

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 1-265

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1980-1981 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 12 to 16 January 1981

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Monday, 12 January 1981	1
Resumption of session, p. 2 — President's New Year's wishes, p. 2 — Welcome to Greek Members, p. 2 — Supplementary budget No 2 for 1980 and general budget for 1981, p. 7 — Petitions, p. 7 — Documents, p. 7 — Texts of treaties, p. 8 — Transfer of appropriations, p. 8 — Welcome, p. 8 — Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution, p. 8 — Order of business, p. 8 — Urgent procedure, p. 9 — Speaking time, p. 10 — Tabling of amendments, p. 10 — Introduction of the new Commission, p. 10 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 20 — Meeting-place of Parliament, p. 20 — Question time, p. 23 — Next sitting, p. 35 — Annex, p. 36	
Tuesday, 13 January 1981	39
Minutes, p. 40 — Documents, p. 40 — 1977 and 1978 budgets (discharge), p. 40 — European automobile industry, p. 50 — Tribute, p. 56 — European automobile industry (contd), p. 58 — Urgent procedure, p. 72 — Voting time, p. 72 — Shipbuilding, p. 77 — Marine pollution, p. 84 — Memorial service for Mr Gundelach, p. 103 — Urgent procedure, p. 103 — Agenda, p. 103 — Next sitting, p. 103	
Wednesday, 14 January 1981	104
Minutes, p. 105 — Documents, p. 105 — Urgent procedure, p. 105 — Programme of the Dutch presidency, p. 108 — Urgent procedure, p. 134 — Programme of the Dutch presidency (contd), p. 134 — Community's own resources, p. 135 — Question time, p. 155 — Urgent procedure, p. 168 — Next sitting, p. 168 — Annex, p. 168	

(Continued overleaf)

NOTE TO READER

Appearing at the same time as the English edition are editions in the five other official languages of the Communities : Danish, German, 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 : *(DK)* for Danish, *(D)* for German, *(F)* for French, *(I)* for Italian and *(NL)* for Dutch.

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

Contents (continued)

Thursday, 15 January 1981 182

Minutes, p. 184 — Documents, p. 184 — Urgent procedure, p. 184 — Committees, p. 194 — Agenda, p. 194 — Energy production (soft technologies), p. 195 — Documents, p. 205 — Voting time, p. 206 — Urgent procedure, p. 208 — Agenda, p. 208 — Energy production (soft technologies) (contd), p. 209 — Credentials, p. 226 — Marine pollution, p. 226 — Environment, p. 231 — Pesticides, p. 235 — Nomination of Greek candidates for appointment to committees, p. 240 — Recovery of waste paper, p. 240 — Agenda, p. 243 — Human rights in Uruguay, p. 243 — Isoglucose, p. 253 — EEC-Brazil framework agreement, p. 256 — Information policy, p. 262 — Urgent procedure, p. 268 — Next sitting, p. 269

Friday, 16 January 1981 270

Minutes, p. 271 — Documents, p. 272 — Petitions, p. 272 — Committees, p. 272 — Urgent procedure, p. 272 — Appointment of Greek Members to committees, p. 273 — Cereals, p. 273 — Fisheries, p. 279 — 'Unification' of Libya and Chad, p. 281 — Information policy (contd), p. 281 — Voting time, p. 284 — Membership of Parliament, p. 294 — Information policy (contd), p. 295 — Cultural workers, p. 303 — Training of young people in the Community, p. 307 — Next part-session, p. 308 — Minutes, p. 308 — Adjournment, p. 308

Resolutions adopted at sittings of 12 to 16 January 1981 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 28 of 9. 2. 1981.

SITTING OF MONDAY, 12 JANUARY 1981

1. Resumption of the session	2	
2. New Year's wishes from the President	2	
3. Welcome to the Greek Members: Mr Bournias; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mr Zighdis; Mr Loules; Mr Pasmazoglou	2	Explanations of vote: Mr Enright; Mr Mart; Mr Hamilius; Mr Klepsch; Mr Habsburg; Mrs Dekker; Mr Prag; Mr Pearce; Mr Patterson 20
4. Supplementary budget No 2 for 1980 and general budget of the Communities for 1981: Mr Glinne	7	18. Question Time (Doc 1-778/80): Questions to the Commission of the European Communities: Question No 1 by Sir John Stewart-Clark: Poultry industry: Mr Gundelach (Commission); Sir John Stewart-Clark; Mr Gundelach; Mr Turner; Mr Gundelach; Sir Frederick Warner; Mr Gundelach; Mr Paisley; Mr Gundelach 23
5. Petitions	7	Questions No 2 by Mr Welsh: Review of the operation of Multifibre Arrangement, and No 38 by Mrs Ewing: Multifibre Arrangement: Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Mr Welsh; Mr Haferkamp; Mrs Ewing; Mr Haferkamp; Mr Seal; Mr Haferkamp; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Haferkamp; Mr Schmid; Mr Haferkamp 25
6. Documents received	7	Question No 3 by Mr Paisley: Integration scheme in Belfast: Mr Giolitti (Commission); Mr Paisley; Mr Giolitti; Mr Boyes; Mr Giolitti; Mr J. D. Taylor; Mr Giolitti; Mr Hume; Mr Giolitti 27
7. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council	8	Question No 4 by Mr Berkhouwer: Summer time: Mr Kontogeorgis (Commission); Mr Berkhouwer; Mr Kontogeorgis; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Kontogeorgis 28
8. Transfers of appropriations	8	Question No 5 by Mr Walter: Reduction in the discharge of waste from the titanium dioxide industry into the sea — Question No 6 by Mrs Weber: Disposal of waste from the titanium dioxide industry — Question No 7 by Mr Wettig: Significance of the directives on waste from the titanium dioxide industry — Question No 8 by Mr Van Minnen: Commission proposal on the surveillance of the environment affected by the titanium dioxide industry — Question No 9
9. Welcome	8	
10. Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution	8	
11. Order of business: Mr Coppieters; Mr Bangemann; Mr Coppieters; Mr Lange; Mr Fergusson	8	
12. Urgent procedure	9	
13. Speaking time	10	
14. Deadline for tabling amendments: Sir James Scott-Hopkins	10	
15. Introduction of the new Commission: Mr Thorn; Mr Glinne; Mr Klepsch; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Fanti; Mr Bangemann; Mr de la Malène; Mr Blaney; Mr Romualdi; Mr Paisley;	10	
16. Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament: Sir Frederick Warner	20	
17. Meeting place of Parliament — Motion for a resolution by Mr Enright and others (Doc 1-749/80):		

by Mr Schmid: Programmes to reduce pollution caused by waste from the titanium dioxide industry — Question No 10 by Mr Muntingh: Damage caused to fishing resources by waste from the titanium dioxide industry:

Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Walter; Mr Narjes; Mrs Weber; Mr Narjes; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Narjes; Mr Schmid; Mr Narjes; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Narjes; Mrs Squarzialupi; Mr Narjes; Mr Sherlock; Mr Narjes; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Narjes 28

Question No 11 by Mrs Lentz-Cornette: Seismological research at European level:

Mr Davignon (Commission); Mrs Lentz-Cornette; Mr Davignon 31

Question No 13 by Mr Hutton: Proposals on forestry:

Mr Gundelach; Mr Hutton; Mr Gundelach; Mr Balfour; Mr Gundelach 32

Question No 15 by Mrs Castle: Publication of a list of the sub-programmes in the United Kingdom:

Mr Giolitti; Mrs Castle; Mr Giolitti; Mr Price; Mr Giolitti; Mr Key; Mr Giolitti 33

Question No 17 by Mrs Squarzialupi: Observance of international standards on working conditions:

Mr Cheysson (Commission); Mrs Squarzialupi; Mr Cheysson; Mr Michel; Mr Cheysson; Mr Herman; Mr Cheysson; Mr Moorhouse; Mr Cheysson 34

Point of order: Mrs Castle 35

19. Agenda for next sitting 35

Annex 36

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

(The sitting was opened at 4 p.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. Resumption of the session

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 19 December 1980.

2. New Year's wishes from the President

President. — Before resuming our proceedings, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to convey to you and your families my best wishes for 1981. I wish you every happiness not only in your personal lives but also in your professional activities. I hope that they will be a source of the greatest satisfaction to you and that together we shall do much good work.

My good wishes go also to all the members of our staff, whom I thank very sincerely for their cooperation.

Finally, I should like to thank the representatives of the press, whose coverage of our proceedings helps us greatly in our work.

3. Welcome to Greek Members

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure to welcome the representatives of the Greek people to the European Parliament.

(Sustained applause)

On behalf of our entire Assembly I extend to you, our new colleagues, a most cordial welcome.

Your presence in this Chamber provides us with an opportunity to celebrate the accession of your country to the European Community, which has been in force since 1 January.

In welcoming Greece, the mother of democracy, the Community becomes Europe in the fullest sense. For all of us your country remains the cradle of our civilization, the land in which the term 'politics' in its noblest sense was first coined thousands of years ago.

We are very happy to be able to join you in the task of forging a European identity that will be enriched by that vision of mankind so dear to the Greece of antiquity, a vision of which we have the most acute need if we are to be in the fullest sense the democratic Community that our institution is called upon to represent.

President

We are joined by a network of common interests which will, I am convinced, forge indissoluble bonds between our peoples.

Greece comes to us bearing its history and its culture which are at the very root of Europe. In highlighting once more the Mediterranean dimension of the Community, this new enlargement brings us closer to the frontiers of our civilization which will achieve its full flowering in the region around the Mediterranean basin. Not only will this contribute to the influence of the Community in that part of the world, but this return to the sources cannot but give an added impulse to the joint task being undertaken together by the peoples of Europe.

We are also deeply aware of the support that the Community, as a maritime power, will derive from the entry into its ranks of a country whose destiny has always been linked with the sea in an unbroken tradition that extends back over 3 000 years.

This is an important milestone for the European Community, and it is due in no small measure to the heroic efforts of our Assemblies that we have been enabled to reach it. Ever since 9 July 1961, when the Association Agreement between the Community and Greece was signed, bonds of friendship have been forged between the Greek people and the peoples of the Community through the efforts of their respective representatives sitting on the Joint Committee of the Association. We know how in the course of long and arduous negotiations the work of this Joint Committee enabled opposing viewpoints to be brought closer together and brought about a better understanding of the problems and of the compromises that were possible. By our work together we have paved the path that we shall tread hand in hand from this day forward.

As of now you, our esteemed Greek colleagues, represent a country that is in the fullest sense part of our Community. We are on the threshold of a new area in which the new member of the Community will have to work hand in hand with the old members to bring about the structural changes that are so necessary at a time when Europe is at a crucial stage in its developments. The European Parliament, for its part, must leave no stone unturned to see that at the end of the transition period the economic and social systems of the ten Member States have been adapted to each other and brought into a balanced situation. This is the task to which it is called, and it must show the political resolve to accomplish it.

At this time of crisis when many doubts are being voiced about the future, the European Parliament must make a special effort to awaken in the public mind a sense of confidence in Europe. We must continue to bring home to the peoples of Europe the meaning of this enlargement and, in a difficult world economic context, the need for a European response

to the challenges with which we are faced. There can be no denying that these two questions are inextricably linked.

The accession of Greece shows that the Community is not the exclusive club of privileged interests that some people love to talk about. Today more than ever the construction of Europe must mean an increase in solidarity, both between the Members themselves and *vis-à-vis* third countries.

There are major differences in the levels of economic and regional development that have been achieved in the ten Member States, and unless action is taken to remedy these differences, they could undermine the homogeneous character of a Community which we would like to see effective and united in its actions. With this aim in view we must without further ado strengthen those Community policies which will promote the convergence of economic policies and lessen the most glaring regional imbalances. Substantial financial resources must be made available for this purpose through the budget which is the expression of these policies.

This quest for convergence must on no account be taken to mean that accession to the Community involves for any one of its members any loss of its own identity within a uniform and centralized body.

On the contrary the Community is enriched by the manner in which it unites the human and cultural differences that reflect the peculiar genius of each nation as it has been forged on the anvil of history. By putting them into a setting worthy of and suited to our age, the construction of a larger European Community enables them to unfold their full power and splendour.

A solidarity that was not extended to third countries, particularly developing countries, would be no more than the expression of a collective egoism. While the Convention of Lomé is a unique example of development cooperation based on equality between partners, it is up to the Community to improve even further its relationships with other developing countries. The relations that Greece has forged with the Mediterranean countries will undoubtedly help to give concrete shape to a global policy shared with all the countries of the Mediterranean basin, a policy for which the foundations have already been laid. These policies, which are an expression of solidarity, must, however, still be decided upon and implemented effectively by the institutions to which they are entrusted. In this connection we are all aware that every enlargement brings with it a degree of risk for the smooth functioning of the institutions, but this is a risk that we shall have to overcome.

If its strength is not to be frittered away, the Community now in the process of enlargement must endow its institutions with a greater degree of cohesion. We

President

must act in such a way that the serious thought that has gone into this matter, particularly within our Assembly, may bear fruit in the form of practical results that will enable each of our institutions to play its role to the full, while eliminating certain shortcomings which have become apparent in the Community decision-making process.

It is to this Community of Ten, more united, richer in diversity and more vigorous, that I address my warmest wishes for success today, without trying to gloss over the difficulty of the tasks that await us. Nonetheless they are exalted tasks, because what we have to do is to fashion a new future for Europe and to let the word go forth once again to the world that democracy is still a messenger of hope.

(Sustained applause)

I call Mr Bournias to speak on behalf of the New Democracy Party.

Mr Bournias. — *(El)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of my Greek colleagues in this Parliament from the ruling party of Greece, which had the honour to play a leading role in bringing about the great historical achievement of Greece's accession to the European Community, I offer my warmest thanks to the President of Parliament, Mrs Simone Veil, for what she has said today and in the past about our accession and about our country. I must also thank the leaders and representatives, both within the Member States of the Community and outside it, of the countries of the free world for what they said when the Treaty of Athens of 28 May 1979 came into operation.

I also offer my thanks to the international press and the media for the way in which they have contributed and enthusiastically welcomed the event. On 17 July 1979, when directly-elected members started work in the European Parliament, you praised, Madam President, the virtues of peace, freedom and prosperity, I should like to assure you that Greece has always fought for these three ideals and I believe that they will be preserved as a result of the unification of Europe. You may criticize me as over-optimistic, even utopian. Nevertheless, I go so far as to believe that the future not only of Greece and Europe but of the whole world depends upon a strong and united Europe.

