1980. Hundreds of millions of ECUs are transferred from the Community budget to the British coffers, holding back the work of European construction. Every ECU poured back is a blow against Europe.

Faithful to our undertakings and remembering that from the beginning we were virtually the only ones to oppose the agreement of 30 May 1980, we call for an end to these repayments which are an intolerable attack on the principle of financial solidarity.

Great Britain knew the rules when she entered the Community.

She must respect them. Her attitude of continually calling the Community patrimony in question and her preference for purchases outside the Community, notably in the Commonwealth, are at the bottom of what she calls her 'over-payments' to the Community budget.

We are all the more opposed to these repayments of credits because basically they are used — under cover of Community policy, particularly on energy strategy — to aid British coal, thereby increasing the distortions of competition to the detriment of other countries of the Community.

In the face of Britain's obstinacy only a steadfast spirit will carry the day; to yield to her demands, her blackmail, is to encourage her in her anti-Community approach.

**Baillot**

At a certain moment Parliament was able to show its steadfastness by blocking in reserve the credits proposed by way of financial compensation.

By adopting Mrs Scrivener's report and the Commission's proposals for regulations — even with a compromise — it would be going back on its own commitments. We think that this is unacceptable.

By remaining steadfast, without reversing our decision, we are helping to sort out the budgetary mess which Britain wants to maintain in the Community. By voting against Mrs Scrivener's report the French Communist and Allied Members are aware that they are demonstrating their Community spirit.

**Mr Rossi (L).** — (FR) Mr President, in her report just now Mrs Scrivener pointed out that this was a compromise, a realistic and balanced compromise and that does in fact seem to me to characterize the agreement reached between Parliament and the Commission.

We do not intend to return to our categorical refusal to apply the principle of *juste retour*, but at the same time we agree to provide temporary aid to Member States who are in a difficult situation. Nevertheless, and this is the essential point, this aid must be in the form of Community measures. We have said and we have said again: the real solution lies in developing common policies which will make these specific aids pointless. The two amendments on the Community's financial contribution and on the rules on eligibility which are the essential part of this new compromise seem to us to be in accordance with this objective. In asking for a reduction in the rate of the Community's contribution to the project submitted we quite simply wished to see that the rules in force in other sectors of Community life are applied, as Community funds are supposed to finance genuine projects and programmes. Here too the Assembly wants the machinery to fit into the Community framework. Nevertheless we can also be realistic. Knowing that the Community measures will bring financial compensation for a financial year which is almost over we accept that a Community contribution be made for projects which have already started but we set a limit date, namely 1 January 1983.

I should like to emphasize once again, Mr President — and I shall conclude with this — that the solution adopted is not an ideal one in our eyes. It is a compromise which should win Council backing and so avoid blocking the whole of the current negotiations, which also include the common agricultural policy, own resources, the development of new policies. In conclusion, I wish to point out that Parliament's attitude in this affair is the logical consequence of its action over the years, particularly in the budgetary field. Henceforward this House will be seen as an institution which on the one hand intends to protect

the Community heritage whilst refusing to allow any violation of essential principles, and on the other intends to act to enable construction of Europe to continue.

**Mr Lalor (DEP).** — Mr President, I think that it is rather unfortunate that in our efforts to procure the increased resources which this Community so badly needs at present, we should be asking the Council of Ministers to compromise themselves to the extent called for in the Commission regulations proposed in the three documents under review in the Scrivener report.

Ireland, my country, has a massive rate of unemployment: 216 000 people out of work, which is one in every six of the labour force. This is almost 60 % above the average in the other EEC countries. One in every three in that unemployment queue is aged 25 or under. Because of that deprivation, allegedly special arrangements have been made for us and five other severely depressed areas in the Community in order to give us 55 % grants to relieve our problems and to create much needed employment. We in Ireland are very grateful for this. But how am I going to explain back home the possibility of supporting Commission Document No 696 which proposes grants of 70 % to the United Kingdom where the problem, though bad, is much less severe than in Ireland? How could I support the blind backdating of these grants?

On the other hand, the GNP in West Germany is four times greater than that of Ireland. When we entered the Community in 1973 we were assured that with the aid of the Regional Fund the gap in the standard of living between Ireland and similar peripheral areas and the golden triangle in the centre of Europe would be narrowed. However, 70 % grants are now envisaged and are going to be used, for example, to modernize canals in the Federal Republic and for the general improvement of facilities. Surely this will widen the gap.

Finally, while in Ireland peat production for energy generation is being phased out — allegedly, because it cannot compete economically with oil — the proposal is being made to make available from European funds IRL 330 million, backdated for 12 months, to aid the UK and German coal mining. How does the Commission justify making this type of recommendation? I want to state quite categorically that the EPD Group will vote against the regulations. It is not because we want to vote against the UK. It is not a vote against Mrs Scrivener who did her very best and managed to reinforce the Community aspects of the draft regulations by strengthening the EEC control of the measures by establishing strict conditions for the programmes considered. I agree that a suitable compromise package must be prepared, but in principle we are still opposed to them.

**Mr Alavanos (COM).** — *(GR)* Mr President, differences do of course exist between the institutions of the Community as regards the special measures for West Germany and Britain. Nevertheless, we believe that these differences are secondary and cannot conceal the real truth of the matter, nor should they. The real truth is that substantial changes are being made in the Community budget and that resources are being transferred not to the poor south, as the Greek people were led to believe by their government, but to Great Britain and West Germany, two of the most powerful countries in the Community. It is unacceptable, in our opinion, for the Community to have responded to the Greek Government's pleas for an increase in funding with a 'no' and a referral to the integrated Mediterranean programmes which have more to do with the realms of fantasy than with reality. It is shameful, in our opinion, that the prices for Greek agricultural products should be raised by up to only 3.5% when inflation in Greece is running at around 20%, and yet for the Greek people to be asked to participate, albeit in a small way, in the financing of employment schemes, transport infrastructure projects and energy strategy in of all places Great Britain and West Germany. In our opinion the Greek Government made a great mistake in agreeing to these refunds at the Stuttgart Summit. Nevertheless, there is still time for it to raise its voice against this, and for it to make a genuine stand in defence of the rights of our country and of Greek workers by moving towards withdrawal from the EEC. Those of us in the Communist Party of Greece will be voting against the Scrivener report.

**Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission.** — *(GR)* Mr President, the great importance which the Commission attaches to the Scrivener report is borne out by the fact that its three amended proposals are today up for debate. These proposals show that the Commission has accepted the views of Parliament on definitive points.

Firstly, that the expenditure measures concerned are not obligatory. Secondly, that they are special measures which must, however, be balanced within the context of Community policies and, thirdly, that it is in the best interests of the Community for payments to be allocated only for new or ongoing schemes or projects and not for projects which have already been completed. I would like to add, moreover, that the discussions my colleagues have had with the Committee on Budgets have resulted in a suitable set of conditions being worked out for the provision of financial assistance by the Community, one aspect of which is that the level of Community participation has been reduced to 60% instead of 70% as was originally proposed.

Mr President, I do not want to repeat everything that was said to the plenary sitting in this House in February by my colleague, Mr Giolitti, on the

remaining amendments, but I would like to say something more in connection with the type of committee which is recommended in the proposals for a regulation. In its new amended proposals the Commission has not thought it wise to change the form of the committee as recommended in the three proposals for a regulation. As my colleague, Mr Davignon, told the Committee on Budgets, the proposals are based on the system which was established in the regulation governing the operation of the Regional Fund. Experience shows that this system has worked well up to date.

Nevertheless, Mr President, I would like to assure you that — if in the end Parliament does wish it — the Commission is willing to support the proposed alteration in the form of the committee.

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

Before proceeding to the vote I should point out that, pursuant to Rule 36, this report was referred back to the Committee on Budgets on 13 February last.

At its meeting of 22 February the Committee on Budgets, as the committee responsible, decided to propose to Parliament to retain the proposals for regulations adopted in plenary sitting, supplementing and modifying them by two amendments.

In order to speed up the work of the House, I think the best thing would be to retain what was voted on last month, to which no further amendments have been tabled, and that I should simply put to the vote the two supplementary amendments adopted by the Committee on Budgets and subsequently tabled by it. I would add, moreover, that no amendment other than the two supplementary amendments by the Committee on Budgets has been tabled. There is therefore no reason for going back on the earlier decision.

*(Parliament adopted this proposal)*

*Vote<sup>1</sup>*

*After the vote on the three proposals from the Commission*

**Mrs Scrivener (L), rapporteur.** — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to ask the Commission, which has already partly answered the question I am going to ask, to please confirm, pursuant to Rule 36 (1), that it will accept the amendments which Parliament has voted and that the form in which it will be put forward will be in accordance with the wishes of Parliament.

You have already said this, Commissioner, but I think that the form of procedure must be observed and that is why I ask.

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission.** — (GR) Mr President, as Mrs Scrivener has requested, I can confirm that with the exception of paragraph 1 relating to the committee, and to which I referred earlier, Parliament's amended proposals represent the views of the Commission, that is to say the Commission accepts them. As regards the point relating to the form of the committee, I stated earlier that if Parliament does ultimately want to change this the Commission will go along with Parliament's wish.

**President.** — Is there a problem, Mrs Scrivener?

**Mrs Scrivener (L), rapporteur.** — (FR) No, there is no problem and I thank the Commissioner for his remarks.

#### IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN

##### *Vice-President*

*After the adoption of the motion for a resolution*

*(Several Members indicated to the President that their voting machines were not working)*

**Mr Seal (S).** — Mr President, I think it is not good enough that this equipment is not working in certain areas and I would like you, as President, to ensure that the parts which are malfunctioning are put right as quickly as possible. It is not fair on Members to come and put their card in, only to find that the machine does not work.