(Applause)

And when I say united Europe I mean a large society of different races who, without losing their character and their national identity and integrity, will become citizens primarily of Europe and secondly citizens of their own country. This, of course, will not happen tomorrow nor in the next few years, but it will happen one day along with complete economic, monetary and political union. This is our duty towards mankind

regardless of race, colour or creed. In one sense we modern Greeks who are carrying on in one part of Europe the spiritual and cultural heritage of our ancestors, who were the first Europeans and founders of the principles of true and untarnished democracy, shall retain our racial unity. We shall be proud of Socrates, Plato, Pericles and Aristotle and our humanitarian and religious traditions, and we shall be good citizens of the State of Europe which, as pointed out by many people, has its roots in classical antiquity.

Ladies and gentlemen, much has been said and written recently about the economic benefits which Greece offers to the Community and expects from it. I am the last person to say that the international economic crisis will not affect Greece's adjustment to the Community. However, solutions were found for the problems of adjustment which existed during the previous phase of enlargement. The ten countries will face the common problems together, as the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mrs Thatcher, said in her welcoming message. I shall not make any special reference to the economic advantages deriving from the Greek merchant fleet for the Community which, as a result of Greek drive and ingenuity, will be converted into the world's leading naval power. The Community will also benefit from Greece's wealthy land and marine resources and will gain, with the accession of Greece, borders — as well as economic and political influence — with the Balkans, Middle-Eastern countries and Africa, with whom Greek businessmen have developed strong economic ties. However, over and above the pros and cons of economic considerations, and at this time of radical change in our nation's direction, we Greeks — as we always have done — attach superior importance to the significance of the contribution which we can make to the ideological, moral and political motives which led to accession. The geographical position of Greece, on land and at sea, represents the south-eastern borders of Europe and is part of the Central and Eastern Mediterranean which completes Europe's Mediterranean flank. The inclusion of Crete, the Dodecanese and the north-eastern Aegean within the Community is a contribution of great political and cultural significance. The international recognition and enthusiastic support given to Greece's accession, which was brought about by the ingenuity of Greece's most outstanding politician, the present President, Mr Constantine Karamanlis *(applause)*, together with the valuable support of the leaders of the Community, is opening up new roads for the political future of the Community and Greece. Ladies and gentlemen, I am proud for my generation because today, for the first time, it is sitting on equal terms with the representatives of great democratic European countries, and because for the first time the Greek language, the language of Plato's Republic and of the Gospels, is being used as one of the official languages of an important and enlightened international organization, namely the European Parliament.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Charalambopoulos to speak on behalf of the Panhellenic Socialist Movement.

Mr Charalambopoulos. — (*El*) Madam President, dear colleagues, we thank you for your kind words about Greece. As you know, PASOK is against Greece's accession to the EEC and has made it clear that it is in favour of a special relationship agreement instead of accession.

This is not the time or the place for a detailed analysis of the argument which led PASOK to adopt the position just referred to.

Since accession to the European Community is one of the most critical choices which will affect Greece's future for many decades to come, the Greek people should make that choice by means of a referendum, as was the case in almost all the other Community countries. For this reason, PASOK has declared that when the Greek people elect it to govern Greece it will propose to the President that a referendum be held so that the Greek people can be given complete and correct information. However, it will need to be pointed out that the Greek people are in the dark about the effects of accession.

The so-called information distributed by the mass media, which operates under the complete control of the government, is essentially one-sided and misleading propaganda which under-estimates the intelligence of the Greek citizen.

PASOK decided to participate in all the Community's organs, as it believes that through its active presence it can best attempt to protect the interests of the Greek people, reduce the damage of accession and make use of the possibilities for cooperation with Mediterranean countries in confronting common problems.

As you are aware, Madam President, PASOK has already joined the Socialist Group, as we consider it closest to our declared position and also because it offers us the possibility to give free expression to our opinions without being bound by the Socialist Group majority.

I would like to mention PASOK's great interest in the employment of Greek men and women in the Community's agencies. We believe that the choice will not be made on the basis of party criteria but on the basis of merit, as was the case in all the other Member States of the Community.

PASOK will fight to advance the rightful demands of workers in Greece and in the whole Community, to ensure the creation of free and independent trade unionism in Greece and to ensure that the public institutions and the will of the people achieve some real measure of importance.

As members of the European Parliament and the Socialist Group we will make every effort to support matters related to peace, disarmament and the reduction of tension.

Our most important duty is to improve the quality of life and the material standard of living of the workers and of all the underprivileged people for whom PASOK speaks, and we shall fight with determination and perseverance in order to achieve this major goal.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Zighdis to speak on behalf of the Union of the Democratic Centre.

Mr Zighdis. — (*El*) Madam President, on behalf of the Union of the Democratic Centre, I should like to offer you sincere thanks for the warm reception to the European Parliament which you gave to the representatives of the Greek people.

I should also like to say how pleased and moved I am by this solemn occasion.

Greece is an inseparable part of Europe, which received its name and a considerable part of its civilization from Greece. This, indeed, is an historic moment as the Greek people unite their destiny with that of the other nine countries which make up the EEC.

The Union of the Democratic Centre, which I have the honour of leading, has always — like those parties from which it sprang — been in favour of Greece's accession to the EEC. We adopted this position prior to 1957 when the German Chancellor at the time, Mr Erhard, proposed to the government that Greece should become a founder member of the EEC. We supported accession instead of affiliation in 1961. We would accept the accession agreement of 1979 with unreserved enthusiasm were it not for the few terms which gave us cause for certain basic reservations.

However, we are confident that with the goodwill of the members of the Ten these will be sorted out when the agreement is being implemented.

A reservation of a different kind arises from the fact that the adjustments aimed at providing Greece with a real western-style democracy have not yet taken place. These are:

- 1 — the assurance that the Greeks would receive objective information,
- 2 — the passing of a fair electoral law which does not misrepresent the will of the people,
- 3 — the abolition of government tutelage over the trade unionist and cooperatist movements,
- 4 — the decentralization of the civil service, and
- 5 — the recognition of regional self-government as the essence of democratic government.

Zighdis

These are, of course, our own principles but, as from today, they must also carry some weight with our colleagues in the Community if Greece's accession is to achieve its desired results.

We of the Union of the Democratic Centre firmly believe in the European idea, one of whose first advocates was, in the years between the two world wars Eleftherios Venizelos.

It is not just economic development which hinges on the unity of Europe, but also the guaranteed preservation of international peace and the hope for the eventual creation of a socialist society with a humane face — which will be the synthesis of the present two opposing social systems i.e., capitalism and communism — able to tame the beast of modern technology and to ensure for mankind freedom, personal dignity and social justice.

Our faith in a united Europe springs from our belief in the greatness of its mission.

Ladies and gentlemen, Madam President, I offer you my warmest thanks.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Loules to speak on behalf of the Communist Party of Greece.

Mr Loules. — *(El)* Madam President, first of all I should also like to thank you for the words of friendship you gave us, and I should like to thank the honourable Members of Parliament for the friendly reception which you gave the Greek delegation and myself.

Madam President, I am sure you will forgive me when I say that I do not share the optimism some of my Greek colleagues have expressed about the benefits Greece and its people will receive from accession to the EEC. I must also state once again the position of my party, the Greek Communist Party, in relation to the European Economic Community and remind you that my party — along with other Greek parties and the majority of the Greek people — was and still is opposed to Greece's accession to the European Community. We take this view because we consider the EEC to be a concerted attempt by the monopolies — and especially by the Western European multinationals — to concentrate and consolidate production so that they can more effectively exploit, for their own profit and that of big capital in general, the tendency towards internationalization of production.

By the creation of the EEC Western European monopolies are aiming to preserve their control and gain a larger share of the spoils by exploiting all workers, and in particular those workers in the economically underdeveloped and independent countries, such as Greece.

It is only natural, therefore, that an organization like the EEC should be in total opposition to the national interests of the Greek people.

Greece's accession to the EEC, far from facilitating economic development and improving the standard of living of the people — much more radical democratic changes in the country are needed for that — will prevent these things and will have far-reaching consequences on the lives of Greeks and on Greek economic development threatening even further the country's national independence.

Already, in fact, — even though we have only just entered the EEC — as the consequences of accession are becoming increasingly recognized, though to differing degrees and extent in the various social strata, so the people's opposition is also increasing.

On behalf of my party I declare that we Communists shall continue to struggle in Greece and in the European Parliament for Greece's withdrawal from the EEC, and at the same time we shall struggle to reduce as far as possible, for as long as Greece is in the EEC, the catastrophic consequences which accession to the EEC will have for Greece and its people, in order to defend the interests of Greek workers and national independence.

President. — I call Mr Pesmazoglou to speak on behalf of the Party of Democratic Socialism.

Mr Pesmazoglou. — *(EL)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I am speaking on behalf of the party of Democratic Socialism, also known as KODISO, which has always supported the idea of building Europe and Greece's involvement in this important process.

The participation today of Greek representatives in the European Parliament symbolizes the fact that Greece is part of a democratic community of nations whose future is interwoven with democracy and social progress. It is also a symbol of the national ties between the Community and Southern Europe.

We attribute great importance to the work of the European Parliament in which the peoples of the Community's countries are directly represented and we believe that the economic and social progress, as well as the security of the Greek people, are firmly tied to the progress and security of all European peoples.

The major importance of the European Parliament arises mainly from the following reasons:

(1) It underlines the European peoples' special role in and independent contribution to world affairs and international attempts for maintaining peace and cooperation amongst nations. The European Commu-

Pesmazoglou

nity also provides an invaluable institutional framework for overcoming the difficulties caused by prolonged world economic crisis.

(2) It ensures popular support and political power for all the other functions of the European Community and strengthens the move towards those institutional reforms which lead to a new society based on justice, humanity and progress for all the peoples of Europe. This is the society which will bring mankind into the 21st century.

(3) It supports the success of democratic government and upholds respect for political freedoms and human rights. I should like here and now, on this solemn occasion, to offer my wholehearted praise for the valuable support which the European Parliament and its many distinguished members gave the Greek people in their struggle against the dictatorship and in their fight to restore democracy in Greece.

The Greek people, out of a sense of trust and self-interest, will give its full support within the European Community to plans and solutions for promoting the common good. In other words, it will support developments which strengthen the coherence and unity of the European people and which uphold respect for international law and international legal procedures against any arbitrary act which threatens to disrupt peace.

In this spirit, with trust in and devotion to the noble concept of European unity, I am sure that my colleagues and I, the representatives of the Greek people in the European Parliament, will accomplish our important mission.

(Applause)

President. — I thank our Greek colleagues for their words and I should like to tell them once again how happy we are that they will be taking their seats amongst us from now on. They have all our best wishes.

(Applause)

4. *Supplementary budget No 2 for 1980 and general budget of the Communities for 1981*

President. — By telex of 23 December 1980 the President-in-Office of the Council informed me that on 22 December the Council had discussed the draft supplementary budget No 2 for 1980 and the draft general budget for 1981.

He indicated that the Council had not been able to take any decision on the amendments made by Parlia-

ment at its sitting of 18 December 1980 to the draft supplementary budget No 2 of the European Communities for the financial year 1980.

The communication from the President-in-Office of the Council did not, however, include any comment on the draft general budget for 1981.

Pursuant therefore to the provisions of the Treaties, I ascertained on the same day that the procedures provided for in the Treaties had been completed and that the two draft budgets had been finally adopted.

(Sustained applause)

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in my personal capacity and also, of course, on behalf of my Group and, on this occasion, on behalf of Mr Klepsch, our colleague Sir James Scott-Hopkins, Mr de la Malène and Mr Bangemann and their respective Groups, and finally on behalf of Mr Fanti and his Italian Communist and Allied colleagues, I would like quite simply to remind you that on 18 December Parliament took its decisions on the draft supplementary budget for 1980 and the draft budget of the Community for 1981.

I would also remind you that under the provisions of the Treaties those decisions of Parliament can only be reversed by an act of the Council voting by a qualified majority. As you know, the Council has adopted no such act and you, Madam President, therefore found that you had a clear duty to apply the Treaties and declare the budgets adopted.

On behalf of all my colleagues I would like to say that we fully approve the decision taken by you on behalf of us all.

(Sustained applause)

5. *Petitions*

President. — I have received two petitions, the titles and authors of which you will find listed in the minutes of this sitting.

These petitions have been referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions for its consideration.

6. *Documents received*

President. — Since the adjournment of the session, I have received from the Council, the parliamentary

President

committees, the political groups and Members of Parliament various documents, a list of which you will find in the minutes of this sitting.

7. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council

President. — I have received from the Council certified true copies of various agreements and legal acts. These documents, which you will find listed in the minutes of this sitting, will be deposited in the archives of the European Parliament.

8. Transfer of appropriations

President. — The Committee on Budgets has informed me that it has:

- (a) approved the proposals for transfers of appropriations Nos 7/80 (Doc 1-417/80), 12/80 (Doc 1-474/80), 16/80 (Doc 1-590/80), 17/80 (Doc 1-651/80), 20/80 (Doc 1-655/80), 21/80 (Doc 1-664/80), 23/80 (Doc 1-656/80) and 24/80 (Doc 1-657/80)
- (b) rejected the proposal for transfer of appropriations No 11/80 (Doc 1-527/80)
- (c) noted the proposal for transfer of appropriations No 18/80, on which Parliament has not been officially consulted.

9. Welcome

President. — It gives me great pleasure to announce the presence in the official gallery of a delegation from the Assembly of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, led by Mr Sinan Hasani, Vice-President of the Assembly.

This delegation is visiting the European Parliament for the third meeting between delegations of both parliaments and includes members of the two Chambers of the Assembly — the Federal Chamber and the Chamber of the Republics and Provinces.

On behalf of the European Parliament I extend to them a warm welcome and good wishes. I hope that the work of the delegation will be fruitful and will promote cooperation between our two parliaments.

10. Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution

President. — Mr Blaney and Mr Capanna have informed me that they wish to withdraw their motion

for a resolution on the hunger strikes by prisoners in Long Kesh and Armagh prisons (Doc 1-692/80).

11. Order of business

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

At its meeting of 18 December 1980 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed to you (PE 70.199/rev.).

At this morning's meeting the chairmen of the political groups authorized me to put the following proposals to you:

In today's sitting the speaking time allocated to each political group to speak to the statement by the President of the Commission would be reduced from 10 to 5 minutes.

At 8 p.m., after the first part of Question Time, items remaining on the agenda could be dealt with until 8.30 p.m.