**President.** — We shall take care of it.

#### 4. Transport (Statement by the Council)

**President.** — The next item is the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council on transport policy.

**Mr Fiterman, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (FR) Mr President, I should like to thank you for enabling me to address the Assembly under ideal conditions.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I learned that you had placed on your agenda two reports on very important questions in the field of transport I decided to take part in the debates to let you have my views and to inform you of my proposals in my capacity of President-in-Office of the Council of Transport Ministers of the Community.

The attention which you are giving to these transport problems seems to me to indicate a desire to stress their importance in the life of the European Community and of the nations which are part of it.

Recent events and the emotions which they aroused demonstrated, if that was necessary, the important place which transport occupies in both the economic and the daily lives of our peoples.

These events strongly underlined the need to overcome the obstacles to the free movement of goods and persons between our countries.

In the face of these events each of the countries involved had to take the necessary steps very quickly. That was done.

As you know, some measures with immediate effect are already in force. Others which require the introduction of supplementary measures and resources are being worked out.

For example, in France a whole set of measures were adopted and are already being applied, or are on the point of being applied. These concern customs procedures, equipment and procedures for improving traffic flow, traffic control and the establishment on a permanent basis of the freedom to cross frontiers.

A special working group has been set up under the auspices of the Minister for Transport to ensure that these measures are implemented.

You will also be aware of the efforts made by the Italian Government, which made it possible to keep the situation at the frontier normal last week.

I must also tell you that with my colleague, Mr Signorile, it has been decided to set up a Franco-Italian working party to coordinate on a continuing basis economic and technical measures to facilitate traffic flow at the frontiers. The same decision was taken by Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany and Austria.

Thus we acted, I think, promptly, or at least as promptly as possible, and effectively, to resolve the immediate problems. But it is of course important to create lasting conditions under which frontiers can be crossed more easily.

It was in order to discuss these questions that, at the earliest possible moment, as I have already said in reply to the questions which were addressed to me, especially the one from Mr Seefeld, the chairman of your Committee on Transport, I decided to convene an extraordinary meeting of the Council of European Transport Ministers on 22 March.

The agenda for this meeting includes application of the directive adopted on 1 December last on the easing of frontier formalities.

As you know, on 1 March last year as French Minister for Transport I announced France's decision to apply this directive from 1 January 1985, and through the various contacts which I am developing at the moment with all my European colleagues I am trying very hard to be able to announce on 22 March that an identical decision has been taken in all the countries of the Community.

In the Council we shall also be taking up a number of related questions as well as that of the application of the directive. We shall have to take account of the fact that not all these questions will fall within the field of responsibility of the transport ministers.

**Fiterman**

I am convinced that on these questions it must be possible to find more suitable procedures and less archaic solutions than some of those which are in force at the moment.

We have to build a Europe for the twenty-first century, which, of course, calls for an effort of the imagination and a willingness to break new ground. I have a feeling that this is possible if everyone gives of his best.

This is why it seems clear to me that we should not confine ourselves to resolving only the problem of crossing frontiers — even if it is important. Recent events have in fact underlined the need for progress in all areas in order to establish at last a real common transport policy.

Let us be clear on this: this policy remains to be defined. Certainly decisions have been taken, but they lack overall cohesion and without that they cannot be effective.

Let me add that in my view it would be superficial to accuse my predecessors of incompetence. The truth is that there are problems and difficulties linked to the particular nature of transport, the complexity of the sector and the unique character of the structures which exist in each country.

Vague speeches on liberalization, however respectable they may be, solve nothing if we do not attack these fundamental problems and find concrete solutions to them. I am thinking particularly of establishing good infrastructures and spreading the cost fairly, of updating obsolete structures and of balanced control of capacity, of the optimum harmonization of conditions of competition, particularly in the matter of technical measures and technical standards, of the establishment of normal and suitable conditions in the social field and of the activities of undertakings.

Liberalization, which is a goal accepted by everyone and incorporated in the Treaty of Rome, will advance in line with the solution of these problems, because the Europe which we want is not a nebulous free trade area but a genuine human community, a unified market in which everyone will be able to assert his interests, and every one of us here knows that none of our countries can ignore their vital interests or see them threatened.

You know, none of this will be achieved in a day, but I should simply like to say that I am determined to move forward since I am aware that one can always find a way if one goes on and that there is no other way of succeeding.

It was in this spirit that I took up several broad questions, to which the solutions will of course be complex, but which seemed to me to be sufficiently mature to offer some hope of progress and new concrete decisions. I think that these problems have to be taken together if we want to achieve anything. I shall mention them briefly.

The first question is that of infrastructure, for which your Committee on Transport has made interesting proposals and which you are to deal with again. I should like to give you my view in a few words. It seems to me that we must envisage a flexible programme covering a limited number of projects of obvious Community interest and importance. I have in mind, for example, certain major road systems such as that linking Central Europe and the Atlantic. I am also thinking of a proper high-speed rail network, of large-gauge canals crossing watersheds, or fixed trans-maritime links.

You will see that these are long-term projects which involve the interests of several Member States and for which we have to envisage novel methods of financing which could combine budgetary and extra-budgetary finance.

This was the line of thought which I suggested that the Commission follow and let us have proposals. We shall shortly have the opportunity to discuss this.

As regards the second question — that of railway cooperation — my objective is simple: it is a question of introducing quicker and more modern services between our countries and taking some concrete decisions which can be implemented in the coming months. There is no need to launch into complicated debates and pile up resolutions and bulky documents, we simply have to try and make it possible for a traveller who wants to go from The Hague to Hamburg to find the information at the station. What is needed is a European timetable for the main routes; more direct, more fruitful and more efficient cooperation must be established between the networks so that there are concrete achievements, and I think that for that new formulae have to be found and initiatives taken.

It must of course be possible for this collaboration to rely on the development of scientific, technological and industrial cooperation. Any advance in this field is a tangible sign of what can legitimately be undertaken by our countries and represents a step forward for what I might call the living Europe as opposed to Europe on paper.

It was in this spirit too, I think, that this House adopted unanimously on 19 January last a resolution to promote the development and manufacture of the European Airbus A 320. As it happens I have just come from Bonn where, with my German colleagues, it was decided officially this morning to launch this machine which has a great future. This is an important decision, one of those acts which mark a positive advance for Europe and show that it is capable of a constructive response to the great challenges of our time.

*(Applause)*

**Fiterman**

I think that on the matter of cooperation on the subject of railways there are also great advantages in advancing together to improve exchanges, technological progress and industrial development.

The third question in the creation of European transport: road transport, where progress also has to be made. In this field, in addition to what I said at the beginning of these remarks, several old files on which action needs to be taken have been reopened. I am thinking of the one on weights and measures. On this point it seems to me that we should be able to reach a reasonable solution on the basis of the progress already made, in the discussion during 1983, towards greater harmonization, whilst taking into account the realities in certain member countries and the time required for necessary adaptation of industrial infrastructure. I am also thinking of the file on quotas. In this respect it would seem to be justifiable to increase Community quotas. For all that it would be premature to expose our transport systems to the probably unsettling effects of total liberalization. The objective of liberalization — which, I repeat, is an objective which everyone recognizes and which we must endeavour to achieve — could in fact only be achieved by a gradual approach based on procedures acceptable to all.

Finally, I am thinking of Social Regulation No 543. This regulation, to which one can attribute every virtue, is at present suffering from the lack of one essential virtue: that of being applied, because, it seems to me, it is difficult to apply it. The regulation is too rigid and poorly adapted to modern conditions of road transport management. It should therefore be revised. That is why I have asked the Commission to let us have its proposals on the subject as quickly as possible. On this question it also seems to me that we should be moving towards flexibility on certain driving hours and towards setting weekly averages and suitable rest periods.

Parallel to this some limits should be set on working hours for drivers. Taking into account all the operations directly associated with driving, these limits meet the requirements both of road safety and the search for economic efficiency. They are also part of the wish for social progress which must permeate transport policy, like any other. In fact public opinion does not understand why the Council only gives approval to documents of a technical nature and seems to ignore the human and social aspects of problems. The contacts which I have made with both sides of industry confirm me in this analysis.

It is this desire to bring our decisions closer to the everyday concerns of ordinary people that leads me to draw your attention to the final aspect of this file, namely the untiring efforts we must make to improve safety for all road users. I am convinced that the Community can and must make efforts of the various Member States more effective by extending Community action to all the many areas of road safety.

It is in this spirit that I have proposed the drawing up of a suitable document — which would express our desire to build a Europe of road safety — and a systematic inventory of spheres in which cooperation by the Member States is necessary.

In this respect I am very pleased that the report which you are going to debate fits in with these ideas, which I hold dear, and I am convinced that it will contain ideas and proposals which we shall not fail to study and to incorporate in a document which the Council must eventually adopt. I must add on this point that my colleague Mr de Croo, the Belgian Minister for Communications, recently informed me of the initiative taken by the Belgian Government in making 1984 'Road Safety Year' in Belgium. I think that we could at Community level make 1985 'European Road Safety Year'.

Finally, the fourth question: that of air transport. As you know, the Commission only completed its memorandum on the subject a few days ago. It is a complex question which requires careful consideration. We are prepared to discuss it, after, of course, rigorous scrutiny of the proposals which have been formulated.

That, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, is what I wanted to say to you before the meeting of the Council of Ministers on 22 March. As I have already had the opportunity of saying before the Committee on Transport, I am determined to make concrete progress, realistically and pragmatically, in resolving problems. But obviously success presupposes agreement and commitment on the part of everyone.

The inclusion on your agenda of two important questions relating to transport and the debates which follow will, I am convinced, help to increase awareness of the need for concrete action to help bring forward a genuine transport policy.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Seefeld (S), Chairman of the Committee on Transport.** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the President of the Council, on behalf of the Committee on Transport and no doubt also of all the Members of this House, for coming here today.

Mr President of the Council, it is a rare event for Council representatives in the field of transport to come here. I remember seeing Secretaries-of-State and junior ministers among us, but in the relatively brief span of 15 years that I have been in this Parliament, may I say that you are the first Transport Minister to come to this Chamber and make a statement here. We note this with satisfaction. So I thank you quite officially on behalf of this House for giving us this opportunity to speak with you.

*(Applause)*

## Seefeld

The Committee on Transport contacted Mr Fiterman as President of the Council. Mr Fiterman came to the committee in his capacity of President of the Council right at the beginning of 1984, when France took over the presidency of the Council. We held useful talks at that time. We fought hard with each other — as is only right — and renewed our reproaches to the Council and, Mr President of the Council, we listened carefully to your statements of intention, both in the committee and today in Parliament. By and large, we can endorse all the ideas you put to us today. Parliament has been making this same list of demands for the past two decades, and in our view many of them should have been dealt with long since. We are pleased that you are tackling them now.

I am convinced, and my colleagues have gained the same impression, that you want to overcome the stagnation in transport policy. We know you have visited your colleagues. We welcome that. You have tried to tackle a number of questions, and we consider it urgently necessary to overcome the stagnation. That is long overdue. But perhaps it is partly because this House has proceeded against the Council of Transport Ministers for failure to act that we now see so many Council meetings, so many discussions, that the matter is now being discussed seriously. It seems to me that our court action has already had one positive effect: the Ministers have woken up and have obviously realized that we are in earnest. Mr President of the Council, the purpose of initiating proceedings was to make the Ministers of Transport get a move on, and they do seem to want to move on a bit now. For the rest, Mr President of the Council — if you would be so kind as to pay attention — I believe that we should measure the Council by its deeds and not by its declarations. We have seen enough declarations in the past, but no deeds yet.

Seen from this angle, Mr President of the Council, you now have a unique chance to improve the very poor image of the Council of Ministers of Transport. You said today that we need practical decisions. I call on you and your colleagues to take them. To that end, I wish you success on behalf of this House for the Council meeting on 22 March. I wish you success for your presidency. We would be happy to be able to say at the end of your presidency that it was not just an exchange of words but that we also saw deeds.

*(Applause)*

### 5. Transport

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-1347/83) by Mr Klinkenborg, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on transport infrastructure planning in the Community.

**Mr Klinkenborg (S), rapporteur.** — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this report is a logical

follow-up of the activities of the Committee on Transport over a very long period. It is the seventh motion for a resolution by the Committee on Transport on the question of infrastructure. It is interesting to note that the first motion for a resolution on this question dates back to 5 June 1973. The discussions on this question have covered such important questions as pilot programmes for infrastructure, expansion of the traffic infrastructure, the future of the railways, fixed links across the seas, improvement of Alpine crossings, the Channel tunnel and others. The Committee on Transport has been looking at these questions non-stop until the submission of this report today.

This report was drawn up simply in response to a Commission report on the activities of the Committee on Infrastructures. Regrettably, that committee is in no way subject to parliamentary control and the Committee on Transport — like Parliament — has to rely on whatever reports the Commission forwards to Parliament from that committee. Yet the procedures of that committee may be of utmost importance to the future of the European Community in the field of transport infrastructure. The Committee on Transport happens to have a deep distrust of anything it cannot control itself and that is why we are somewhat critical of what the Commission has said about its activities. The Commission has tried to make it clear, through three projects, that it has a systematic cost-benefit analysis at its disposal, whereas in fact it is simply putting the new situation and, in the end, itself, in question again. I shall return to this later.

These three projects are, firstly, the Channel tunnel, secondly, the Alpine tunnel and thirdly the Strait of Messina. If we compare the three cost-benefit analyses with each other, as it is only sensible to do, it becomes clear that they are not comparable because they are all based on different premises. That raises an enormous problem in terms of the allocation of budgetary resources, the problem that in the end we must be able to justify why we do *not* want to support something with European resources, why in our view one or other measure simply does not add a European dimension. Those projects which are supported pose no problem at all, for people do not look a gift horse in the mouth. But anyone on the list whom we refuse will very soon ask us to justify our refusal.

Looking at the two main projects, the link across the Strait of Messina and the Channel tunnel, we can only conclude that the way the Commission has done its sums is incompatible with real policy-making, including Parliament's policy. May I point out that the agricultural structure in Sicily was adjusted at the cost of considerable resources, but that in its cost-benefit analysis of the link across the Strait of Messina the Commission reached the conclusion that this was *not* a project with a European dimension. This does not seem very rational to me, or to the Committee on

**Klinkenberg**

Transport. That is why we propose that all projects submitted to the Commission should be measured not by some arbitrary procedure, but that objective European criteria should be formulated to evaluate cost-benefit analyses.

The Commission accepted this, as I said earlier, by instructing specialists to take account of this European dimension and these European criteria in evaluating the cost-benefit analyses and to set them out in a Commission proposal. That is a laudable step forward, since for the first time we would be able to assess the Strait of Messina project objectively in relation to the Channel tunnel project.

This is a very specific report. It does not so much attempt to suggest new infrastructure measures as to evaluate the old ones accurately. That was the Committee on Transport's approach and the committee adopted the report unanimously.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Gabert (S).** — *(DE)* Mr President, honourable Members, I would like to begin by congratulating Mr Klinkenberg on his excellent report. It is a most important report and must form the basis of our future transport policy, which we were gratified to hear Minister Fiterman discuss today. It must also form the basis of the Commission's activities. Otherwise we will make no progress in this field in future either.

The Socialist Group will endorse Mr Klinkenberg's report unequivocally. This report, some of whose points I would like to comment on, also deals with the important matter of determining the role of and interrelationship between the individual modes of transport within the framework of coordination on a general European scale. It is extremely important to coordinate them at last, since that is the condition for creating a European transport policy, which we still lack. Mr Minister, I repeat that you were most cooperative, as indeed you had to be. During my five years as a Member of this Parliament, your predecessors hardly did anything to further European transport policy.

This report also raises the question of the need to coordinate the infrastructures. It describes the railways as one of the most important modes of transport. The European Parliament pointed that out as early as 9 March 1982, calling for the expansion of the EEC railway network on the basis of the European infrastructure master plan drawn up by the International Union of Railways. The Commission was requested to draw up a route map fixing the priority measures to be taken. That is also an important task for the Commission. All transport planning must take account of the importance to Europe of third countries, of transit countries such as Austria, Switzerland and Yugoslavia. That is particularly necessary in the case of two countries, since the accession of Greece to the European Community.

When it implements the transport policy, to the extent that it exists at this stage, the Commission must at last play a more active part, for that is its function under the Treaty of Rome. I am saying this because I believe the Commission failed to deal adequately with the situation at the Brenner Pass three weeks ago. I still cannot understand how the Commission could tell me, when I telephoned them, that officials would be sent to the Brenner Pass in mid-March to have a look at what was going on. For by then it was all over and, thank God, the Ministers had acted. The Commission could have taken the initiative, i. e. a European transport initiative. But it did not do so. I want to make that quite clear today.

The report rightly calls for new motorway projects to be examined critically, on the basis of specific criteria: the shortage of funds in general, the possible destruction or damage of the countryside, the danger of emissions and pollutants and of the transfer of heavy goods traffic from road to rail or internal waterway, and combined transport. I think these important aspects must be taken into consideration in all future transport policy planning.

The Socialist Group also welcomes the request made in the report, and which Mr Klinkenberg repeated a few moments ago, to formulate common criteria for cost-benefit analysis and for assessing the Community interest of all transport infrastructure measures. The Commission should look at this report very seriously, and so should the Council of Ministers. May I repeat that this report must serve as the foundation for future transport policy planning. To this end the Socialists will endorse it.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Turner (ED).** — Mr President, may I first of all thank the President-in-Office of the Council for coming here and giving such a positive speech. Without prejudice to the European Parliament's action against the Council of Ministers for doing nothing in the Court of Justice, may I say that I hope that what he said means that they are turning over a new leaf. Everything he has said, I must say, is totally different from what we have heard before from other Ministers of Transport, and I hope that he will convince his colleagues.

My group supports the Klinkenberg report entirely. It is absolutely vital that the Community view should be taken into account in all major transport planning. It is right that the Council of Ministers should decide the amount of money that should be spent, in concert of course with the European Parliament, and that they should agree the principles upon which that money should be spent on EEC projects. But it would be quite wrong if the Council got into the habit of selecting year by year different projects from a list given to them by the Parliament or by the Commis-



**Turner**

sion or by anyone else and deciding on this and not on that on purely political and nationalistic grounds. I hope very much that the President-in-Office of the Council will make it clear to his colleagues that their job is not to pick and choose amongst a list of projects what they think they want to carry out but to agree the principles and leave the Commission, with the advice of the European Parliament, to get on with the specific job of choosing specific projects and their priorities. These must be decided on the basis of technical considerations and reasonableness and not on grounds of politics.

Mr President, I agree that the Commission should also coordinate national plans in transport and should do its best to try and persuade the national Ministries of Transport to develop their projects in an EEC manner. But unless we also have a Community infrastructure fund, a multiannual fund, as we have called for time and time again and which is now held up in the Council of Ministers, unless we have that clout, nothing that the Commission says to national governments will ever have much effect and therefore the prime message must be not that we coordinate national plans but that we have a Community programme.

I agree very much with what Mr Seefeld said about the President-in-Office coming here and being so positive. May I end by saying that there is one thing I did not like in what the President-in-Office said. He gave the impression that we must go for only the most major projects one can possibly conceive. He did not quite say that, but that was the impression he gave, as if he were only thinking of tunnels and the Straits of Messina and enormous jobs like that. Of course in the EEC one could count on the fingers of two hands the number of jobs that are as big as that. May I please appeal to him to take into account also the smaller projects where we have bottlenecks of equal importance. It may very well be that a bottleneck is disastrous for EEC traffic, but the job need not be all that big. It may be that the national government in question will not take the necessary steps and therefore the EEC should push and do it itself. If I might just, out of my own experience, give a personal view. The east coast ports in England are not very big, but they are a very serious bottleneck to EEC traffic and they do deserve EEC support.