On Wednesday the joint debate on the Spinelli and Balfour reports on own resources and budgetary questions would take place as planned, but the tabling of amendments and the vote on the motions for resolutions would be deferred to the February part-session in view of the excessively short deadlines for tabling the amendments.

As far as Thursday's sitting is concerned, Mrs Pruvot's report on youth activities would be withdrawn from the agenda, as it had not been submitted sufficiently early.

Are there any objections?

These proposals are adopted.

I have received from Mr Coppieters, on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members, a proposal, pursuant to Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure, that the oral questions (Doc 1-508/80, 1-769/80 and 1-770/80) listed at the bottom of the page in the draft agenda should not be included in the debate on the report by Mrs Walz (Doc 1-696/80), which is entered on Thursday's agenda.

I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Madam President, we have proposed that the oral questions by Mr Seligman, Mr Galland, Mr Müller-Hermann and others should not be taken in conjunction with the report by Mrs Walz.

Coppieters

Our intention, formed almost a year ago, was to hold a major debate on soft energy sources. A debate of that kind would have required months of preparation in the Committee responsible to avoid being constantly relegated to the background when we discuss energy problems. I am sorry that the majority of our political groups did not want this, as became apparent in the enlarged Bureau, and the debate has been changed into a meaningless port-manteau discussion covering all kinds of different topics. As a result a debate which is urgently necessary, particularly after the incidents at Le Hague, has been made impossible and we have been prevented from discussing to what extent soft energy can be an alternative to present sources of energy. My colleagues have succeeded fully in their efforts. When we read the briefing we find that the whole topic of energy has not been included among the important items on the agenda. We protest strongly against that fact and urge that the Walz report alone should be taken on Thursday, otherwise how can we honestly face the European public?

President. — I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (*D*) Madam President, I wish to speak against Mr Coppieter's proposal who, if I have understood him rightly, wishes the three oral questions with debate by Mr Seligman, my colleague Mr Galland and Mr Müller-Hermann and others to be struck off the agenda.

If Mr Coppieters wishes to withdraw an oral question with debate tabled on behalf of his own Group, he is perfectly entitled to do so. But I do not think he has any right to ask for oral questions by other groups not to be debated. Madam President, I would almost be tempted to set up a group to defend the rights of the majorities if his Group for the Defence of Minority Rights continues its present practice.

(*Laughter*)

(*Parliament rejected the proposal by Mr Coppieters*)

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (*NL*) Madam President, I obviously did not want to propose that these questions should be withdrawn but simply not taken jointly with the other matter; that was the purpose of my proposal.

President. — Thank you, Mr Coppieters, for this explanation.

I call Mr Lange.

Mr Lange, chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (*D*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to

put a request to you: the draft agenda indicates a joint debate on these two reports. The question of own resources has nothing to do with convergence, dealt with in the Balfour report. That is an entirely different matter. If we hold a joint debate we shall only be confusing two fundamentally different issues. I would therefore ask for both these items to be taken on Wednesday but in separate debates to allow a proper discussion, failing which we shall not be able to reach meaningful conclusions.

President. — Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I call Mr Fergusson.

Mr Fergusson. — Madam President, I refer to the debate on Uruguay (Doc. 1-693/80) which we are having on Wednesday: there is a deadline for amendments to the Uruguay report, which is 8 o'clock tonight, so that they can be debated on Wednesday, but in the English version of the report by Mrs van den Heuvel the amendments that were made in the Political Affairs Committee have not been incorporated. I imagine this is so in other versions as well. Now, we can, of course, make those amendments again but we would not know exactly how to do it unless the version that came out of the Political Affairs Committee is actually before us, so I request, at least until this confusion is ironed out, a postponement of the deadline for tabling amendments to that report.

President. — If that is the case, we could put back this deadline until 10 a.m. tomorrow. However, we shall speak of that again in a moment.

Are there any other comments?

The order of business is therefore fixed*.

12. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received from Mrs Clwyd and others a motion for a resolution, with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the steel industry in Wales and the rest of the United Kingdom (Doc. 1-771/80).

The justification for this request for urgency is contained in the document itself.

I shall consult Parliament on the urgency of this motion for a resolution at the beginning of Wednesday's sitting.

* See OJ No C 28 of 9. 2. 1981.

President

The motion for a resolution tabled by the Liberal and Democratic Group, with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the adoption of supplementary budget No 2 for 1980 and the general budget for 1981 (Doc 1-786/80) has been withdrawn.

13. *Speaking time*

President. — In agreement with the chairmen of the political groups I propose that the speaking time for each sitting be allocated in accordance with the provisions of Rules 28 and 36A of the Rules of Procedure.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

14. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

President. — I propose that we fix the deadline for tabling amendments as set out in the draft agenda, except for the Spinelli and Balfour reports (Docs 1-772/80 and 1-136/80), for which the deadline would be fixed for 6 February at 12 noon, and the Van den Heuvel report, for which it would be fixed for tomorrow at 10 a.m.

I call Sir James Scott-Hopkins.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, is it not possible, as we are going to divide out speaking time separately on Wednesday between the Spinelli and Balfour reports, to have the vote on Mr Balfour's report during Thursday's sitting? Would that not be the correct way of going about it? There is no problem over translation of the documents, so I suggest that we take the Balfour report and the amendments, if there be any, during Thursday's sitting.

President. — You are proposing therefore that in the case of the Spinelli report the deadline for tabling amendments should be fixed for Friday, 6 February but that for the Balfour report the deadline for tabling amendments should be fixed for tomorrow at 10 a.m. and that the vote should be taken of Thursday.

Are there any objections?

The deadline for tabling amendments is therefore fixed*.

* See OJ No C 28 of 9. 2. 1981.

15. *Introduction of the new Commission*

President. — The next item is the introduction of the new Commission of the European Communities.

I call Mr Thorn.

(Applause)

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, everyone here will understand that I find it difficult to hide what I feel as I stand in this Chamber today. I was elected with you in June 1979 and, with ten years as a Member of this House and four terms as President of the Council behind me, I see so many familiar faces as I look around.

You bring back memories of various stages of a political career, of which this particular moment is undoubtedly a high point.

In my view neither purpose nor degree of commitment should depend on the particular hat one is wearing. What is both new and humbling for me, as I stand before you today as the new President of the Commission, is that I have been entrusted by the governments of our ten countries with the difficult task of presiding over the institution which is regarded as the power-house of European integration at a time when the European venture is plagued on all sides by the myriad problems which have dogged our slow and difficult progress of years past.

I am well aware of the daunting nature of the task which has been entrusted to me. For this reason I would like to begin by paying a warm tribute to my illustrious predecessors, and in particular to Roy Jenkins, who ran the ship with determination and courage for the last four years.

(Applause)

My colleagues — all of whom are present at this solemn gathering — and myself are depending on your support as the elected representatives of the peoples of Europe. We are determined to stick resolutely to the course plotted for our generation by, amongst others, that most illustrious of Europeans, Robert Schuman. We have no alternative unless we want to dash the legitimate hopes of 270 million Europeans.

The Commission would like to associate itself with the tribute which Madam President has just paid to the Community's newest Member State. In particular we would like to welcome the representatives of the Greek people who have come to join you on the benches here. I do not propose to dwell on all that Greece means to Europe and to each one of us. But I

Thorn

would like to emphasize that we are all aware of the hopes and the political faith which fired Greece's desire to take part in the European endeavour.

(Applause)

This second enlargement of our Community should be a source of encouragement to us because it affirms the vitality and attraction of what we are doing. It should also serve as a reminder to the institutions of their responsibilities and obligations.

There is no doubt that, initially, the political advantages of enlargement will be overshadowed from time to time by the problems of integrating a less-prosperous economy into our Community during a period of world-wide difficulties. I sincerely hope that at such times, and in our negotiations with the other applicants for membership, we will not lose sight of the political goals we share: the creation of a European Union based on law and democracy. We must not disappoint those who are counting on us.

(Applause)

This is particularly important because we are celebrating this happy event, the arrival of a new Member State, in the midst of general gloom. There is no need for me to tell you that our society is in the throes of an extremely serious crisis which is affecting both our economy and our will to succeed. What is worrying is the simultaneous waning of enthusiasm throughout the Community for European union. Its importance and significance are no longer understood, and that is why I am grateful to all those who, like my friend Mr Genscher, stress the vital necessity of European union.

Irrespective of what bench we sit on, we are all aware that the prospects for the 80s are not too bright. The recession is deepening and acquiring the proportions of a catastrophe which threatens not only prosperity but also the foundations of our society. Our very civilization may well be transformed.

I am still deeply convinced that the venture enshrined in the Treaties, the venture which made it possible to reconcile and reconstruct a Europe devastated by war and lay the foundations for its later prosperity, will be our salvation too in the economic and social crisis which is threatening the very values on which our society is based. For, as we all know, it is not merely prosperity and economic health which are in danger.

More than 35 years ago six governments took a decision to act in concert, realising that they would never solve their common problems singlehanded. Today, as these same countries, with their four new allies, prepare to withstand the demands and avarice of the superpowers of the eighties, the motto of 'united we stand' has, to my mind, lost none of its attraction and none of its pertinence.

Madam President, it was at Parliament's express request that it was decided that this would not be a political discourse, even in the tenor of its quotations and references. Since Parliament rightly wanted its first exchange of views with the Commission to be of a political nature, where it could take up political positions, and that in a forthright and critical manner, I would hope that this first discussion would be in the nature of a general exploratory debate, in which I could put before you the programme of a Commission of whose loyal cooperation I can give you the most sincere assurances. That is why I now wish to confine myself to some remarks of a very general nature; I hope that you will understand.

Instead of setting out new goals and objectives, I would simply remind you that the objectives we are pursuing are solemnly entrenched in the preambles to our Treaties. What many people are inclined to forget is that we are endeavouring:

- to lay the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe;
- to promote economic and social progress in our countries by common action to eliminate the barriers which divide Europe;
- to secure the constant improvement of living and working conditions for our peoples;
- to remove existing obstacles and promote concerted action to guarantee steady expansion, balanced trade and fair competition;
- to strengthen the unity of our economies and to ensure their harmonious development by reducing the differences existing between the various regions and the backwardness of the less-favoured regions;
- to contribute, by means of a common commercial policy, to the progressive abolition of restrictions on international trade;
- to confirm the solidarity which binds Europe and the overseas countries and to ensure the development of their prosperity.

These are the circumstances in which the new Commission takes up office. There may be doubt as to whether the Commission is a political institution. But it is so by its very nature, by the express wish of the Contracting Parties to the Treaties, and finally by necessity. It is the driving force behind European integration and the guardian of the Treaties. It is the central pivot in the dialogue between the Community's institutions. It has a vital part to play in grasping the nettle of the crisis and in trying to meet the aspirations of the people of Europe.

The new Commission which I wish to introduce to you today combines a wealth of experience with fresh talents. As I introduce my team, I will of course add a few words about the way we have organized ourselves.

There is no need for me to introduce most of my colleagues since they have been answering your ques-

Thorn

tions faithfully and to your satisfaction for years. A word about the newcomers — all of whom served their own countries with distinction and devotion before they answered Europe's call. All of them have served as Members of Parliament.

Mr Contogeorgis, who has a valiant political past, comes to us from Greece.

(Applause)

As you know, he conducted his country's accession negotiations very efficiently before he joined us.

Mr Narjes used to hold a senior position on the Commission's staff. He gave up his mandate as a Member of the Bundestag to join us.

(Applause)

Mr Andriessen, formidable like all former Finance Ministers and leaders of political parties, comes to us from the Netherlands.

(Applause)

Mr Richard, a former British MP, won himself an international reputation as his country's Ambassador to the United Nations.

(Applause)

And last, but not least, my old friend Michael O'Kennedy, whose courtesy and efficiency you learned to value during his term as President of the Council, two short years ago, when he sat on the opposite side of this Chamber.

(Applause)

You already know what our portfolios are to be. There has been publicity and comment. You have received a list or will receive one this very afternoon. I would like to confirm that we are resolved — and this, Madam President, is one of the vital points and one of the few points that I am going out of my way to underline with particular emphasis — to work as a close-knit, united team and assure you that the allocation of portfolios reflects, first and foremost, our concern to strengthen internal cohesion and highlight collective responsibility. We are well aware that the social tensions and distortions provoked by the crisis may create difficulties for our Community. This is why we are determined to stand shoulder to shoulder; for us, collective responsibility means solidarity. This is the only way that each of us can make the best use of his experience and talents to further the Community's cause.

It is in this spirit that each of us gave a solemn undertaking before the Court of Justice this morning that we would, in compliance with the Treaties, be

completely independent in the performance of our duties, in the general interest of the Community, and that we would neither seek nor take instructions from any Government or from any other body.

I should like to stress the importance of this solemn undertaking given this morning, which, far from being a mere formality, is crucial to our mandate.

I have been struck by the fact that in recent years, and more particularly since your election by direct universal suffrage, recurring quarrels of form and substance have strained relations between our two institutions. The same point was made at the recent European Council in Luxembourg, which deplored the permanent state of inter-institutional strife. The new Commission's first concern, therefore, was to get to grips with this problem. We did so at an informal meeting held before we actually took up office.

It would be premature to draw any conclusions at this stage. But we have come up with a number of indicators, which I will put to your President without delay. What we would like to do — and there is no time like the present — is to take a close look at what can be done to help us play a more effective part in your proceedings, and by so doing strengthen the dialogue between our two institutions.

However this dialogue must be unequivocal and hardhitting.

(Applause)

Perhaps I can take this opportunity, since the matter is so topical, of referring to the budgetary developments which the Commission has already discussed. This is not the time to go into details, but I feel that Parliament should know where the Commission stands on the 1980 supplementary budget and the 1981 general budget, both of which have been declared adopted by your President.

Parliament is aware of the difficulties which have arisen within the Council. It knows that certain Member States consider that the procedure laid down by the Treaty and by the Financial Regulation has been breached. It is not for me to comment on the Council's position or on the discussions it has held on this matter.

As far as the Commission is concerned — and here I speak for each and every Member — I would like to make it quite clear that we consider both the supplementary budget for 1980 and the budget for 1981 to be legal and hence enforceable.

Where is this situation leading? The issues are two-fold: legal and political. I do not need to tell you that certain Member States have failed to make the payments flowing from adoption of the 1980 supplementary budget. The situation with regard to the 1981

Thorn

budget is less clear and there are still doubts as to the position of certain Member States. The Commission is looking into the matter. But Parliament can rest assured that, if it finds that certain Member States have committed irregularities, it will want the situation rectified. It will obviously keep Parliament informed of developments, in full awareness of the position of the Commission as guardian of the Treaties.