**Mr Baudis (PPE).** — *(FR)* Mr President, colleagues, the Council of Transport Ministers made its position clear as long ago as 1978, when it instructed the Commission to draw up a systematic plan for transport infrastructure which would support and promote European integration. It is in fact one of the foundations of it. In the interests of efficiency the Commission must be requested to draw up a basic regulation which will make it responsible for guidance and coordination in the field of transport infrastructure in our Community.

Planning for transport means that the respective jobs and roles of different modes of transport have to be defined in broad outline, which implies that the Council will have to reach a political consensus on the principal elements of a common transport policy. In order to set priorities in terms of different infrastructure projects, which are certainly all of interest but from which a selection has to be made, we hope that the Commission will work out a framework for the evaluation of objectives which will contain objective and mutually comparable criteria, with the help of a cost-benefit analysis for each project. In this way the European Parliament will have all the facts needed for an assessment so that it will be able to make a choice, however delicate, and not just confine itself as has so often been the case, to ratifying projects prepared outside Parliament and without any prior consultation. It is a question of the democratic process. The European People's Party wholeheartedly supports Mr Klinkenborg's report which can only further the interests of the European Community.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Carossino (COM).** — *(IT)* Mr President, I should like first of all to thank Mr Klinkenborg for his report, with which we are in full agreement, and which we will support with our vote. In particular, I propose to dwell for a moment on the statements by the President-in-Office of the Council, and thank him for the prompt, effective action taken by him — in his capacity as Minister of Transport of the French Government — to resolve the immediate causes of the agitation, and help the situation on the French-Italian frontier to return to normal.

The situation however remains precarious even after the end of the Brenner 'blockade', because the underlying causes of dissatisfaction have distant roots, and are the result of the repeated failure of the Council of Ministers to act in recent years. These causes cannot therefore be removed at a stroke.

As we are all aware, the conditions under which international road transport has to operate, including the crossing of frontiers between Member States, are complicated by formalities imposed by the national bureaucracies — formalities that are often futilely oppressive and unbearable, wasting time and causing unjustified increases in the cost of goods. It will not be easy to remove these obstacles, and we frankly have no desire to join hands with those who, recently, with a fair helping of unwarranted optimism, have stated that a simple act of goodwill is all that it would take to abolish frontier controls. For the abolition, or even the simplification, of frontier controls a strong political will on the part of the Council of Ministers is what is in reality necessary, since decisions are needed that affect important aspects of fiscal, commercial, and industrial policy in the individual Member States. In a situation that differs so much from one country to

**Carossino**

another we must of necessity progress by degrees, striving to attain the freedom of movement of people and goods, adopting measures for harmonization, liberalization, and financial support by the Community, so as to cope with the snags which the complete opening up of the national haulage markets will cause.

As the chairman of the Committee on Transport, Mr Seefeld, reminded us a short time ago, the European Parliament has done what it could to get us out of the complex, stalemate situation in which we find ourselves today — a situation that has now become incompatible with the very existence of the Common Market: it has put forward numerous concrete, detailed proposals, in every field of transport policy, even going so far as to take the Council of Ministers to the Court of Justice for failure to act and violation of the Treaties.

It is obvious — after everything that has happened, and in face of the danger that the situation where the Community's frontiers are paralysed may rear its ugly head again — that the Council of Ministers must take prompt, effective decisions. As a priority — I agree with what has already been stated — it is necessary — and in our view it is something that must be done immediately — to apply the directive on simplifying frontier formalities. We hope that the special Council of 20 March will come to this conclusion.

We have recently also welcomed, with satisfaction, the Italian Government's undertaking not to take advantage of the extension period granted to it for the application of this directive. An Italian Minister has, moreover, recently stated that Italy will do everything it can to comply with the directive in the stated time. As a Member of the Italian Parliament I consider this last statement to be unacceptable. The difficulties now facing us were already there when the Italian Government committed itself, in the eyes of public opinion and those most closely concerned, and the only action open to it today is to honour the commitments it undertook. This measure is, anyway, no more than a first step in the right direction because, obviously, until a substantial degree of progress has been achieved towards the harmonization of taxation, it will not be possible entirely to do away with frontier checks.

As far as the measures are concerned that more properly relate to the road haulage sector, it is my view that, under present conditions, the Commission's proposal to abolish Community quotas and liberalize the market within five years is unrealistic, whereas considerable progress in this field is possible, just as progress is necessary in regard to infrastructure policy — the report on which we shall shortly be supporting with our vote — as it concerns the reform of the social aspect of haulage traffic, as far as the new measures regarding truck weights and sizes are concerned.

There are many difficulties to be overcome, but the recent agitation at the frontiers has not been entirely harmful: it has also helped to create more favourable

psychological and political conditions for an agreement, and we hope, Minister, that you will take advantage of this when the Council of Ministers next meets, under your presidency.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs von Alemann (L).** — *(DE)* Mr President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, it is only because the European Parliament proceeded against the Council for failure to act that more concrete measures have been submitted for consideration. Mr President of the Council, we welcomed the fact that you put practical plans before us a few weeks ago in the Committee on Transport. We can assure you that we are very keen to resolve the transport problems of the European Community in close cooperation with you. For if we cannot even resolve problems which should in fact have been resolved on the basis of the Treaties of Rome, such as transport policy, surely we will scarcely be able to resolve the problems the future will bring. That is why my group has always regarded the expansion of the Community transport infrastructure as a most important, I would go so far as to say, central question. So we welcome Mr Klinkenborg's report; and I would like to tell him that we think his report is a very good one and thank him for the excellent work he has done.

Transport policy is in a worse state today than ever before. I can demonstrate that with a few figures. Overall, cross-frontier goods traffic rose from 213 500 m tonnes in 1960 to 544 600 m tonnes in 1979. That is a rate of increase of 155%. Goods traffic by road benefited greatly from that trend, increasing the volume of goods carried nearly eightfold. The amount transported increased from 11 700 m tonnes in 1960 to 103 200 m tonnes in 1979. That is one reason why it is now so urgent to see real action and not just more words in the field of Community transport infrastructure.

Especially as regards the burden on the major transit roads and the financing of projects, we believe that action should long since have followed words. At the time, the Council should not just have given the Commission a mandate to negotiate with Austria but, more importantly, should have allowed it to talk about money. That some progress has been made now is — we can say in all modesty — thanks largely to the close cooperation between all the groups in the Committee on Transport, which has constantly concerned itself with this matter.

But we need more than that. As Mr Klinkenborg notes in his report, the procedure proposed by the Commission to date for evaluating measures of Community interest is inadequate. We have already discussed this in committee and Mr Klinkenborg has also said a few words about it. We shall continue to urge you to work very intensively to improve these evaluation criteria so that we can have a transport infrastructure that truly deserves that name.

von Alemann

For what is it that annoys people when they open their newspapers? They find again and again that what they think of as a Community transport policy does not even exist because the border controls are far too complex; and they think that what is set out in the EEC Treaties must at last actually be done. Even before the Brenner Pass blockade, we said here in Parliament that things cannot go on like this. What happened? The blockade!

May I appeal urgently to everyone to work together to ensure that border controls really are simplified, even if not removed. In other words, that means transferring the controls to the external frontiers where possible, checks for the transport of goods and passengers, sensible cooperation in the prevention of terrorism and a package of measures to harmonize taxation in the long term — I know that still lies in the future — failing which the controls cannot eventually be removed entirely.

Unless we take these matters seriously, the voters will not be very interested in going to the polls on 17 June, saying: it's all just talk, nothing ever happens!

We welcome the Klinkenborg report because we believe that a transport infrastructure programme is absolutely essential and we ask the Commission to work out measures commensurate with its importance.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Scaroni (DEP).** — *(FR)* I should first of all like to thank the President-in-Office of the Council for taking part in our work today, thereby demonstrating his interest in it. I think in fact that the special meeting of the Council of Transport Ministers on 22 March, which was convened on his initiative, will be a special date for the future of European transport. In any case I think, like him, that we have to find room for imagination to enable us to harmonize and to work together. This is the hope I am voicing today on behalf of my group.

Naturally, I come back — and this is important — to Mr Klinkenborg's report which occupies a particularly prominent position today. It highlights in particular the link between the encouragement which has to be provided by the Community and its financial participation in various projects of Community interest. Certainly in the section on route planning the rapporteur has given a particular place to the development of railway infrastructure. One cannot share the priority it gives to the railways but one has to recognize that roads have benefited from large investment loans for many years while the railways, dare I say it, have been the paupers. It is also true, that — leaving aside certain bottlenecks — the European motorway network in general is well-developed and well distributed. On the other hand one cannot say the same for the Community rail network which continues to suffer from low average speeds and, to some extent, many defects, which we deplore.

This is an appropriate time to discuss the proposed European high-speed network. The TGV has shown us what can be achieved. Each country develops its own technology without taking any account of the fact that it will be confined within national frontiers. But there is a danger that, because of a lack of progress on European railways we may be lagging behind in a few years' time. Solutions exist. I made my own contribution in a recent motion for a resolution which Mr Baudis and I tabled on the setting up of an industrial cooperation group with a view to the creation of a European high speed rail network. As we see it, it is not the projects which are lacking, it is the political will, which means us, but perhaps not only us. It is not impossible to overcome the technical barriers which are always invoked in order to turn down any new development in the field of infrastructure. I shall take as an example the development of Community interest, which Mr Klinkenborg dealt with so cleverly; he made a lot of very interesting suggestions and recommendations on the subject. I think that Mr Klinkenborg's report is the standard work on transport infrastructure for the Community. It indicates the reasonable way for progress. That is why I shall support it, as I did in committee. My group also supports it.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Moreland (ED).** — Mr President, I would like to congratulate our rapporteur, Mr Klinkenborg, on his report. I think that he is absolutely correct in emphasizing the need to strengthen the railway networks in the Community. I think he is absolutely right to say that the consultation procedures need to be updated and to be subjected to parliamentary control. Indeed, I can say he was a brave man, because he tried to gate-crash one of the Commission's committees when drawing up this report and received a somewhat firm rebuff from the Commission. Although I have always found it difficult to believe, looking at Mr Klinkenborg, that he is the sort of person who would get a firm rebuff without giving a rebuff back.

I would like to congratulate the President-in-Office on his speech. Of all the speeches I have heard from Ministers over the last few years in this Parliament, his gives me the most encouragement. I think that the message to him would be that at last the Council of Ministers has got the message from the people of Europe about the need to make transport move more freely and easily. I think every speech today has highlighted that particular point.

However, he has to go even further. The directive which he said his government is now going to implement (indeed one wonders why before the lorry strike it was not going to be implemented until a later date!) needs a second stage. There is a lot more to be done on facilitation, and I am hopeful that the Council of Ministers will ask the Commission to come forward with a second stage of facilitation. There is a lot more

**Moreland**

that can be done in this area. I personally, having had the experience of going over one of these borders, think a lot of it is simple administrative bungle. A lot of it is unnecessary and is certainly what the founders of the Treaty of Rome did not wish to happen. It should have gone years ago, and it must go.

I would go further and disagree slightly with my colleague, Mr Carossino, by saying that I think the whole quota system can go because it distorts lorry transport. It does not actually protect the railways in the Community. Indeed, following on what Mr Klinkenborg has said, the real emphasis on the railways must be on investment. We need a lot more investment rather than protection. He must not forget either that a lot of lorry drivers have suffered over the last few weeks. I hope we are not dismissing that and that the Community is considering some form of compensation.

Finally, Mr President, can I simply say two words to Mr Fiterman? They are 'Channel Tunnel'. I hope he is going to take a decision soon.

**Mrs Ewing (DEP).** — Mr President, may I thank all the members of the Committee on Transport for the work they do. I think that that committee really does produce a lot of good ideas. I would also like to thank the rapporteur and the President-in-Office of the Council for being here today.

However, may I say that, while I support all the things that are being done at the present time, I felt there was just a hint of 'big is beautiful'. I know that the work that has to be done by the committee is ongoing work, but I would just make a plea for the 'small is beautiful' aspect of transport. Not everyone lives beside a busy border or a busy motorway. This Community has, for example, many islands; I represent 80. Greece has, I think, double that number of inhabited islands. There are many other islands in other Member States. There are many aspects of transport which I thought had been accepted in principle. I just mention one or two briefly.

I do make an appeal for a point I thought had been established, namely, that ferries would now be regarded as part of infrastructure. I notice the motion for a resolution mentions a report about the island of Rathlin. I tabled one in similar terms about Tory Island, off the coast of Ireland. What I was getting at there and what Mr Paisley was getting at was the right of every member of the Community to some form of public transport. It may seem a strange thing to say to those who live in densely populated areas, but there are villages and islands where there is no public transport whatsoever. I therefore make a plea that the right to transport be not lost sight of. It is a very fundamental question.

I understand the Commission is coming up with very interesting proposals, for people representing areas like mine, concerning islands and drivers' hours and areas far away from motorways. I look forward to the

proposals. Sometimes regulations can make the law an ass if they are applied to single-track road areas and remote areas.

Lastly, road equivalent tariff: I understood that Parliament adopted this principle twice. The Commission has shown a certain degree of interest in it by suggesting that projects should be put forward for road equivalent tariff. It works very well, for instance, in Norway. Could I say that the estimated cost in the UK would be 23 million and already there are subsidies of 13.5 million so the net cost would only be 9.5 million, which is ten hours of oil revenue. Yet, unfortunately, two weeks ago the Secretary of State for Scotland announced that the Conservatives were going to give up their commitment to road equivalent tariff. That may be for them decide, but I would urge this Community not to give up its commitment to this principle because it is a principle that was twice passed, once on the basis of a report by a Conservative Member in the old Parliament, Mr Corrie, who would be very disappointed to think that that principle so hard fought for on behalf of island citizens may not be included as one of the top priorities in the next stage of the transport considerations of the committee.

**Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission.** — (GR) Mr President, I would like first of all to address myself to the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Fiterman, and to express, along with Parliament, my pleasure at his presence here, together with my congratulations on the decisive manner with which he pointed out the need for the Council to proceed with realism in tackling the urgent problems in the transport sector.

Only a little time remains of the French presidency, just three and a half months, and I would hope that this time will be productive. I would like to assure both the President-in-Office of the Council and Parliament that the Commission will do all it can to assist in taking decisions.

With reference to the matters the President-in-Office touched on, I would like to take this opportunity to inform him and Parliament as well that, following the completion of the internal procedure, the Commission has today submitted its proposal for the amendment of Regulation 543. Tomorrow the Council and the Committee on Transport will have this to hand.

Turning now to the report by Mr Klinkenborg. I want to congratulate him on using the occasion of the three-yearly report on the work of the Committee on Transport Infrastructures to make an overall evaluation of the policy which has been followed in the transport infrastructure sector. His report is of interest to everyone, and of special interest, of course, to the Commission.

I would like to make a few comments about what has been said by Mr Klinkenborg and the other speakers and about the content of the Committee on Transport's report.

## Contogeorgis

Parliament has expressed a wish for its control over the operations of the Committee on Transport Infrastructures to be strengthened. I understand its interest and concern, but I do want to say that by virtue of the decision through which it was constituted this is a technical committee. Furthermore, the same decision carries the stipulation that the content of its deliberations on projects submitted by the governments must not be made public, and this is something which makes parliamentary control over the committee difficult. However, in response to Parliament's wish, and in spite of the existence of the decision, I would like there to be a procedure for parliamentary control. I propose that the Commission and Parliament should meet once, or possibly twice, a year in the framework of the Committee on Transport, and for parliamentary control of the work of the Committee on Transport Infrastructures to take place on the basis of an oral report provided by the Commission. Control of an informal sort which could, nevertheless, be real enough.

Another matter to which I want to refer is improvement of the methods used for evaluating the Community interest of infrastructure projects. Of course, the methodology used by the Commission on the basis of a regulation which the Council has ratified can be improved. The great weakness lies in the fact that our more general understanding of international traffic flows is based on different types of data. There is a need for more detailed studies of these flows. These studies are expensive, however, and for them to be conducted successfully there must be no worsening of the problems at the borders between Member States while they are in progress. Despite this the Commission, in collaboration with the Member States, intends to look further at ways of improving the provision of statistical data on this sector.

Mr President, I do not want to go into greater detail because time is limited. I would just like to say again that the Klinkenberg report contains many interesting proposals which must be followed up as appropriate within the framework of the Community's institutions. I would like to say that within its own range of competence the Commission will follow up Mr Klinkenberg's report as appropriate in accordance with the proposals in the resolution.

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

### Vote <sup>1</sup>

#### 6. Road safety

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-1355/83) by Mr Baudis, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the adoption of a programme of Community measures to promote road safety.

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**Mr Baudis (PPE), rapporteur.** — (FR) Mr President, colleagues, the death of one human being is a family bereavement. The deaths of tens of people in a disaster is a national event. But the death each year of several tens of thousands of people on the roads of Europe is merely a matter of statistics. Nevertheless these 46 800 deaths in Europe, the 150 000 seriously disabled are like the figures from a battlefield. Those are the official figures — recorded in the last statistical yearbook for the Community — for the numbers of victims of road accidents.

Faced with such a terrible balance sheet — equivalent to destroying the population of a medium-sized town — and with one and a half million wounded every year, not counting the human suffering and the astronomical sums involved in these accidents — it is the Community's duty to adopt measures which are equal to the challenge.

The Community measures in force at the moment are far from adequate. One could not confuse these directives on the harmonization of technical provisions relating to vehicles, on technical testing of goods vehicles, with a serious approach on the Community's part, capable of taking up this challenge.

Although the accident curve seems to be falling slightly in the majority of countries in the Community, thanks to the efforts made by national, regional and local authorities, my colleagues on the Committee on Transport and I consider that these should be supplemented by measures taken at Community level. The initiative had to be taken because a large number of national and international organizations, as well as private associations, have carried out very serious studies and submitted very valuable recommendations which have nevertheless gone unheeded, because these organizations do not have any legislative or executive powers.

But the Community can fill this gap in as far as constructive proposals emanating from these organizations can be transformed into provisions having the force of law in all the countries of the Community.

We are asking the Commission to submit a multi-annual programme as quickly as possible, based on the recommendations made in the motion for a resolution submitted to you for voting and on the proposals contained in this report. And we are asking the Council to take up this question at its next session with a view to the adoption of a framework decision containing guidelines for action to be taken to combat this scourge.

Various measures are proposed: uniformity of road signs and adaptation of them to the traffic conditions with the aid of modern electronic techniques; reduction of accident black spots and in particular the third lane which is very often the cause of head-on collisions; ensuring — since this accounts for 8 % of accidents — that vehicles are technically tested after

**Baudis**

serious accidents and before being resold; finally, changing driver behaviour, as this is the cause of most accidents: the establishment of a blood alcohol limit around 0.8 g per litre seems a reasonable measure. Improving instruction to road users for the purpose of obtaining a driving licence, more general use of driving licences on the points system as used in several countries, Germany in particular. Provisional driving licences for a probationary period. And above all education in the highway code for young people of school age. These prerequisites must be studied very closely and should make it possible to introduce a European driving licence, which almost all the countries of Europe want.

I did not want to draw out my remarks and I have limited myself to what seemed to me to be the most urgent and to those measures which can be applied rapidly. Time is the essential factor and the Community has already lost too much of that.

The Committee on Transport hopes that with this report it has drawn the broad outlines of what, I hope, will soon become a true Community charter leading to the reduction of road accidents.