So much for the legal. Now for the political. The Commission considers that today's budgetary problems must be discussed by the institutions, that political solutions must be found. I am convinced that you share this point of view. The Commission has felt for some time that operation of the budgetary procedure could be improved and believes that in this context the institutions have an obligation to each other and more importantly to our Community. Revision of the Financial Regulation will give us an opportunity of discussing and solving a number of these difficulties. But essentially, the two arms of the budgetary authority must endeavour to ensure that the difficulties we have experienced over the last three years do not recur. It is vital, for instance, that the conciliation procedure should live up to its name. The Commission, and its President, is prepared to play its full part here.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in conclusion, you will have noticed that I have purposely confined myself, on this, our first encounter, to assuring you that the new Commission is well aware of what is at stake as it takes office. It is ready and willing to shoulder its responsibilities. It will always do so with courage and determination.

But I would like to make it clear, here and now, that Europe, and hence the Community, is not run solely by 'Brussels', by stateless technocrats far-removed from day-to-day reality. If the Community is misunderstood, if not viewed with suspicion, by many Europeans, much of the blame can be laid at the door of all the governments of the Member States.

(Applause from certain quarters)

If your governments are incapable, as the recent European Council in Luxembourg demonstrated, of defining either the content or the shape of European Union, the Commission declines all responsibility for the delays and the setbacks which the public rightly denounces.

At the same time — and providing you can spot the enemy — I would urge you, ladies and gentlemen to be ruthless whenever we fail in our task. Let me say again that critical vigilance by you, the representatives of the people of Europe, is essential to the life of Europe's institutions.

In a few weeks' time, when we present our programme, you will be able to judge for yourselves whether or not we are lacking in determination or in imagination. Meantime, let us work together to restore institutional peace, and recreate a climate of understanding, mutual trust and cooperation. It is to this end that I stand before you. Thank you for your kind attention.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission of the European Communities has now been reconstituted after a procedure which has lasted for several months and certainly somewhat retarded the action of that institution of late. The Commission has also increased the number of its Members to fourteen following the enlargement of the Community to include Greece. And now we in Parliament are confronted with a renewed institution with which we shall be obliged, for better or for worse, to compare our respective positions at great length.

I shall be very brief; I would just like to highlight something Mr Thorn said about collegiality. In the present economic situation and with the social circumstances confronting us and the crisis of society, a whole series of reasons and political pretexts militate in favour of a kind of renationalization of certain interests which might properly be defined as belonging to the Community. In my view when it comes to defence of legitimate national interests, the Council, the Committee of Permanent Representatives and the national governments can or should suffice. What we want in particular of the new Commission is that it should reflect in a continuous and intransigent process the spirit and resolve of supranationalism in its detailed work and at the level of basic action. We noted Mr Thorn's reference to this aspect a moment ago.

A further point: the Commission of the European Communities is of course responsible for routine daily management, but it must also engage in a dialogue, on behalf of the Community, with European public opinion.

In respect of both those important tasks I would like to give voice here to a rather keen regret already expressed repeatedly in the past months by other spokesmen of the Socialist group: one small flaw in the Commission, as it is constituted at present, is the fact that its Members are all men. A sense of balance and imperative social reasons should have led to the presence of several women Members in the Commission. We all know that the responsibilities for such

Glinne

appointments lie at widely varying levels and I do not wish to lay the blame at the door of the Commission, but it is most unfortunate to note that the Commission, whether it likes it or not, is rather sexist, to use the current term.

May I add that we are expecting further information from Mr Thorn in a few weeks time. We have already been able to form an opinion through the information published after the conclave at Gaichel, through various sources and even indiscretions. We await with great interest the governmental statement, if I may call it that, which will be made to us in February. Mr Thorn knows that we in the Socialist Group have always had a feeling of particular sympathy and great cordiality towards the Commission as constituted on successive occasions, to the extent that the Commission has always seemed to be a natural ally and a particularly constructive partner in the dialogue with our institution.

Madam President, I shall confine myself to those remarks today.

We address our good wishes to the Commission, despite its foreseeable shortcomings and the fact that it contains no women Members. Whatever may be our differences of opinion, we feel bound to convey our good wishes, given the serious problems facing the Community, our countries and our peoples at present.

The Commission may rest assured that we shall support it to the extent compatible with our own role, our own programme and our own responsibilities as the Socialist Group in the European Parliament.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* We listened with great interest to the statement by the President of the new Commission, Mr Thorn. We are grateful to you and to the Members of the new Commission for setting to work in the spirit, and not merely according to the letter, of the Treaties. We have placed high hopes in you, Mr Thorn. We wish you and your thirteen colleagues in the new Commission good fortune and success in your work.

(Applause)

We are not debating the programme of the new Commission today. We shall be doing so during the next part-session in February when it has been submitted to Parliament. Nevertheless I welcome the fact that the President of the Commission has already taken this opportunity to highlight certain key points. I listened with great interest, Mr President, to the

passage in your speech about cooperation and dialogue between the Council — of which you yourself have experience — the Commission and Parliament, as well as your specific points on cooperation with this Assembly. I see that as an important pointer to the future; let us continue on these lines and place our trust in cooperation in the interests of the development of Europe and let us not try to seek legalistic ways of postponing decisions which must obviously rest with the politicians.

(Applause)

Cooperation between the institutions is essential if the Community is to flourish and develop further into a political union. Clearly there are good intentions on both sides. We shall need inventiveness, determination, frankness and skill.

I welcome your clear statement that the Commission considers the 1980 supplementary budget and the 1981 budget legally valid and therefore binding.

(Applause)

I welcome that fact on behalf of my Group. It reflects respect for the will of the elected Parliament which our President has carried through in a convincing manner.

May I point briefly now to certain expectations which we have of the new Commission's programme. We are assuming that the Commission will be presenting a programme with a timetable and priorities ready for adoption and will be bound by that programme after its adoption by our Assembly. We expect the programme to take account of the need for further development of the legal basis of the European Community following the accession of Greece and the enlargement towards the south — an institutional task of high priority. Similarly we are looking forward to the development of a new basic concept for the relationship between the national and Community policies on expenditure. Then we expect the Commission — if necessary on the basis of Article 235 of the EEC Treaty — to make proposals for the further development of the European Monetary System, for an economic and monetary union and for a common energy, regional and industrial policy; we expect it to make progress with the adjustment of the common agricultural policy and to pay greater attention to the fight against unemployment as part of an overall social policy; we are also looking for concrete proposals on safeguards for our raw material supplies, for proposals to develop a common educational, cultural and information policy framework and, finally, we are looking for an increase in own resources and harmonization of value-added tax rates with a shift from the principle of the country of destination to that of the country of origin in assessing value-added tax. These are the clear wishes of my Group, to which we give priority. I hope that they will be taken into account.

Klepsch

Let us set to work, Mr President, in the spirit which inspired your whole address; let us make progress together in Europe.

(Applause)

President. — I call Sir James Scott-Hopkins to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, it is my pleasant duty to follow my two colleagues in welcoming, on behalf of my Group, the new President of the Commission and his colleagues, and I welcome not only those of them who are new colleagues to the Commission — particularly our Greek Commissioner, who has just joined us; I wish him extremely well in his new tasks — but also those Commissioners whom we have been dealing with in the past. It is nice to see them still there; we know their strengths and, of course, their weaknesses, and it will be interesting over the next few years to be able to play on those strengths, to say nothing of their weaknesses. We are delighted to see them here.

I must say I join with Mr Glinne when he talks about his regret that there were no ladies appointed to the Commission. I think it is a grave pity that this has happened. I look back on the debate we held on these very important matters in connection with the Rey report and at the words which were actually said by the President-in-Office, Mr Colombo, at the time. I will not read them all out, because time will not allow me to, but he did say that he would personally take pains to see that Parliament's request that it should play some part in appointing Members of the new Commission was respected; but as this House and you, Madam President, know full well, we played no part whatsoever in the choice or appointment of Members of this new Commission. I find that regrettable, and I hope that in future steps will be taken to see that we do, in fact, have the opportunity to do so.

If I may say so at this particular moment, it does seem to me, looking at the Treaty, that after two years this House should have the opportunity of assessing whether or not the Commission President's first two years of office have been satisfactory or not and of taking a vote on the matter. I am quite certain, knowing the President of the Commission as well as I do over the years, that the result will be satisfactory; but I do say this, that *en principe* this House should have the opportunity after two years, as laid down in the Treaty, of having a full debate as to whether or not they are satisfied with the performance, not only of the President, but of his collegiate body of Commissioners. That I will hold the President of this House to do in two years' time from now, for I am sure that would be the wish of this House.

I also think, Madam President, that one wishes to look at the situation in connection with the debate we are

going to have. I am not going to enter into a political debate now, nor am I going to present a shopping-list, as my colleague Mr Klepsch did, of what my Group wishes to see the Commission do — that will come next month when the President of the Commission presents his programme to the House — but I am sure that that programme will not only be necessary but will be imaginative as well. If it is not, of course, the obvious course for this House to take will be to try to remedy that situation. And I am glad that before that happens he and his colleagues have taken as a collegiate body decisions concerning the budget for 1981 and the supplementary budget for 1980. I welcome these decisions and warmly congratulate him.

In conclusion, Madam President, I find quite extraordinary the remark which has been made quite frequently, both in my country and over here in the rest of Europe, that there are not enough jobs for 14 Commissioners — a president and thirteen others. There you have 270 million people and the Commission, which, as its President has said, is the motivating force, the power-house, of this Community: surely to goodness there are more than enough jobs to be done by this new Commission if these 270 million people in our Community are to move forward along the lines laid down by our founding fathers.

(Applause)

I am sure that there will be no problem here. I wish the Commission well on behalf of my Group — not only the President of the Commission, Mr Gaston Thorn, but all his Commissioners, new and old, during their coming years of office. When they do well, as I am sure they will, we will congratulate them: when they do badly, as I am sure they will not — but they might — we will censure them.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Fanti to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Fanti. — (I) Madam President, I wish to follow the previous speakers in conveying greetings and good wishes to the new Commission, to all its Members and to its President.

May I, however, make two remarks about its composition, even if the responsibility for this lies at a higher level and certainly not with the Commission itself. Sir James Scott-Hopkins and Mr Glinne have already made one of these remarks: the governments of the Member States did not think fit to respect the wish expressed by our Parliament and in other quarters for a woman to be appointed to the new Commission; this omission represents a lack of sensitivity and a delay in recognizing an important process of change which is under way in the life of all the countries of Europe and elsewhere in the world.

Fanti

I am making my second observation as an Italian. I note with regret that in appointing the two Italian Commissioners — for whom, let me be quite clear about it, I have the greatest respect — the government of my country has adhered once again to the old criterion of the governing majority without taking account of the national and Community requirement for greater representativity which should also be respected.

I took good note of the statements made by Mr Thorn, of his more general remarks and of his comments on his awareness of the crisis now facing us: that crisis does not merely have external origins but is affecting the Community from the inside as is clearly apparent from the problems which occurred during the last meeting of the Council of Ministers in Luxembourg on the subject of the budget, to which Mr Thorn referred.

My Group clearly reserves the right to express its own views when we come to indicate our position during the February debate. May I take this opportunity, however, to suggest that the debate on the Commission's programme should be as wide-ranging and detailed as possible, given the great importance of that programme to the future of the Community; the debate should be organized in such a way as to enable the political groups of Parliament to express through a vote their views on the programme as requested in the resolution adopted by Parliament and therefore binding on Parliament.

The next four years will be decisive in the life of the Community: either Europe will succeed, through the firm commitment of its constituent forces, in escaping from the present crisis situation and building a secure future based on renewal and transformation of its institutional and policy-making existence or else we shall see, since we all know that a status quo is impossible, a rapid decline leading to total disintegration. We are convinced of the inevitability of this decisive choice and shall be firm and rigorous in our positions.

This directly-elected Parliament maintained with the Jenkins Commission relations which were marred by a fundamental contradiction: the contradiction between a Commission which was coming to the end of its term of office and a directly-elected Parliament which had just entered on its mandate and was therefore full of vitality. That disparity has now been made good by the appointment of the Thorn Commission. I think it proper for us not merely to ask for commitments from others but to express now our own commitment to the Commission. We must first and foremost be committed to close cooperation between Parliament and the Commission in the context of the institutional and policy renewal which we Communists support and propose: a practical form of cooperation based not simply on words but on precise and constructive proposals based on an analysis of the problems reflected, for instance, in the opening of a major

debate on the important topic of own resources during this part-session; we are also convinced of the need for our agreement or disagreement with the Commission to be expressed in a spirit of frankness and loyalty so as to perform, each in our own sphere and within our own terms of reference, the functions which are necessary to enable the Community to make progress — progress which is today more than ever vital.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Bangemann to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Madam President, I too wish to begin by looking into the future. Our Group places high hopes in you, Mr Thorn, and in your colleagues in the Commission. After listening to you today, even if this was only the first introduction to your new Commission, we believe that our hopes will be fulfilled. I hope you will bear with me, however, if I also look back briefly and draw the attention of my colleague Mr Fanti to the following point: the resolution drawn up by Jean Rey, a colleague whom we all remember with respect and who had the honour to formulate for the Political Affairs Committee the position of Parliament on the composition of the Commission and future cooperation with it, indicates in paragraph 4 that the Commission should not merely have one woman among its Members but that from 1 January 1981 membership of the Commission must include a reasonable number of women.

I know Mr Thorn, that you are not to blame but that the fault lies with the governments of the Member States who failed to take action on this motion for a resolution drawn up by our friend Jean Rey.

I should now like to look back at another point without seeking to criticize too highly the procedure followed once again by the Commission in distributing portfolios among its Members; perhaps I had better not be too critical so as not to give a bad example and encourage other governments to intervene again. In my view it would have been better — perhaps things will change in future — for the new division of political responsibilities to be accompanied by a corresponding division of administrative responsibilities. It is very difficult for Parliament, through the parliamentary control which we wish to exercise, to follow these responsibilities in detail if the political division is not accompanied by an administrative distribution. We are therefore always faced with some difficulty in considering certain decisions by the Commission.

I know that our major debate on the Commission's programme is not to be held until February. But I should not like to lose this opportunity to make two remarks about the future relationship between Parliament and the Commission, remarks which seem to me

Bangemann

to extend beyond a programme debate. They are of a more fundamental nature and concern the basic relationship between the Commission and Parliament.