By voting for the resolution which I have tabled the first Parliament elected by universal suffrage will, to use the words of the President-in-Office of the Council, have established the foundations of a Europe of road safety. I believe that is a priority for all of us.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Turner (ED)**, *draftsman of an opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee*. — Mr President, the Transport Committee is quite a good client of the Legal Affairs Committee. They asked us if Parliament could sue the Council of Ministers for failing to act in the transport sphere, and we said yes. They kindly asked us our views on this question too. There is legal basis for what the rapporteur wants to do. First of all, where different national regulations lead to danger there is the possibility of harmonization directives or regulations to give identical regulations throughout the EEC for traffic safety. A perfect example of this is on which side of the road you drive and one might well say that for safety's sake one should always drive on the same side. In fact, we gave this as an example in our report of what you should not propose, because although Britain — and I think one other country — drive on the left while the rest drive on the right, it would be quite impractical to change that, both financially and for reasons of psychology and so on. But apart from that, where there is danger because of different regulations you can have a directive. That would not apply to such things as parking regulations. It probably would not apply to speed limits because there is no real reason why it is dangerous to have one maximum speed limit in one country and another in another country, unless of course the limit is dangerous in itself.

A second type of directive should be minimum directives where you can harmonize to get standards, standards, for example, on health checks for drivers and the safety of vehicles and the safety and strength of crash barriers in the middle of roads and of traffic lights and so on. Next there is the question of non-tariff barriers to trade. For example, one can use such minimum standards of a national nature to keep out goods of another country. One could have minimum standards on rear lamps or brakes which would keep lorries from one country out of another country. And so the Transport Committee must remember that it must not set up trade barriers by proposing minimum standards of that sort.

Next point: they asked us about criminal law and whether one should have harmonized penalties for dangerous driving, drunken driving, etc. We have advised that the answer to that is no. If any particular Member State were wildly out of line on the sort of punishments it gave, one could only really go in for informal consultations with the authorities of that country.

Finally, on the question of minimum infrastructure of transport which means dangerous roads, lanes which are too narrow, lack of dual carriageways or bottlenecks of any sort, and black spots you can certainly lay down regulations on the minimum width of a lane, for instance, of a certain type of road, but we came to the conclusion that the best way of dealing with infrastructure deficiencies was to support the transport infrastructure fund which of course the European Parliament is now suing the Council of Ministers over.

So, the Legal Affairs Committee has given, I hope, helpful advice all along the line and I think we have franked almost everything that the rapporteur proposes to do.

**Mr Seefeld (S)**. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the mourners of the thousands of road casualties accuse us. They want to know whether the politicians of Europe are doing enough to make road traffic safer. Our reply is bound to dissatisfy and even depress them.

I do not think any of us can say with a clear conscience that we have done enough so far at European level. We have become accustomed to living with statistics. Mr Baudis, whom I warmly thank for his report on behalf of my group, gives the figure of one and a half million road accidents and 50 000 road deaths in the Community. Those are the figures, those are the statistics. Sad but true. But if a driver cheerfully sets off from home one morning and does not return to his family in the evening because he has died in a road accident, statistics become meaningless. That is an individual tragedy. That is why I emphasize that our concern must be with the 50 000 individual

## Seefeld

tragedies each year. That is why we must do more than we have done to reduce the number of these tragedies and we are all under an obligation to wage a war without mercy on the number of deaths on our roads.

I have deliberately referred only to people, although I could also include the economic losses due to road accidents; but those losses can be replaced, a human life cannot.

The own-initiative report by the Committee on Transport, which was prepared carefully, for instance by a hearing of associations, organizations and personalities concerned with road safety, includes a long list of suggestions and requests to the Commission and the Council. Each of these proposals, if implemented, could help us in our endeavours. So our appeal will be the following: ladies and gentlemen in the Council of Ministers of Transport, will you please take a European Parliament report very seriously for once. Do not relegate it to a drawer in your desk, which I am sure you can hardly close any more because so many good reports of ours are gathering dust there. Do not add the Baudis report to those other documents, but act at last! Do what we suggest!

We as the representatives of the people of Europe, have to listen carefully to the people. You should really do the same. So why do you not take your courage in both hands and act? You could do yourselves credit at last if, together with us, you succeeded in making a major inroad into the sad number of road accidents and deaths. The Commission ought to act too. Mr Commissioner, why not increase the number of officials dealing with road safety? There are rather too many officials dealing with agriculture. Transfer some of them to the directorate-general responsible for transport policy and road safety.

It must be made clear today that the Community is concerned with safety and concerned with improving road safety. This report by the Committee on Transport forms a solid basis on which to build and on which we must build. Mr Fiterman suggests that 1985 be declared European Road Safety Year, and we welcome that. The Socialist Group endorses Mr Baudis's report unreservedly.

*(Applause)*

**Mrs Phlix (PPE).** — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, you will doubtless agree with me that Mr Baudis is to be thanked for his report on so important an aspect of the lives of the citizens of Europe: road safety.

Safety is one of the priorities of the transport policy that is today being discussed at such length, and rightly so. Everyone here agrees with this report. Parliament has seldom been so united. The number of casualties — and I will just repeat the figures: 50 000

dead, 1.5 million injured — means not only that a high price is paid for the transport of passengers in the Community but above all widespread misery and human suffering. The policy-makers must undoubtedly take a very large measure of moral responsibility for this. The problem with large figures is our inability to grasp them.

Each of us is acquainted with victims of road accidents where he lives and is confronted with the consequences these accidents have for the victim's life and for his family. I would ask you not to reduce these figures to the level of statistics or anonymous newspaper reports. As politicians we have a duty to be alive to cases of suffering and to help where we can. We have a great moral responsibility to the citizens of the Community.

We feel special thought should be given to children, young road-users who all too often have to pay for recklessness with their lives. The EPP Group calls for the highest priority to be given to action to improve road safety, as the report suggests, and will therefore unanimously approve the report. Road safety was put on the list of priorities as long ago as 7 September 1979, during the first part-session of this directly-elected Parliament. Is it not time, as the life of this Parliament draws to a close, for something serious to be done about it?

We hope that at the meeting arranged on the initiative of the President of the Council special attention will be paid to the safety aspect in all its various forms and that decisions will also be taken. A safety year, as has been suggested by my country's Minister, is a laudable proposal. All too often special 'years' lead to 'marginalization' and safety is much too important for that since it concerns the lives of the citizens of this Community.

*(Applause)*

**Dame Shelagh Roberts (ED).** — Mr President, in the United Kingdom, 100 people are killed on our roads every week of the year and nearly 1 000 people are injured on our roads every day of the year. In relation to our population, these terrifying figures are not in fact the worst in the Community, and I believe therefore that not just this Parliament but the whole of the Community should welcome the interest which the Committee on Transport is taking in the subject of improving road safety.

Mr Baudis's report is a classic example of ways in which the Community can cooperate, can share its problems and its solutions for the greater good of the whole of the population and, on behalf of my group, I very much welcome this report. But I am bound to go on to say that it makes depressing reading, and that is in no sense a criticism of Mr Baudis. Mr Baudis has uncovered the facts, and it is the facts that make such depressing reading. He draws attention to the fact that

**Roberts**

there is ample evidence that, if more money were spent on eradicating accident black spots, if more money were spent in general on transport infrastructure, this dreadful toll of human life on our roads could be reduced. He points out that the Commission has shown a lack of urgency on this subject, and he draws attention to the many reports, studies and investigations which each member country has undertaken and whose valuable recommendations have subsequently lain on the shelf to gather dust.

I welcome the very positive response of the President-in-Office of the Council this afternoon, but I hope that in calling for a European Year of Road Safety in 1985, the President-in-Office is not merely stating an intention, but is determined that the Council will will the means, because that is what is needed if we are to direct our energies to a subject desperately in need of Community action, one which I believe would be welcomed by the Community as a whole and would show this Parliament to be a force for good and for constructive action. I hope, therefore, that the report will be taken very seriously.

I would like to draw attention to just one other point. I think that more studies could be undertaken — perhaps the Commission will take these on board — into the psychological aspects of the human reaction. I believe there is a danger that as we advance technology and improve safety measures in terms of brakes and lighting and so forth, we may tend to ignore the fact that no amount of advance in technology speeds up human reactions. I do believe, Mr President, that there is scope for further studies on that subject.

**Mrs von Alemann (L).** — *(DE)* Mr President, I would like to tell Mr Baudis that my group too will endorse his report and I want to thank him for submitting such a comprehensive and important report. This report, and I would like to draw the Chamber's attention to this, is an own-initiative report, i.e. it was drawn up on the initiative of the Committee on Transport. I think the statistics speak for themselves and show that a report was necessary and that we must devote more attention to this matter in future.

I would like to comment on one point, which Mr Nyborg made in his Amendment No 1, namely that if you charge road tolls, heavy goods traffic and through traffic is liable to shift to secondary roads, which increases the risks to road safety.

I ask all those, especially in my own country, who keep bringing up the question of road tolls, in order to fill up their empty coffers, to think about this. We in the Committee on Transport are entirely against any form of road toll, partly because we know they are no use. We are in favour of the report and ask you all to adopt it.

**Mrs Scamaroni (DEP).** — *(FR)* I should simply like to say a few words. Mr Baudis's report is impressive. It is impressive because it is intended to put an end to a situation which is leading to veritable slaughter. 50 000 dead on the roads every year is far too many! Our Committee on Transport can accept it no longer, and Mr Baudis has upheld this magnificently.

By pooling experience in order to establish standards and common rules, the European Community will promote significant progress in the area of road safety. I do not want to go back over the long list of measures proposed by Mr Baudis, they are all indispensable. And contrary to what some people might think, they are not particularly expensive. The problem is not how to apply these proposals. But does one, all in all, want to put an end to the annual slaughter on the roads of Europe? The implementation time must also be taken into account. We have to wake up to the fact that we are all answerable for the deaths.

For my part I have made my choice. I shall unreservedly support the excellent report of my colleague Mr Baudis. My group is giving him its full support, and I have to say that if the Community so far has taken hardly any initiatives to improve road safety on a Community scale, Mr Baudis's motion is at last inviting the Council to adopt a decision instructing the Commission to draw up proposals with a view to providing the necessary measures.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Albers (S).** — *(NL)* Mr President, many resolutions have been tabled on road safety, and they are included in this report. It is therefore an extremely important initiative. A large number of written questions have also been put over the years, although I have not always had the impression that the Commission has taken them very seriously. Perhaps this report can help to change this situation somewhat.

It is important, of course, for the highway codes and the technical specifications to be harmonized. It is also important for the infrastructure to be improved and for combined transport operations and the selective use of passenger cars and lorries to be encouraged. The growth of road transport must be curbed. But what is even more important, and this does not receive quite enough attention in the report, is the need to improve the working conditions of employees in road transport. From the checks that are made we see that the application of the social rules is still rather chaotic. We are therefore pleased to see that the Commission has at last come forward with a proposal for changes to the social rules, albeit a year later than it originally promised.

Mr President, I hope that this will soon be followed by decisions in the Council and that these social rules will be revised. Shortening the working hours of trans-



**Albers**

port employees and improving their working conditions will certainly make a major contribution to road safety.

**Mr Moreland (ED).** — Mr President, like others, I would like warmly to congratulate the rapporteur on his report.

As my time is brief, I will just make the point that I think all of the institutions of the Community ought to give more attention to the question of road safety. Perhaps I should say more priority. By this I mean that the Council, for example, should not block certain of the proposals for reasons not connected with road safety. For example, the laminated glass proposal is blocked by one Member State for purely protectionist reasons, and that is outrageous.

Secondly, the Commission has delayed for a long time the proposals on tachographs and drivers' hours, because it has got bogged down on the issue of relations between employer and employee. It has a very strong element of road safety: that is how the public views it.

Thirdly, the Member States ought not to think that this is the end of all road safety. There is a lot that the individual Member States can do — I was going to say to my German colleagues, perhaps speed limits, but that might be a little embarrassing at this point in time.

Finally, Mr President, to the Parliament I would say that I hope we shall not let the Council off the hook on Road Safety Year, 1985, and that our Committee on Transport will take this up before the end of this Parliament, because I think it is an excellent idea which must be promoted and we should not let the Council forget it.

**Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission.** — (GR) Mr President, I too would like to congratulate Mr Baudis for managing in his report to give such an integrated presentation of a subject which is technical and complex and yet of deep human significance. As I had the opportunity of stating during a public debate organized last June by the Committee on

Transport, and in which specialist international organizations took part, the Commission recognizes the need to improve road safety and is working on this matter.

I can inform you now that the Commission has made headway in this respect and that, after taking due account of Mr Baudis's findings and of today's debate, it will very shortly be submitting a draft resolution on road safety to the Council. Today the President-in-Office of the Council expressed the political will to move ahead on this matter. A Council resolution which covers areas in which there is a need for action to be taken immediately will, I believe, indicate that the political will required for us to make progress does exist, and it will constitute a political commitment. I think that this resolution will deal with the obligations of drivers and of road-users in general, obligations in respect of vehicle design, and with the obligations of the Member States concerning the infrastructure. It must provide for immediate steps where needed, for a programme of future actions, and for the carrying out of a substantial number of studies because the road safety measures which are appropriate must be based on thorough research.

Mr President, I hope that this Council resolution will be ready very shortly, and although the Council will not be ratifying it at next week's meeting I hope it will do so when it meets in the middle of May.

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

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

### 7. Closure of the session

**President.** — I declare closed the annual 1983-1984 session of the European Parliament and I remind the House that pursuant to the Treaty, the European Parliament will meet tomorrow, Tuesday 13 March 1984 at 9 a.m.<sup>1</sup>

*(The sitting was closed at 8.10 p.m.)*

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

*ANNEX**Votes*

**The Report of Proceedings records in an annex the rapporteur's position on the various amendments and the explanations of vote. For details of the voting the reader is referred to the Minutes of the sitting.**

**SCRIVENER SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT (DOC. 1-1476/83  
'Employment, transport, energy'): ADOPTED**

*Explanations of vote*

**Mr de la Malène (DEP).** — *(FR)* We have fought against the disastrous mandate of 30 May 1981 from the beginning, just as we have fought against all the consequences of it.

We have remained faithful to this stance and voted against the Commission's proposal. We consider that from the beginning of this affair Britain has taken up a position which we find unacceptable both from a substantial and a procedural point of view.

Because of that attitude the common agricultural policy has been reviled and indicted. Because of that attitude necessary improvements to the common agricultural policy have not been made. Because of that attitude there is not enough money for the farmers in the 1984 budget and the Commission — I say this emphatically — has led us astray in this matter and did not make provision for the sums which it should have entered, anticipating, without admitting it, the adoption of reform proposals which it had not yet put forward.

European construction as a whole and the farmers of Europe are suffering on account of this action. This is something we cannot overlook.

Nevertheless we were prepared to recognize that developments had lent some foundation to the British claims and that it should be possible to review the distribution of financial burdens. We said it and we repeat it and we hope that at the next European Council wisdom and the voice of Europe will prevail. But at the level of our own Parliament at this moment and in the expectation of such wisdom we have been disappointed too often for us not to maintain truly our position, which we think is best for Europe and best for farmers.

In conclusion, I must not forget to congratulate our Committee on Budgets on the results it has achieved. It tried to disguise as a Community initiative something which was quite the opposite. None the less, it is still a disguise.

**Mrs Ewing (DEP).** — I usually give my explanation of vote in writing. However, on the occasion of the budget vote I was misquoted by the Conservative spokesman, who said that all the British voted against the budget. I did not, although I am going to support the Scrivener report. I have always voted to have the money back. It is very difficult to vote against having the money back in the same way that it is very difficult to vote against sunny days. However, there are a number of points I feel entitled to make on this issue.

How does the imbalance arise? The imbalance is clearly there, and if Britain is imbalanced, then my part of it is all the more imbalanced. I would suggest that the UK buys too many things from outside the Community and that, in a certain sense, it has not

Ewing

made up its mind whether, in the words of the Conservative booklet, it is here to stay or not. Is it in or is it out? If it is in, why do we go on buying so many things from outside the Community?

Secondly, I am gravely concerned at the way 'Mrs Thatcher's money back' — which is the headline often used in the press — is presented to the man in the street in the United Kingdom. It is creating a confrontation situation in his mind in which all the Europeans are presented as the enemy in some way, stopping him from getting his just desserts. It is stirring up a tide of animosities that Mrs Thatcher may not be able to withstand when the day comes that she decides she is satisfied with the arrangements.

Thirdly, I support having the money back on the basis that...

**President.** — Mrs Ewing your speaking time is over.

**Mr Balfour (ED).** — I would like to reply to Mrs Ewing by apologizing to her very profoundly for having assumed that she had voted in the same way as the rest of the British contingent. She does sit behind me. I did assume that she had voted in the interests of her constituents. I was wrong. I did not realize that she had taken her lead from the Irish and the French Gaullists. I would like to assure her that ever since making that mistake I have been setting the records straight throughout the whole of the United Kingdom, and I think that she should rest assured on that score.

*(Protests by Mrs Ewing)*

**Mr Pranchère (COM).** — *(FR)* My friend, Louis Baillot, clearly demonstrated the firm opposition of the French Communist and Allied members to the Commission's proposals and to Mrs Scrivener's report, which are in fact intended to allow Mrs Thatcher to draw on the Community cheque which the European Assembly had put aside.

It is well known that the mandate of 30 May 1980 which we call 'the capitulation of the French Right' (the entire Right: UDF, RPR, therefore the majority), greatly benefited the United Kingdom. Each year Mrs Thatcher has cashed her cheque. But this is not all: in the midst of today's organized publicity campaign we must not lose sight of the fact that Great Britain receives 90 % of the credits for sheepmeat, that payments from the EAGGF guarantee section have virtually doubled, rising from 880 to 1 690 million ECU, not to mention in addition the overpayments to the English Milk Marketing Board of 755 million ECU, which have not yet been repaid. Enough is enough!

At a time when the farmers are losing their tempers and taking action against the provocative and disastrous proposals from the Commission for the fixing of the 1984-85 agricultural prices, we cannot without reacting strongly accept that once gain 750 million ECU are to be paid to the United Kingdom in violation of the principle of financial solidarity and of the rules on Community preference, when it could be used to finance an increase of 7 % in agricultural prices. By voting against Mrs Scrivener's proposals...

**President.** — Mr Pranchère, you have exceeded your speaking time.

**Lord Douro (ED).** — My group will vote in favour of Mrs Scrivener's resolution. These regulations provide for extra expenditure in the United Kingdom and in the Federal Republic of Germany which will partially redress the present budgetary imbalance relating to the British contribution to the Community's budget.

I very much regret what Mr de la Malène said. Mrs Ewing accused the British Prime Minister of trying to create confrontation between Britain and the other Member States. I suggest that the way my group has behaved over these regulations has done the very opposite of trying to create confrontation. We have sought to work with other political groups in this Parliament playing a perfectly legitimate role of Parliament in reviewing and amending the proposed regulations. I suggest that Mrs Ewing should convey that advice to other Members of her group and I do believe that these regulations — as now re-worded — are a sensible compromise. As I have said earlier, we will support them.

**Mrs Ewing (DEP).** — Mr President, when one is attacked, I think one should be entitled to defend oneself. Not content with one error of fact against my name, I now have to suffer an insult. Well, let me just say to him. He can go to anyone in the Highlands and Islands, even to his own supporters, and no one will say that I do not serve the interests of my constituency.

\* \* \*

### KLINKENBORG REPORT (DOC. 1-1347/83 'Transport'): ADOPTED

#### *Explanations of vote*

**Mr De Pasquale (COM).** — (IT) I should like — not only on my own account but also on behalf of the wider political, trade union and business circles in Sicily — to congratulate the Committee on Transport and Mr Klinkenberg on the scrupulously thorough way in which they have handled the complex problems relating to the project for a fixed link between Sicily and the mainland of Europe.