Firstly you may rest assured, Mr President and Members of the Commission, that this Parliament has never joined the chorus of those who have tried to undermine the European and political function of the Commission by dismissing the Commission as Eurocrats. In most, if not indeed all, cases the people who have voiced such criticism themselves bear political responsibility for the failure of Europe to advance — and I am intentionally now looking to the immediate left of Mr Fanti — trying in that way to lay the political responsibility at the door of the Commission.

The Council must recognize quite clearly that we shall not allow ourselves to be separated from the Commission by such manoeuvres but shall jointly pursue our European policies. For that to be possible, Madam President, two basic agreements are necessary between us and the Commission in the view of the Liberal and Democratic group. Those agreements concern first the budget — not the present budgetary conflict which we shall be able to solve through a joint approach, but the question as to whether the Commission is ready to make a budget adopted by the Parliament and Council, i.e. by the two arms of the budgetary authority, the basis of its executive power, without constantly saying that a legislative decision by the Council, necessary on major political issues, is lacking. Nobody disputes the fact that it is necessary on major issues. The principal point for us in the budgetary dialogue with the Commission is whether that body will be prepared in future to cease resorting to the same old pretext and will instead be able to follow the wishes of Parliament on lesser matters too.

My second point is this: we are a legislative body which in reality has very little power of decision over legislation. The authors of the Treaty wanted that to be so.

They also wanted the Council to take legislative decisions. Madam President, the authors of the Treaty could not imagine that the Council would merely shelve hundreds of proposals submitted by the Commission and adopted by Parliament, thus holding up the progress of the Community.

(Applause from certain quarters)

In the context of the Treaties we therefore need a political agreement with the Commission which might take the following form: the Commission will submit its proposals to the Council and Parliament as stipulated in the Treaties. At the same time it will give a political commitment to Parliament — which it will also show to the Council — by taking up the amendments requested by Parliament under certain conditions which we shall have to discuss further, the essen-

tial thing is that it should undertake to cooperate with Parliament in this way. We should then have a considerable part to play in the legislative process.

Madam President, I want to stress that this would require no amendment to the Treaty. This is not a sterile institutional quarrel. It is a step which would bring about substantial progress in the decision-making machinery of this Community. Let us not delude ourselves. The repeated assertion that the peoples of this Community are fed up with the European Community and with the progress of European unification is not true. It is not yet true. The national governments and national bureaucracies have clearly had enough, and if they continue with their present tactics the peoples of the Community may one day also have had enough. That would indeed be a catastrophic development. Our sole task is to prevent such fatigue from developing and in this we must cooperate with each other, by convincing the national governments, the national administrations and all those who no longer want European unification to continue, that it is always worth while to seek progress towards unification in Europe; let us seek to convince them of that through our own work and cooperation. We shall then have the full support of the peoples of Europe. We have a joint responsibility to bring that about.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr de la Malène to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr de la Malène. — *(F)* Madam President, Mr President, in the fast-moving world in which we live today, it is traditional for assemblies to formulate good wishes and votes of thanks and I have great pleasure in conveying our good wishes to the new Commission. My wishes go in particular to President Thorn whom we all, and I in particular, have known for a very long time. I have known him in a great many offices, all of which he has filled with great energy, talent and devotion to duty. Because of all his qualities he has been able to continue on a brilliant career. We feel sure that the talents which have guided him in the past in the course of his career will prove equally apparent in his new office. We welcome that fact for him and even more for Europe. May I also convey our congratulations and good wishes to all the Members of the outgoing and new Commission. Like many of you, I would like to say a special word to the new Greek Commissioner whom I have the honour and pleasure of knowing; I wish him a warm welcome and am convinced that he will work efficiently for his country and for Europe.

I noted Mr Thorn's observations on a number of points. He expressed the hope that we should arrive at a situation of peace between our institutions. I warmly

de la Malène

welcome those words. I too hope for peace between the institutions because I believe that our European Community has nothing to gain from these institutional quarrels. They cause a great deal of time to be lost and do great damage, outside our rather secret gatherings, to the image of the Community; they do a great deal more harm than good. I hope his words will not fall on deaf ears. I hope too that we shall not, as has perhaps too often been the case in the past, see two institutions combining their efforts against a third — I shall name no names — either directly or indirectly. I find that a disturbing situation. It may bring short-term gains but in the medium term we can only lose because the real strength lies elsewhere: Europe is the loser, and under these conditions I think it would be better to change our methods.

Mr Thorn also said to us that he and his colleagues would place the emphasis on collegiality. We have been formulating that wish for a long time and we hope that it will be attained: we welcome the intentions of the Commission. Mr Thorn said that the Commission intended to be a political body. For it to be so the Commission must meet a fundamental condition: its decisions must be taken on a collegial basis. Otherwise the Commission is not entitled to lay claim to political authority. If it is to be a motive force in politics it must become the collegial body which the Treaties wanted it to be, and the spokesmen for the Commission must at all times speak on behalf of the whole Commission.

As you and I all know, the new Commission has a heavy workload in front of it. Mr Thorn said so just now most eloquently. The general world situation and the situation in Europe are unfortunately threatening us with disintegration rather than with greater strength and if, in areas such as the capital market or the motor vehicle industry, individual failures prevent our Community from finding the appropriate response, given the difficulties existing today in the world and in Europe, the centrifugal forces will win the day and European unification will fall by the wayside. The more difficult the situation, the greater is the tendency of the centrifugal forces to win the day and the greater the effort required to reverse the trend. Allow me to make one observation on this subject.

Among its other vital tasks, the Commission has been instructed by the Council to prepare a fundamental report by next spring. We place high hopes in that report. We all do so. And I would like to remind the Commission that it must take care not to sacrifice existing achievements to dreams or aspirations. That is a widespread tendency in this Assembly in particular, and we shall have occasion to comment briefly on this in connection with our budgetary debates. There is a tendency to believe that something has been achieved when it has not. And if we sacrifice real attainments to idle dreams nothing will remain: the achievements will be lost and the dreams will not be realized. The risk of

this is so current in the Community institutions that we feel bound to issue a warning.

Mr President, I wanted to put these observations to you. I have done so on behalf of my political Group not in a spirit of criticism but, on the contrary, because we expect a great deal of you and of your collegial institution. It is precisely because we expect a great deal of you that I wanted to put these fundamental observations. Having done so, it remains for me to express the hope for your own sake, and above all for the sake of Europe, that you will be equal to the heavy responsibilities placed in you and to our high aspirations.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Blaney from the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Blaney. — Madam President, might I join those who have wished every success to the new President of the Commission, Mr Thorn, and to the other Commissioners who have recently been appointed.

To the President of the Commission perhaps I may express deep disappointment that, coming as he does from the smallest country in the Community, with vast experience behind him as President of the Council, Member of this Assembly, member and minister of his national parliament, he has not availed of this opportunity to consult this elected Parliament on the appointments and the division of responsibilities in the Commission. Instead Parliament has been demoted, treated in a most casual and cavalier manner. We were the last people, in fact, to know what is going on and were simply informed of what had taken place after the various unedifying wrangles of which we have read in the newspapers and heard and seen on our radios and TVs in recent weeks.

We would have wished that, instead of blatant interference by national governments in the allocation of the responsibilities in the Commission, this Parliament, elected by and representing 260 million people plus the people of the Greek nation who have joined us since 1 January, might have had an opportunity of expressing its views. Instead we have witnessed the selfishness of the major powers in trying, through their various Commissioners, to capture the most important portfolios. Indeed, in some instances Commissioners have been so overloaded with responsibilities that no single individual could possibly be capable of doing full justice to the important tasks which have been showered on them, while other Commissioners are virtually unemployed or semi-employed so that their talents are being thrown to the four winds.

Blaney

This is the disappointment, Mr President, that I wish to express here today. I should not be interpreted as being critical of the Commissioners who share this burden together with the Parliament for the next four years. We wish you every possible success, because on your success depends the success of this Parliament and on our joint success depends the future of Europe and indeed of a greater part of the world. So we wish you well.

We hope that your success will be great, but nevertheless I want to pinpoint those things which I have criticized and which are really a negation of the whole idea and concept of our togetherness and usefulness as a united Community. We could and we will do better. But if we could get the major powers and their governments to cease interfering in the allocation of responsibilities and give this elected Parliament a little more consideration, then we could expect greater things to emanate from the Commission. But despite the difficulties we do hope for better things in the future.

Finally, Madam President, I wish to ask why the policy and programme of the Commission, which we have been promised in a month or so, are not available now. How is it that when a government is elected, a new Prime Minister can be chosen almost at once and can present his cabinet within a matter of hours or days and his programme within days or weeks? Yet the Commission has had months to do this and is composed of experienced men, the majority of whom have served in public office. I merely say that the sooner we have the Commission's programme the better, so that this Parliament can discuss it.

May I conclude by congratulating one of our Commissioners, Mr Gundelach, who has shared the portfolio on fisheries. May I congratulate him and ask him to contrast his recognition of the importance of agriculture and fisheries, to the extent that he feels that it should be the responsibility of two rather than one Commissioner, with the jealousy and selfishness of some others who have continued to monopolize portfolios lest someone might succeed in doing a better job than they could do?

President. — I call Mr Romualdi, who is a non-attached Member.

Mr Romualdi. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the non-attached Italian Members I gladly join in the expression of good wishes by the leaders of the political groups to President Thorn and the Members of the new Commission who have a vast burden of work at this point in history characterized by many conflicts, as the President himself has pointed out.

The whole Community and each of its Member States suffer from serious problems. My country for example

is living through a grave political and institutional crisis accompanied by an economic and social crisis to say nothing of other evils: the natural disasters which have recently struck parts of the Mezzogiorno and a terrorism, confused in its motives and objectives, which pervades the whole country and is responsible for murders and other acts of brutality. The latter evil is, of course, not confined to Italy because its tentacles extend out everywhere, and it is a potential risk to us all, a risk against which the new Commission must also help to guard us.

I note that the Commission has overcome its first obstacle and attained its first objective by drawing up its own programme of work and wisely distributing the portfolios between its various Members. That distribution was not easy because of the political implications which it obviously has. It now remains for us to await the development of the programme which President Thorn has briefly outlined.

For the present we shall confine ourselves to expressing our strong hope — a hope which now extends to other parts of our continent and in particular to the Mediterranean basin, since Greece has joined the Community, thus increasing its strength and widening its horizons — that the Commission will manage to become the government, the real executive of the Community. Mr Thorn, that is the only way of achieving peace between the institutions.

I read a few days ago on the occasion of President Jenkins' departure that, in the four years of his administration, the Commission has been too open to the wishes and objectives of the Council and was still to the specific interests of the individual capitals, even where their interests were in open conflict with those of our Community. I do not know whether that is true. But I do know that in performing its allotted tasks the Commission has enormous difficulties, as Mr Bangemann pointed out just now. Neither do I intend to dwell here on the responsibilities of the outgoing President.

Nevertheless I should like to believe that the four years of Mr Thorn's presidency will be marked by a resolve to create and stubbornly defend the independence of the Commission in its relations with the Council. In my view President Thorn has an effective means of attaining that result: he should place his trust increasingly in the authority of this Parliament whose decisions, in the spirit and in accordance with the wishes of the peoples who freely elected it, must be reflected in guidelines around which a great and united Community can be built: not simply an economic Community but a social, political and human Community of the nations and the peoples of our Europe.

President. — I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — In the time available to me, Madam President, I rise to urge the new Commission to place the plight of Northern Ireland on the top of its priority list. Northern Ireland has the worst plague spot of unemployment in the whole Community with 95 000 people now unemployed. Agriculture is our largest industry. Because of grain prices our intensive farming is being destroyed. We have lost a third of our breeding herds. Why cannot intervention grain be stored in Northern Ireland and be made available to save our agricultural industry from total ruin? With the advent today, Madam President, of the representatives of the Greek nation in this Parliament I am reminded of a famous call associated with that nation. For those Members of this House not aware of that call I will explain that it was called the Macedonian call. I would like to issue a Macedonian call to the new Commission to come over to Northern Ireland and help us.

President. — At the close of this debate, and before proceeding with our agenda, I should like to convey my personal good wishes to the President of the Commission and to all the Commissioners — both those with whom we have already been accustomed to work and the new Commissioners — and to express the hope that our two institutions may continue to cooperate under the most favourable conditions possible.

16. Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament

President. — The next item is the statement from the Commission on the action taken on the opinions and proposals of the European Parliament*.

I call Sir Frederick Warner.

Sir Frederick Warner. — Madam President, I am slightly puzzled by the fact that one of the texts in front of us refers to 20 resolutions and the other to 21. According to somebody, one of our communications has just vanished into thin air on its way from the Parliament to the Commission. Did that really happen or not?

President. — We shall look into this question and give you an answer in the course of the part-session, perhaps even tomorrow if that is possible.

17. Meeting place of Parliament (Vote)

President. — The next item, pursuant to Rule 33 (4) of the Rules of Procedure, is the vote on the *motion for a resolution by Mr Enright and others (Doc 1-749/80)*:¹ Meeting place of Parliament.

(Parliament adopted the preamble and² the sole paragraph)

After the sole paragraph, I have Amendment No 1 by Mr Enright seeking to add two new paragraphs to read as follows:

- 1a. Resolves that the part-session of February and July shall take place in Strasbourg;
- 1b. Instructs the Bureau to place before Parliament, at the March part-session, its proposals for the second half of 1981.

Mr Enright requests that separate votes be taken on the two halves of paragraph 1a. The first part would therefore read 'Resolves that the February part-session shall take place in Strasbourg', the second part 'Resolves that the July part-session shall take place in Strasbourg'.

(Parliament rejected the first part of paragraph 1a, and then in successive votes adopted the second part of paragraph 1a and paragraph 1b)

I can now allow explanations of vote.

I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — I shall be extraordinarily brief, Madam President. All I want to say is that I shall be voting for this motion for a resolution not merely because I proposed it, but because I think it shows that this Parliament is beginning to have some of the virility a true parliament should, and is taking control of its own affairs. Let us continue with that tide which is beginning to flow in the right direction.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Mart.

Mr Mart. — *(F)* Madam President, I can only say how much I regret this vote which is unfavourable to Luxembourg. I regret it all the more as the resolution in question is hostile solely to the smallest Member State, which has up to now made all the necessary efforts in the interest of Europe.

* See Annex.

¹ See debates of 19 December 1980.

² By electronic vote

Mart

Ladies and gentlemen, this hostile vote is therefore a real blow to the people of Luxembourg.

President. — I call Mr Hamilius to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Hamilius. — (*F*) Madam President, a few months ago this Parliament adopted by an overwhelming majority, indeed almost unanimously, a resolution calling upon the Council to assume the responsibilities placed in it by the Treaties and take a decision to put an end to our operating difficulties due to the dispersal of our places of work.

If the Council is unable to reach a decision within the time allotted to it by us, which seems not unlikely in view of our past experience, we have decided to take matters into our own hands. We agreed on the same occasion and with the same degree of unanimity to respect the status quo. Madam President, our Bureau acted accordingly.

The resolution which Mr Enright has tabled and on which the whole Parliament is now to vote reflects first and foremost, in our view, the impatience and discontent felt by this Parliament in face of the consequences of the present dispersal of our places of work. It also reflects, I believe, the satisfaction we feel with the fact that individual offices have been placed at our disposal here in Strasbourg. This improvement enables us to measure to an even greater extent than in the past the disparity between our present working conditions and the conditions which should really exist in a European Parliament.

May I say to Mr Enright and to all those who share his opinion that the Liberal Group is equally dissatisfied and we too believe that decisions should be taken by the Council, or failing that by us, this year. Nevertheless my Group will vote overwhelmingly against the resolution as a whole.

I should like now to explain our reasons for adopting this position.

The first and by far the most important reason is precisely the fact that we have already taken a decision and placed the Council in front of its responsibilities; by voting now on the resolution by Mr Enright we merely diminish our credibility. We have, of course, taken matters into our own hands, as Mr Enright said, but we have done so prematurely. The Council may see this as a pretext, as an encouragement not to take its responsibilities. There are other reasons, Madam President, for which we adopt this position. Let me remind you of just one: as I said a moment ago, in deciding on the venue of our meetings, the Bureau acted in full conformity with the authority and duties conferred on it by our Rules of Procedure and with the resolution adopted by us almost unanimously. In

seeking now to take a decision of this kind in plenary sitting, the view of the Liberal Group is that Parliament has embarked upon a procedure which is liable to do great harm to the efficiency of our parliamentary work.

To avoid any misunderstanding, Madam President, I would like to hope that this vote by Parliament is not, as my friend and colleague Mr Mart believes, an expression of hostility or distrust towards a city or nation but is due quite simply to the desire to ensure the proper working of our institution. I also venture to hope, Madam President, that this vote is not a vote in favour of a particular town and does not express a preference for one particular solution. We should have adhered to our initial decision. That is why we bitterly regret what has happened here and we express our regret in the interests of Parliament itself.

(Applause from the right)

President. — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group)

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Madam President, I shall give a brief explanation of vote. In the final vote my Group will be voting against this motion for two main reasons: firstly we have up to now expressly entrusted the Bureau of Parliament with this task, and our experience has always been satisfactory because there are a great many problems to solve e.g. negotiations with the staff, the distribution of working time and the preparations which have to be made for accommodation and other matters. If we adopt this resolution, we shall be shifting to Parliament as a whole the discussion of the expediency of technical and other related arrangements. I do not see that as a progress and do not believe either that it will facilitate the great decisions which this House has to take.

Allow me to make the following points: this House had decided to set a time-limit for the Council. We have done so, but there are forces in this House which, after our initial decision, are now seeking to take matters into their own hands without waiting for the negotiations with the Council and without really considering matters. As a result the effectiveness of our first motion is — let me be quite clear about it — being called into question.

A further point: I do not believe it desirable to take decisions of this magnitude on the basis of emotional arguments such as the situation at the place of work during a part-session or other arguments relating to earlier situations.

My Group therefore discussed the whole problem in detail at its last meeting and took a vote. No member of our Group supported the Enright motion and we shall not therefore be voting in favour of it.

President. — I call Mr Habsburg.

Mr Habsburg. — (D) Madam President, as one of those Members of this Assembly who supported the urgency of the Enright motion last month but will now be voting against the motion itself, I wish to make the following statement: from the start I have considered this motion impossible to implement but morally justified. It is intended to convey to the Bureau that we do not want decisions to be taken by higher bodies with certain understandable exceptions. This is particularly true in the present instance, because the decision of the Bureau is quite clearly the result of pressure from forces who have no mandate from the electors. In the eyes of those forces this Parliament seems only too often not to exist for the people of Europe but for the trade union leaders among its staff.

The Enright motion rightly stresses once again how impossible our working conditions are. Many of us welcomed the published intention of holding all our part-sessions in Strasbourg in future. I am not saying this merely on my own behalf, although I personally consider this city to be the only logical capital of Europe. I am saying it rather on behalf of all those among us who take seriously the desire of the electors to construct a politically strong Europe. This year Parliament has a hard fight ahead of it. We must defend ourselves against the petty reactionary nationalism of all too many governments with their bureaucratic bodies which, in almost all our capitals, are rather like the tail wagging the dog. An elected Assembly of the people is a thorn in their side. Therefore they do everything possible to limit the activities of the elected representatives. At the same time they criticize us on the grounds that our Parliament costs the taxpayer too much. That is however only partly true. The real truth of the matter is that close on one-third of our expenditure could be cut at a stroke of the pen if our governments at long last met their obligation and reached agreement on our seat. Their present conduct is simply squandering the hard-earned money of their citizens. That is the underlying significance of the vote on the Enright motion. I hope that it will be interpreted as a shot across the bow.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Madam President, I shall be voting in favour of this motion, although I am not entirely in favour of all its points. In particular I see no mention of another possible meeting place which to my mind is the most appropriate, namely Brussels; nevertheless I shall vote in favour of the motion because it contains a number of essential aspects. Firstly, it places emphasis on the fact that we must have a single seat. Secondly, it points out that this

Parliament itself must have the freedom of manoeuvre, maturity and authority to decide itself on its own place of work, especially now that those who have formal authority have proved sadly lacking.

I consider it vital to the effective functioning of this Parliament for us to be provided as soon as possible with a single place of work. I cannot see how we can reconcile our electors with our travelling existence which is detrimental to our work.

Finally I welcome the statement in the resolution that Parliament decides to lay the schedule of part-sessions in 1981 before the whole House for a vote. On an essential matter like this involving historical and other factors I cannot agree to a *fait accompli* being created through a series of small steps. I consider it imperative for all Members to take part in this decision-making process and for this matter not to be left solely to the Bureau.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Prag.

Mr Prag. — Madam President, I would just like to say that I shall abstain on this motion, very simply because of the implied slight to Luxembourg contained in the amendment. Luxembourg is a city for which I have great personal affection and respect; it is also a city which has played a very important part in the development of the European Community, and I regard it as a matter for regret that there is a clear implied slight in the amendment.

Having said this, I want to add that as far as the general sentiment expressed in the motion about the powers of this Parliament is concerned, there I am fully in favour. The sessions which we have held in Luxembourg — let us face it — were not happy sessions. They were not happy sessions because the organization was grossly inadequate, and I am afraid many of my colleagues tended to blame Luxembourg for inadequacies which were our own inadequacies. There were no proper signs indicating where to go or where various offices were — we had no offices and yet the building was full of empty rooms which various people found, and I am afraid that this defective organization was blamed on Luxembourg. Perhaps the Bureau was waiting to allocate the empty rooms in the nasty little corner which the political groups have as meeting rooms. There is a rather unpleasant little 'oligopoly' in the matter of meeting rooms which prevents Members of this Parliament from holding their meetings and makes them uncertain, right up to perhaps an hour or even a few minutes beforehand, when they may have a group of 70 or 75 people, whether they are actually going to be able to hold their meetings.

Prag

It is high time that the Bureau realized that it is the servant and not the master of this Parliament and that it must express the wishes of the whole Parliament: just as a rapporteur has to express the wishes of the committee, so the Bureau must express the wishes of the Parliament, and for that reason I am torn between the two aspects of this resolution. I will not vote against Luxembourg but I am wholeheartedly in favour of the general sentiment that this Parliament itself, the whole House, must deal with such vital matters.

President. — I call Mr Pearce.

Mr Pearce. — Madam President, I want to explain why I supported both amendments and will vote for the motion. I think if you took this motion as a criticism of the Bureau, then you would be getting the right message. I think it is time that Bureau Members, Quaestors and group chairmen recognized that this Parliament is for us, for all of us, not just for the convenience of a few, and I bitterly regret that although we have the facilities here to question the President of the Commission and the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers there seems to be no mechanism whatsoever for putting questions to or getting justice from our own Bureau. Maybe that could be changed one day.

The problem of Luxembourg has partly been touched on by Mr Prag. I have no doubt, Madam President, that you had an office, that the group chairmen had offices and that the Quaestors had offices. I did not have an office, and it is intolerable to be expected to work on a chair in a bar with nowhere to put your papers. It is sheer incompetence on the part of the Bureau that no steps were taken to cure that. In the same way the arrangements for lunch were quite inadequate there. Similarly just getting to Luxembourg is a problem for some of us living in certain Member States. Because the Bureau and the Government of Luxembourg took no suitable measures, it would be necessary for me to leave my home on a Sunday night and to arrive back on a Saturday morning.

Therefore, Madam President, it is not that I have anything against Luxembourg, but until such time as the Bureau is prepared to make the same sort of working arrangements for all of us as any other employer or organization would, I do not want to go there again.

President. — I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — Madam President, I asked to give an explanation of vote in December and I appear to be the victim of the system whereby you go to the end of the queue if you are put in first. The trouble is,

Madam President, that we are confusing a vote on an issue of principle with a vote on an issue of detail, and it puts me in a dilemma. The issue of principle is who should decide where we meet, and the issue of detail is where we should meet in July. I very much regret that the amendment was passed, because I am forced to consider which of these is the more important.

On the issue of principle it is absolutely clear that this Parliament as a whole must be given a direct say in the conduct of its own affairs and, in particular, on where it meets. At present it could scarcely be more indirect. The enlarged Bureau, the staff, the national governments, almost everybody has a say in where we meet except for us the elected members of this Parliament. We were elected to represent the millions of people of Europe and we are entitled to take a decision on how that can be done most effectively.

Now as to whether it should be Strasbourg or Luxembourg, I merely say, for the information of those who have been shouting for Strasbourg, that it is a lot cheaper to meet in Luxembourg for a start and that secondly if you look at your Treaties, you will find that all four of the institutions are in Luxembourg and that the Treaties mention the seat of the institutions, and not the seat of any one body.

Having said that, however, I have to decide which is more important — the matter of principle or the matter of detail, and I come down in favour of the matter of principle. That is why I shall vote for this resolution.

(Applause from the right)

President. — I have received from Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), a request, pursuant to Rule 35 (4) of the Rules of Procedure, for a roll-call vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

Vice-President

18. Question Time

President. — The next item on the agenda is Question Time (Doc. 1-778/80).

* For details of the result of the vote see the minutes of this sitting (OJ No C 28 of 9. 2. 1981).

President

We shall begin with questions addressed to the Commission.

Question No 1 by Sir John Stewart-Clark (H-532/80):

Is the Commission satisfied that Community regulations in the poultry industry are being observed properly in all countries of the Community, and in particular, is inspection being carried out uniformly, are birds being correctly graded, is water content properly controlled, and are low interest rates and exemptions for social security benefits giving unfair advantage to any Member State?

Mr Gundelach, Member of the Commission. — (DK) The honourable Member, Sir John Stewart-Clark, has in reality put four different questions about the situation in the poultry industry, and most of his questions are rather technical in nature. I shall therefore try initially to give a general answer, and my answer is that the Commission is not entirely satisfied with the situation in the poultry sector as regards various factors which may influence the fairness of competition. That is why we have put forward a number of proposals including one on the water content of carcasses which is to enter into force on 1 April, while a further proposal is now before the Council and yet another will be submitted in the near future.

Sir John Stewart-Clark. — Having had the good fortune to be the one to put the first question to the new Commission, I welcome President Thorn's call to this Parliament to be exacting in its requirements. I hope that he agrees that responsible questions are a helpful method to this end.

I should like to thank Commissioner Gundelach for his answer. I am very glad to hear that there are specific measures coming into effect on 1 April in regard to the content of water. The four aspects mentioned in my question may be of a technical nature, Commissioner Gundelach, but the main point at issue here is whether the Commission is really on top of this as far as control is concerned. Is it not the case that certain Member States are not really carrying out the regulations already in force?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I do not think it's true to say, as the questioner suggests, that Member States are not properly implementing the current regulations. As the honourable Member knows, we have the necessary means to ensure respect for the regulations. I am more disturbed by the fact that it has not yet proved possible for the Council to adopt uniform rules in all areas. It has done so in respect of the water content, but we still need uniform regulations on health controls, for example, carried out by veterinary surgeons or other competent persons. In that area there is no uniformity and we do not have a uniform situation either in

respect of the grading of carcasses. There is therefore a need for new rules, and the Commission will be putting forward the necessary proposals.

As regards the other problems relating more to the actual market situation, i.e. differences in interest levels which influence sales or production and variations in social costs which procedures have to meet, we must recognize that we are living in a Community which is still imperfect in the sense that it has not yet been able to make a break-through towards the coordination of the Member States' economic and social policies.

Mr Turner. — Has the Commissioner published the report he made last year on the inequalities in the different countries in regard to poultry inspection? Everybody has read it, but I don't think it is published yet. Secondly, what is he going to do to get rid of the inequalities to which attention is drawn in that report?

Will he follow his very good example in the fishery sector, where he has appointed or is about to appoint a number of EEC inspectors to inspect the national fishery inspectors? Until we have EEC inspectors in agriculture as a whole inspecting the national inspectors, we shall never feel that we are treating each farmer fairly in each country.

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) We have, of course, given attention in our studies, to which the honourable Member himself referred, to certain differences in the implementation of control measures about which I spoke in my earlier answer concerning the inadequacies of control measures. On the basis of our investigations we shall in a matter of months, or even sooner, be putting forward a series of new proposals to replace the current rules with a specific view to achieving more uniform substantive provisions and more uniform measures for control. As regards the last question, there is no provision at present in agricultural policy for something similar to the proposal made for fisheries policy i.e. physical inspection by the Commission itself; it may well be maintained that this aspect of agricultural policy has not been sufficiently developed and that we may transfer our experience in a new policy area, fishery policy, to the longer established area of agricultural policy in order to ensure uniform implementation of uniform controlling measures.

Sir Frederick Warner. — I understand the difficulties about working towards a complete system of uniformity, but there is very widespread dissatisfaction in the industry and therefore any progress which could be made would be highly welcome. Would the Commissioner consider whether, as a first step towards uniformity, one could introduce a Community system of licensing — not day-to-day inspection but a Community system of licensing — so that there

Warner

was at least a guarantee that no premises were operating without the full installation of capital equipment which is required by the regulations?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I readily recognize the fact that dissatisfaction is felt in industry about the disparities between the individual Member States. As I have already said, I consider it necessary for new rules to be laid down and for the existing rules to be satisfactorily harmonized. As regards a licensing system to ensure the conformity of production in the poultry sector, I would ask the honourable Member to show patience. That is such an important step, partly from the angle of the precedent it would create for other areas of production, that I cannot immediately give a favourable answer. But I have already given a favourable answer as regards the underlying motivation for this question with which I entirely agree.