The Community interest of this project has been demonstrated with facts and on the basis of a very careful and detailed on-the-spot examination, which shows how wrong are the conclusions reached by the Commission on the basis of superficial, unreliable appraisals.

The Commission must therefore revise its negative view regarding the question of the Straits of Messina and give direct help first to the preparation of the project and then to its execution.

We have to overcome not only the inertia and delays of the Italian Government, but also the undervaluation and inattention of the Commission. These two obstacles must be removed; the Klinkenberg report is only a first step — but a very important one — in the right direction, and we Italian Communists will therefore support it.

**Mr Enright (S).** — I should like to congratulate Mr Klinkenberg and thank him for this excellent report. To a large extent, he is defending us against our present Conservative Government, particularly in what he has to say about the railways. Do you realize that in a previous, rather kinder Tory administration, Whitstable was debarred completely from having a railway of any sort? Kent East is now suffering from the deprivations brought about by Beeching's butchery. That Beeching butchery is now being made to look like resuscitation by the way that this present government is behaving.

Furthermore, there are huge tracts of motorway that have not been joined up properly in Kent East. What effort has been made by this present government to do anything about it? Nothing! I am delighted too that Paragraph 24 of the resolution asks for a careful evaluation of the Channel Tunnel, because it is certainly true — and I must warn the Commissioner of this — that it is quite possible that if the Channel Tunnel comes out near Folkestone, it will have very serious effects indeed upon Dover. Therefore I ask the Commission to examine this proposal very carefully indeed.

**Mr Moorhouse (ED).** — I shall be supporting the Klinkenberg report. While expressing our thanks to Mr Klinkenberg for his pointers in the direction of railways, in response to Mr Enright may I ask: Why this sudden interest in Whitstable? Has he not heard of the M25 which has just been connected? It is now possible for heavy lorries to travel quite freely down the east coast of England, across the M25 and down to Kent, thanks to Mrs Thatcher.

I must confess I was diverted there for a second, because I did particularly want to thank Mr Fiterman for coming here today along with other colleagues. We have certainly appreciated his commitment to the development of a common transport policy for the EEC. We have had enormous frustrations, of course, as he will appreciate, in the Committee on Transport in furthering this cause, but he has been one who sees quite clearly that the development of a common transport policy is at the heart of European recovery. That is

**Moorhouse**

the sense of the matter. We can only develop an internal market satisfactorily if we have a common transport policy. So long as he keeps on this course he can count on our full support.

**Mr Antoniozzi (PPE).** — *(IT)* I shall be voting in favour of the resolution on transport infrastructure planning in Europe, which was the subject of Mr Klinkenborg's report.

The report presents a broad and very detailed picture of the questions involved, and we are therefore convinced that it will enable solutions to be found to important problems concerning the fundamental links within Europe. I propose that priority be given to the largest of these projects which need adequate financial support for their implementation. Amongst them, in the South of Europe, there is the important question of the 'bridge' between the mainland and Sicily, by means of a link with Calabria. This infrastructure can promote further economic and social development, as well as solve the question of establishing more immediate contact between different areas that also have a part to play in bringing the peoples of Europe closer together.

My hope, as I support this resolution, is that in this way some of the problems that have existed for too long will be solved, thereby demonstrating the complementary character of Community action — which would in this way reflect even more strongly the role of a Europe able to act where action is difficult using local or national resources and processes alone — and showing the validity of certain principles that we have recently affirmed and supported by adopting the draft Treaty establishing the European Union.

On behalf also of vast areas of the south of Italy I thank the Minister, who is here today, and the Transport Commissioner, for the commitment they have so clearly shown in favour of these subjects and the proposals to which I have referred and for which I shall vote, renewing thereby my act of faith in Europe.

**Mr Prout (ED).** — The recent lorry drivers' blockade in France has left an extremely confused financial situation in its wake. Initial UK estimates suggest that average losses to hauliers ran at UKL 200 a day and that losses to cargo owners were well in excess of UKL 2 million. The task posed for the insurance industry in dealing with these claims is formidable, particularly with respect to the interpretation of the CMR Convention. Moreover, in many cases it will be extremely difficult to establish the cause of loss.

Although the dispute took place in France, its real target was the failure of the Council of Ministers to agree on a number of elementary proposals vital to the success of the common market. If the barriers did not exist, the dispute would not have occurred. All Community governments must therefore bear some share of the responsibility for the delays.

I urge the Council of Transport Ministers to accept this responsibility, to facilitate compensation arrangements in an equitable fashion and to act quickly to remove the real causes of the dispute.

**Mr Romualdi (NI).** — *(IT)* Mr President, I should like to say on behalf of the members of the Italian political right, that we shall be voting in favour of this excellent Klinkenborg report on the infrastructures — such as, for example, the Straits of Messina, the Modena-Pistoia motorway, the Channel Tunnel or the waterway linking Milan with the Adriatic, and so on — that are necessary in order to improve the truly sad conditions under which transport operates within our Community — now blocked quite literally by bottlenecks on the roads, at sea and in the air as well as customs bottlenecks — which, taken all together, seem like a repetition in modern terms of the structures, methods and taxes of the Middle Ages at their worst. We want a united Europe, but we are doing nothing to unite it, at least materially, through means of communication that really are such in fact as well as in name, and that serve the free movement of goods and people, as the Treaty says, and as was the hope — and perhaps still is — of our electors, who are undoubtedly the most sincere and open supporters of the European ideal, the only ones on whom we can still count — at least so we hope — and from whose agreement we can derive the strength to progress effectively towards unity and a modern world.



**Salg og abonnement · Verkauf und Abonnement · Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές · Sales and subscriptions  
Vente et abonnements · Vendita e abbonamenti · Verkoop en abonnementen**

---

**BELGIQUE / BELGIË**

---

**Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad**

Rue de Louvain 40-42 / Leuvensestraat 40-42  
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel  
Tél. 512 00 26  
CCP/Postrekening 000-2005502-27

Sous-dépôts / Agentschappen:

**Librairie européenne /  
Europese Boekhandel**

Rue de la Loi 244 / Wetstraat 244  
1040 Bruxelles / 1040 Brussel

**CREDOC**

Rue de la Montagne 34 / Bergstraat 34  
Bte 11 / Bus 11  
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel

---

**DANMARK**

---

**Schultz Forlag**

Møntergade 21  
1116 København K  
Tlf: (01) 12 11 95  
Girokonto 200 11 95

---

**BR DEUTSCHLAND**

---

**Verlag Bundesanzeiger**

Breite Straße  
Postfach 10 80 06  
5000 Köln 1  
Tel. (02 21) 20 29-0  
Fernschreiber:  
ANZEIGER BONN 8 882 595

---

**GREECE**

---

**G.C. Eleftheroudakis SA**

International Bookstore  
4 Nikis Street  
Athens (126)  
Tel. 322 63 23  
Telex 219410 ELEF

Sub-agent for Northern Greece:

**Molho's Bookstore**

The Business Bookshop  
10 Tsimiski Street  
Thessaloniki  
Tel. 275 271  
Telex 412885 LIMO

---

**FRANCE**

---

**Service de vente en France des publications  
des Communautés européennes**

**Journal officiel**

26, rue Desaix  
75732 Paris Cedex 15  
Tél. (1) 578 61 39

---

**IRELAND**

---

**Government Publications Sales Office**

Sun Alliance House  
Molesworth Street  
Dublin 2  
Tel. 71 03 09

or by post

**Stationery Office**

St Martin's House  
Waterloo Road  
Dublin 4  
Tel. 78 96 44

---

**ITALIA**

---

**Licosa Spa**

Via Lamarmora, 45  
Casella postale 552  
50 121 Firenze  
Tel. 57 97 51  
Telex 570466 LICOSA I  
CCP 343 509

Subagente:

**Libreria scientifica Lucio de Biasio - AEIOU**

Via Meravigli, 16  
20 123 Milano  
Tel. 80 76 79

---

**GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG**

---

**Office des publications officielles  
des Communautés européennes**

5, rue du Commerce  
L-2985 Luxembourg  
Tél. 49 00 81 - 49 01 91  
Télex PUBLOF - Lu 1322  
CCP 19190-31  
CC bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/200

---

**NEDERLAND**

---

**Staatsdrukkerij- en uitgeverijbedrijf**

Christoffel Plantijnstraat  
Postbus 20014  
2500 EA 's-Gravenhage  
Tel. (070) 78 99 11

---

**UNITED KINGDOM**

---

**HM Stationery Office**

HMSO Publications Centre  
51 Nine Elms Lane  
London SW8 5DR  
Tel. 01-211 3935

Sub-agent:

**Alan Armstrong & Associates**

European Bookshop  
London Business School  
Sussex Place  
London NW1 4SA  
Tel. 01-723 3902

---

**ESPAÑA**

---

**Mundi-Prensa Libros, S.A.**

Castelló 37  
Madrid 1  
Tel. (91) 275 46 55  
Telex 49370-MPLI-E

---

**PORTUGAL**

---

**Livraria Bertrand, s.a.r.l.**

Rua João de Deus  
Venda Nova  
Amadora  
Tél. 97 45 71  
Telex 12709-LITRAN-P

---

**SCHWEIZ / SUISSE / SVIZZERA**

---

**Librairie Payot**

6, rue Grenus  
1211 Genève  
Tél. 31 89 50  
CCP 12-236

---

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

---

**European Community Information  
Service**

2100 M Street, NW  
Suite 707  
Washington, DC 20037  
Tel. (202) 862 9500

---

**CANADA**

---

**Renouf Publishing Co., Ltd**

2182 St Catherine Street West  
Montreal  
Quebec H3H 1M7  
Tel. (514) 937 3519

---

**JAPAN**

---

**Kinokuniya Company Ltd**

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome  
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 1.76    BFR 80    IRL 1.20    UKL 1    USD 1,75



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS  
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Catalogue number: AX-AA-83-015-EN-C

L-2985 Luxembourg