Mr Paisley. — Could the Commissioner tell us how the numbers of inspectors compare from country to country for similar size poultry factories?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) There are naturally differences between production inspection arrangements in the individual Member States.

When we talk about uniformity, we are referring to the control measures taken to safeguard the interests of consumers. We are also talking about the uniformity of economic conditions over which we have political control. But we have not reached the stage where there can be a uniform interest policy, a coordinated interest policy or a coordinated social policy. There are certain natural advantages, and we live in a Community where these natural advantages are one of the driving forces of the dynamism of the Community's economy and this is something which cannot be coordinated.

President. — As they are on the same subject, we shall take together Question No 2 by Mr Welsh (H-527/80):

Will the Commission make a statement to Parliament on the results of its discussions in Geneva on 21-23 October and the timetable for renegotiation of the Multifibre Arrangement?

and Question No 38 by Mrs Ewing (H-630/80):

Will the Commission comment on the present state of the Multifibre Arrangement negotiations?

Mr Haferkamp, Member of the Commission. — (D) The GATT Textile Committee met on 22 and 23 October last year in Geneva to consider the operation of the Multifibre Arrangement pursuant to Article 10 of the basic text. The supplier countries

expressed dissatisfaction on this occasion. They maintained that the agreement had been deprived of its substance and complained about proliferation of restrictions in the textile trade. Most of them also criticized the bilateral agreements with the Community. On this occasion the Community emphasized the difficult economic situation facing its textile and clothing industry. The Community also drew attention to certain factors distorting competition in the international textile trade.

Following this meeting held to review the situation, a further meeting of the GATT Textile Committee took place on 9 December 1980 to begin negotiations on world textile trade to cover the period after the expiry of the second agreement. As you know, the current agreement is due to expire on 31 December this year.

On 9 December 1980 an initial exchange of views was held, in the course of which the delegations put their main positions. The Community expressed its support for special regulations to cover world textile trade after the expiry of the current agreement. None of the delegations present refused to enter into the necessary negotiations.

A further meeting of the Textile Committee is scheduled for the late spring, but we do not have a definite date as yet. The Commission will be establishing bilateral contacts between the main participants. The Commission also intends to submit initial proposals for a negotiating brief in March or April. That brief should be adopted by the Council before the summer recess. The negotiations proper will then probably not begin until after the summer recess. The Commission naturally consults representatives of the textile sector in the Community.

Mr Welsh. — As it is a day for congratulations, may I first offer our congratulations to Mr Haferkamp on his reappointment and express the hope that, as far as matters of trade are concerned, this Commission will be even more responsive to the needs of the people of Europe, as expressed in this place, than its predecessor?

The Commissioner will certainly be aware that the multifibre negotiations are of commanding interest to all citizens of the Community, and not least to our new friends in Greece, as being of absolutely fundamental importance for the development of trade policy for the EEC. Will the Commissioner therefore give us an assurance now that the fullest possible information will be given to Parliament, through its Committee on External Economic Relations, at all stages of these negotiations, and further will he undertake to give full weight to Parliament's views when proposing this directive to the Council of which he spoke, provided these views are communicated in due form and before the end of April?

Mr Haferkamp. — (*D*) I can give assurances on the matters referred to here. I am assuming that the committees of Parliament, several of which will be involved, will be making suitable arrangements for rational cooperation which the Commission sees as an important prerequisite for the strengthening of our negotiating position. I join the honourable Member in stressing the importance of this agreement for areas extending even beyond the textile industry. We are involved here in negotiations with a large number of countries, many of which are developing nations. Our relations with our partner countries are equally important and affect all the citizens of this Community.

Mrs Ewing. — May I, in accordance with Scottish custom, wish the new Commission a happy New Year — both the old faces and the new?

In his negotiations will the Commissioner take into account the apparent practice of some multinationals, who use subsidiaries in developing countries and are thus getting back-door preferential trade? Could this be examined, and would he consider the requiring of certificates of origin in the textile industry for all intra-Community trade?

Mr Haferkamp. — (*D*) In the course of these negotiations we shall be considering the positions put forward by the governments of the partner countries. We shall, of course, take account of economic factors and of the specific needs of undertakings. We shall have to consider all the technical instruments necessary to safeguard compliance with the results of the negotiations; rules and certificates of origin may be one such instrument.

Mr Seal. — May I join in the congratulations and congratulate Mr Welsh on at last having put down a question of his own on textiles?

Does the Commission appreciate that many textile manufacturers and thousands of textile workers in the EEC, particularly those in the United Kingdom, are depending on the Commission reducing the quotas of incoming textiles in these forthcoming MFA negotiations in order that they may stay in business? Will the Commission also bear mind, when these quotas are being negotiated, that Greece is now a member of the EEC, and consequently will it ensure that lower quotas are negotiated in order to compensate for the inclusion of Greek textile production as part of the overall EEC textile production?

Mr Haferkamp. — (*D*) We shall, of course, take account of the fact that the Community now has ten members. We must safeguard the interests of the whole Community; I would not care to state at this stage whether this can best be achieved through low quotas for our partners.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Would the Commissioner bear in mind just how many regions of this Community are in very serious difficulties because of the decline of the textile trade, and will he make a very serious endeavour to regulate the volume of imports in accordance with the state of the home market in the Community, in other words to have some form of growth recession clause?

Mr Haferkamp. — (*D*) It is quite clear that a balance will have to be struck in these negotiations between several different objectives. It is obviously our task to ease the situation of a hard-hit branch of industry and to use for that purpose the instruments available under international agreements e.g. in GATT. We have done so in the past and shall continue to do so in future. In the negotiations on new provisions to cover the period after 1981, or after the expiry of most bilateral agreements in 1982, we shall obviously take account of the problems faced by this sector. It must be recognized that in the area of textile production and clothing the various branches of the industry and products are affected to differing degrees by imports. There are great difficulties in some sectors while others are doing very well. We must recognize this fact, and cooperation with you will be particularly useful, given your special practical experience in these matters. Over and above this we shall also have to take account of the interests which we have as a Community in the area of exports, e.g. for products of the mechanical engineering and other industries, and we must allow for our overall interests in our relations with other countries. In other words a number of important aims must be reconciled. We shall do all in our power to strike an optimum balance.

Mr Schmid. — (*D*) Mr Haferkamp, will the Commission raise the question of international labour standards in the negotiations on the Multifibre Arrangement, i.e. the problem of comparable social conditions and that of comparable conditions in working life?

Mr Haferkamp. — (*D*) The Commission has, as you know, proposed on various occasions in the past the inclusion of a social clause. I would remind you of the Convention of Lomé and of the scheme of generalized preferences which was recently debated in this House. The Council of Ministers has never taken up our proposals. We must consider to what extent it is reasonable to include a clause of this kind in a sectoral agreement; our study of this matter has not yet been completed. I imagine we shall be returning to this point when preparations for the negotiating brief have advanced further. I think we must take great care — perhaps it is also a matter of presentation — to avoid creating the suspicion that we are seeking by means of a clause of this kind to prevent others from exporting to the Community. That is not our underlying inten-

Haferkamp

tion, but it is a matter with which the Commission has been concerning itself for a long time and with which you will be familiar from the other examples I have quoted to you.

President. — Question No 3 by Mr Paisley (H-536/80):

Will the Commission make a statement upon what proposals it has received from the United Kingdom Government for the integration scheme in Belfast and in response to the offer of £ 100 million for Belfast made by Commissioner Burke in Belfast in October 1980?

Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission. — (I) The Commission has not as yet received a formal proposal from the United Kingdom Government relating to an integrated operation for the Belfast area. The Commission is perfectly willing to take this initiative but, until a formal decision has been reached, the financial contribution from the Community cannot be fixed, as was already indicated by President Jenkins and Commissioner Burke during their visit to Belfast last October.

Mr Paisley. — Could the Commissioner tell us whether there have been any informal exchanges with the United Kingdom Government about this very important matter which means a lot to the citizens of Belfast? And has any suggestion been made to the Commission that housing could be included in this scheme, as housing is one of the most pressing needs in the city at the present time?

Mr Giolitti. — (I) There have been informal contacts between the services of the Commission and the Northern Ireland authorities, in particular the Departments of Environment and Commerce of Northern Ireland, with a view to defining the framework of an integrated operation programme. We know that the Northern Ireland authorities are thinking of including the construction of housing in the integrated operation. I must say, however, that as of yet there is no regulation which would enable the Commission to finance programmes for housing construction. Under certain conditions such financing might perhaps be provided through Community loans under the New Community Instrument, but no provision is made for contributions for this purpose from the financial instruments at present available to the Commission.

Mr Boyes. — Does the Commission agree that the reason for the United Kingdom Government's refusal to produce its share of the money is that it is staggering down a road which leads to ever-growing unemployment, because it is blindly following economic policies based on the theory of monetarism?

Mr Giolitti. — (I) As regards the second part of the supplementary question, we have no plans at present to set up other integrated operations because we must await our experience of the first programme. In due course, when this becomes possible, we shall certainly be willing to examine other proposals. In answer to the first part of the question, the Commission — as I have clearly stated but perhaps I had better do so again — is not confronted with any refusal by the United Kingdom Government to propose or undertake this operation. I said, and I now repeat, that we have not yet received a formal proposal, but a study has been initiated to examine the possibility of setting up an integrated operation in the Belfast area.

Mr J. D. Taylor. — Has the Commission already received a formal submission for Naples, the other city which together with Belfast was selected for an integrated programme? Does the Commission know, or has it endeavoured to find out, why the United Kingdom Government has failed to submit the Belfast proposals at the same time as the Italian Government succeeded in submitting the Naples proposals? Is the Commission aware that the present draft proposals for Belfast have prompted allegations of sectarian bias, and will the Commission ensure that these proposals for an integrated programme for Belfast will be the subject of full consultation with all local authorities involved before giving final approval to this integrated programme?

Mr Giolitti. — (I) Naples is a different matter, but there are links between the two because they are both integrated operations. I shall give a very brief answer to the question as to whether we have received a formal request in the case of Naples and whether the operation has been initiated. The Italian Government has defined its own undertakings and the Commission has thus been able to define, for its part, the commitments which it can give on behalf of the Community. As regards the organizational procedures — if a formal proposal should be submitted by the United Kingdom Government — for the integrated operation in Belfast, it is quite clear that the very nature of an integrated operation necessitates involvement of all the authorities — at Community, national and local levels — at all stages from planning to implementation of the integrated operation.

Mr Hume. — I should like to congratulate the Commissioner on the selection of Belfast as one of the first areas to have an integrated operation and to comment that the very selection of Belfast is recognition by the Commission of the serious problems which obtain in that city.

I would point out that, in addition to the existing very serious housing problem in that city for the past 10 years, the city has been placed under a great strain

Hume

as a result of one of the biggest population movements in Western Europe since the Second World War arising out of the troubles in Northern Ireland for the past decade. In the area which has become so overcrowded because of that population movement, today 1 out of 2 men is out of work. These facts alone underline the seriousness of the problem. I therefore ask the Commissioner to do all in his power to expedite the development of this integrated programme. Could I also thank him for his openness in seeing local authorities in the Belfast area and in consulting them on their ideas as to what should be included in this particular operation?

Mr Giolitti. — (I) I thank the honourable Member for expressing his appreciation of the Commission's initiative. I have visited the city on more than one occasion and am well aware of the serious and urgent nature of the problems in the Belfast area; I am therefore able to give an assurance to the honourable Member and the whole Parliament that we shall continue and that I personally shall continue to give the closest possible attention to these problems and to the actions which may usefully be taken to facilitate and promote a solution.

President. — Question No 4 by Mr Berkhouwer (H-558/80):

Will the Commission do all its power to encourage the Nine and as many of their European neighbours as possible to retain in 1981 the uniform system of summer time, which was at last introduced in 1980, in spite of the summer time blackmail practised by the GDR?

Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission.

— (El) The Commission is determined to continue its efforts to bring about a uniform system of summer time in the European Community. The Council of Ministers already drew up in July of last year a first directive on the fixing of a uniform date for the beginning of summer time for 1981 and 1982. The dates in question are 28 March and 29 March respectively. The Commission has also proposed uniform dates for the end of summer time for 1981 and 1982, and these are 11 October and 10 October respectively. However, these dates have not yet been ratified by the Council. Furthermore, in the Member States of continental Europe summer time ends four weeks earlier than in the UK and Ireland. The Commission intends, in the near future, to submit new proposals to the Council for adjustments to the uniform summer time which will come into force in the Community for 1983 and subsequent years. The Commission is sure that the Community's adjustments to summer time will also be implemented in the rest of Europe outside the European Community.

Mr Berkhouwer. — (NL) I gather from the answer given by our new Greek Commissioner that our clocks

will all show the same time during the actual summer months in all ten Member States, including the Federal Republic of Germany.

Mr Contogeorgis. — (El) Certainly, Mr Berkhouwer, there is every indication that in the Ten, which includes the Federal Republic of Germany and Greece, summer time will be implemented this year.

Mr de Courcy Ling. — It is reassuring to hear what the Commissioner has just said, and I am very glad that the Commissioner in charge of transport is taking a personal interest in this very vexed matter of our clocks, because it is difficult to see how the trains of Europe can run on time if our clocks are telling different times. Will the Commissioner give his attention to the problem of discrepancy, to which he has referred, at the end of summer time? This is when the chaos really takes place. It has a very serious effect on commerce and on business inside the Community. This is a genuine non-tariff barrier to trade, and the situation throughout the winter — the situation now — is also bad, so I would ask the Commissioner to give special attention to persuading the Council to take a harmonious line over their clocks in the month of October and to work for a harmonized winter time as well as a harmonized summer time.

Mr Contogeorgis. — (El) As I said earlier, on the subject of the end of summer time, there is a difference in Ireland and Great Britain, and the Community will attempt to bring about a uniform end of summer time. I also mentioned earlier that an effort would be made to implement the uniform summer time, which is in force in the countries of the European Community, and in the other European countries outside the Community.

President. — Thank you very much, Mr Contogeorgis. I do not think it would be apt to let this opportunity pass without congratulating the new Commissioner, the first Greek Commissioner, on answering his first question in the Chamber.

(Applause)

I cannot think of any country or any Commissioner more competent to talk about summer time in Greece. Secondly, I congratulate the Commissioner on his brief answer. I hope that from now on Members will put brief supplementary questions.

Questions Nos 5 to 10 will be answered jointly, as they are all on the same subject.

Question No 5 by Mr Walter (H-541/80):

The aim of the Council Directive of 20 February 1978 on waste from the titanium dioxide industry is to prevent and gradually reduce pollution caused by such waste with a

President

view to eliminating it altogether. What are the Commission's targets with regard to the time-scale and the quantities involved, for reducing the discharge into the sea of waste from the titanium dioxide industry?

Question No 6 by Mrs Weber (H-542/80):

The Council Directive of 20 February 1978 on waste from the titanium dioxide industry refers to the 'discharge into surface water, ground water and the sea, and dumping at sea'. What quantities of such waste are at present disposed of in this way each year by the Member States of the Community?

Question No 7 by Mr Wettig (H-543/80).

Member States of the European Community are repeatedly granting authorization for the discharge of waste from the titanium dioxide industry into the sea. Does the Commission consider that this authorization by the Member States is compatible with the Directive on waste from the titanium dioxide industry and with the Oslo and London Conventions, and how does the Commission view in this context the provisions of the German law of 11 February 1977 on the disposal of substances at sea, according to which authorization may also be granted, on the grounds that it is essential to the public interest, for the discharge of substances which constitute a possible threat to the marine ecosystem?

Question No 8 by Mr van Minnen (H-544/80):

Article 7 of the Directive on waste from the titanium dioxide industry instructs the Commission to submit to the Council, within one year of notification of the Directive, a proposal on the procedures for the surveillance and monitoring of the environments concerned. The Directive came into effect 20 February 1978. Has the Commission submitted the proposal referred to, and if not, why not?

Question No 9 by Mr Schmid (H-545/80):

The Directive on waste from the titanium dioxide industry requires the Member States to draw up programmes for the progressive reduction and eventual elimination of pollution caused by waste from existing industrial establishments. Which Member States submitted their programmes to the Commission by the specified deadline of 1 July 1980?

Question No 10 by Mr Muntingh (H-546/80):

There has recently been increasing scientific evidence of the damage caused to fishing resources by the discharge of waste from the titanium dioxide industry into the North Sea. In view of this situation, is the Commission prepared to take steps to urge the Council of Ministers to put a stop to the discharge into the sea of environmentally harmful waste from the titanium dioxide industry by the beginning of 1982?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (D) In answer to Mr Walter's question, the time schedule for reducing discharge of waste from the production of titanium dioxide into the sea is defined in Article 9 of the Directive concerned. The Member States are required to prepare, within specified time limits, programmes for the progressive reduction of pollution

with a ultimate view to eliminating pollution altogether. These programmes will be submitted to the Commission for harmonization and must ensure that the aims of the Directive are achieved by 1 July 1987. It is the Commission's intention to ensure that the deadlines for the progressive elimination of pollution within the meaning of Article 1 of the Directive are observed.

On Mrs Weber's question, the Commission has no information on the levels of production in titanium dioxide plants. It cannot therefore as yet indicate levels of waste discharge for 1979 and 1980. However, we expect the Member States to provide this information to us in the report on the prevention and progressive reduction of pollution by industrial waste which they are required to compile under Article 14 of the Directive. Assuming that the plants are working at full or normal capacity, the following approximate discharge levels can be expected: in the North Sea and English Channel daily discharges in river estuaries and on the high seas may be estimated at 4 100 tonnes SO_4H_2 , 3 000 tonnes of iron sulfate in the form of the heptohydrate SO_4Fe and 1 300 tonnes of FeSO_4 as dilute sulfuric acid; in the Mediterranean on the other hand some 335 tonnes of SO_4H_2 are discharged in the form of neutralized products.

On Mr Van Minnen's question, the Commission submitted to the Council on 11 December the proposal for a Directive on methods of monitoring and control of the environment in the vicinity of titanium dioxide production plants.

On Mr Schmid's question, on 1 July, the date of submission, no Member State had yet notified the Commission of programmes for the progressive reduction of pollution, as stipulated in Article 9(3) of the Directive. The Commission has now received programmes from Germany, France, Italy, The Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

The Belgian programme remains to be submitted.

On Mr Muntingh's question, until such time as different fundamental information becomes available showing greater toxicity of titanium dioxide waste than was assumed when the Directive was issued in 1978, the Commission does not intend to take an initiative to amend the time schedule laid down in Article 9 of this Directive. It is of the opinion that the directive adopted by the Council in February 1978 and applicable in the Member States since 1979, with a view to the elimination of waste from titanium dioxide production plants without causing harm to human health or to the environment, can bring about the attainment of these goals with the aid of the programmes by the Member States to which reference has already been made. For the rest I would draw your attention to Article 12 of the Directive which states that Member States may apply more stringent standards within their own territory.

Mr Walter. — (D) The Commission did not answer Mr Wettig's question H-543/80. I shall therefore put it as a supplementary question and ask the Commission whether the authorizations repeatedly granted by some Member States for new discharges of titanium dioxide waste are compatible with the Directive. May I ask in particular whether the discharge of titanium dioxide waste into the North Sea under the legislation applicable in the Federal Republic of Germany to discharges of waste on the high seas can be considered compatible with the Directive?

Mr Narjes. — (D) The Directive does not prohibit the discharge of titanium dioxide waste but makes it conditional on prior authorization. Such authorization can only be given for limited periods but may be renewed. Provision for authorization of this kind is also made in the Oslo and London Conventions on the discharge of waste of this kind at sea. The Oslo and London Conventions have been supplemented and ratified by the Federal Republic of Germany through the act of 11. 2. 1977 to which you referred, a regulation of 7. 12. 1977 and an administrative decree of 22. 12. 1977. I cannot agree at first sight that the German law cited by you conflicts with the international conventions or with the European Community Directive.

Mrs Weber. — (D) You said just now, Commissioner, that you have no information on the exact level of production in the undertakings concerned. My question is this: is it a fact that all the waste produced by titanium dioxide plants is at present still dumped at sea, or do you have any more precise figures for the proportion of waste disposed of by other means within the Community? Perhaps you could let us know the cost of these different methods.

Mr Narjes. — (D) We are expecting to find answers to these questions in the reports which the Member States are required to submit during 1981 following the expiry of the three-year period.

Mr van Minnen. — (NL) Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner for the fact that the Directive was submitted to the Council on 11 December, his predecessor being, of course, responsible for that, but I do not think that we can be satisfied with the time schedule. The Directive should be ready within a year. I realize that the Commissioner has only been in office for a few days and cannot have had much to do with this, but I wonder whether his answer does not suggest leaving too much to the Governments of the Member States, whereas scarcely a week passes without the sea becoming even more polluted than before. The question I want to put is simple: is it really not possible to make faster progress? We have lost a great deal of ground, whatever efforts we may have made, but I

hope that the Commission will agree that the North Sea, the Baltic and the other seas around us can still be saved. Can the Commissioner give an assurance that the Commission will shorten its time limits and apply stronger pressure to the Governments?

Mr Narjes. — (D) I share the regret expressed by the honourable Member at the time which has been lost. I too have noted from the records that no Member State has complied with the obligations laid down in the Directive or has only done so with delays of up to six or seven months; one Member State has not even met its obligation now. I can merely give an assurance that we shall do everything possible to make good the lost ground.

Mr Schmid. — (D) The Directive indicates that the ultimate objective is to prohibit all these discharges. Can you indicate, Commissioner, when such a prohibition might enter into force? I ask this because I know that some Member States have submitted plans for even greater levels of discharge in 1987.

Mr Narjes. — (D) If I have understood the Directive correctly, a distinction must be made between the elimination of polluted waste and the discharge of non-polluted waste. The sole intention of the Directive is to prohibit polluting discharges by the date in question but not to ban forms of discharge which cause no pollution.

Mr Newton Dunn. — Bearing in mind Mr Gundelach's reply to an earlier question, that 'natural advantages are part of the driving factor of the Community', does the Commissioner undertake that the alternative environmental quality objective approach shall always be allowed as an option for controlling this type of waste?

Mr Narjes. — (D) If I have understood the question correctly, the speaker was asking whether we have any intention of stipulating specific methods of discharge. There can be no question of that. It is up to the Member States involved to determine how they wish to attain the aims of the directive and what techniques they will use for the elimination of waste.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (I) The Directive on titanium dioxide has led to a great many speeches in this Parliament because it is a faulty directive. Perhaps the Commissioner should have the courage to draw that conclusion in public: it is a directive which is marred by many flaws and with which we can make no progress. I therefore put this question to the Commissioner: would it not be better to think of providing incentives for conversion of the titanium dioxide production cycle? I shall explain this very briefly: today

Squarcialupi

titanium dioxide is being produced by a manufacturing cycle which involves high levels of pollution and is extremely expensive in terms of the discharge of waste products. As I have myself explained to Parliament, production cycles for titanium dioxide which cause no pollution are known today. Does the Commission intend to take account of these clean production cycles or will it continue to support a directive which is leading to serious, extremely serious distortions of competition?

Mr Narjes. — (D) I share the honourable Member's concern at possible damage from the long time-limits set in this text. I believe that the Commission will have to reconsider this matter when the first three-year reports are available under Article 14. In evaluating those reports one major task for us will be to consider alternative methods for the elimination of these harmful waste products and to draw the necessary conclusions. I therefore added to one of my answers the proviso: as long as no more recent information is available to suggest more serious harm than was known in 1978. This reflects our willingness to review the Directive if the need arises.

Mr Sherlock. — Mr Commissioner, may I also welcome you into this difficult minefield of environmental matters? You have, of course, an excellent adviser by your side whom I notice smiling broadly. But as I congratulate you at the New Year, there is also an old English custom, which is at the beginning of the year to make a declaration of intent. They are intended to be good declarations. Another old cracker motto or bromide that comes out of the hat . . .

President. — Mr Sherlock, there really should not be any need for me to explain to an English person how questions go. One has got to be tolerant in other directions. Please can we have your question?

Mr Sherlock. — Yes, you can. 'Legislate in haste and implement at leisure' seems to be your motto in the Commission over the few years that I have had the pleasure of working in this Parliament. I ask whether in the coming four years, and during the whole of the collegiate four years which follow it, could you make a New Year resolution to look more closely at the possibility of implementing some of the ideas that are put forward, because without implementation the law, as I remarked last week, is an ass?

Mr Narjes. — (D) Mr President, may I express my thanks for the good wishes. I share the view which has been put and particularly appreciate the work of Mr Carpentier. I hope that you will recognize the good intentions which underly my declarations. For the rest I agree with your last sentence and I am

prepared to reconsider implementation at the end of the year.

(Applause)

Mrs von Alemann. — (D) May I return to something that Commissioner Narjes just said in answer to the question by Mr van Minnen; he stated that the Commission did not see any imperative necessity to take action until new information became available. I am rather surprised by that and would like to ask the Commissioner whether the North Sea report which has now been published and the conclusions of hearings held in the North Sea area have not yet convinced him of the fact that the synergetic effect of all environmental pollution in both the North Sea and Mediterranean make it imperative to curtail discharges of titanium dioxide.

Mr Narjes. — (D) Consideration of the synergetic effects will be one aspect of our work after presentation of the first three-year reports. Before answering the question I would like to know whether new information has become available since 1978 which was only 24 months ago. I am not aware of any fundamentally new information published in the last 24 months, but I should be grateful to you if you could forward any relevant documents which may have escaped my attention.

President. — Question No 11, by Mrs Lentz-Cornette (H-589/80):

In view of the most recent earthquake catastrophe in Italy, can the Commission state what consideration has actually been given up to now at Community level to forecasting such catastrophes and how far it has considered coordination of seismological research, particularly in the Mediterranean area?

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) The question by Mrs Lentz-Cornette relates to an essential problem: is it possible to forecast earthquakes? The scientific answer today is no. We know the overall symptoms, but we do not know the time which is liable to elapse between the occurrence of certain symptoms and the occurrence of the disaster. This varies from a few seconds to a number of years.

The situation is as follows: research in this field, which involves concentration of very extensive data, is being effected under a resolution and programme adopted by the Assembly of the Council of Europe, in other words in a wider context than that of the Community. The Commission thinks that this is the right choice and it is participating in the work of the Council of Europe. In its more specific political approach the Commission must concentrate on action concerning the construction of buildings capable of withstanding

Davignon

earthquakes. It must also ensure better organization of activities in the event of natural disasters. In conclusion, the state of scientific knowledge is too uncertain at present for us to be able to participate in any more precise action than that to which I have referred.

Mrs Lentz-Cornette. — (*F*) Given the frequency of earthquakes in these Mediterranean regions and considering that the Community has already committed substantial sums and will probably be making available even larger amounts or supplementary credits, can the Commissioner say whether it is planned to reconstruct the towns and villages on the basis of appropriate standards to ensure that the buildings concerned are better able to withstand seismic occurrences in future. This has already been done in some countries: I read recently an article from Tashkent where houses withstood earthquakes with an intensity greater than 7 on the Richter scale.

Mr Davignon. — (*F*) I am able to confirm to the honourable Member that this is our intention. To the extent that buildings are reconstructed we must see to it that the most appropriate technologies are used in the interest of the Italian authorities and of the European Community. Contacts are envisaged with this end in view and reports will, of course, be drawn up.

President. — Question No 12 by Mr Adam has been held over to the next part-session.

Question No 13, by Mr Hutton (H-500/80):

Why were no proposals on forestry presented to this Parliament by the end of 1980, as the Commission promised last March?

Mr Gundelach, Member of the Commission. — (*DK*) Since the beginning of 1980 the Commission has been continuing its earlier efforts with a view to the creation of a basis for a common forestry policy. In the Commission's report of 3 December to the Council and Parliament on the main lines of the future common agricultural policy, an important chapter will be found on the need for a common forestry policy, and the content of this chapter follows on closely from the debates last March to which the honourable Member refers in his question. Over and above this general follow-up to the 1978 proposal for a decision on forestry policy, the Commission has attempted, in the structural discussions and in the structural proposal submitted to the Council and Parliament, to introduce specific provisions on forestry in connection with regional policy measures. As regards both the general and specific aspects, the Commission attempted in 1980 to continue with the efforts undertaken by it in 1978 and 1979. Unfortunately we have not as yet been able to achieve concrete results in connection with the Mediterranean approach. It

would be very helpful if Parliament could discuss the general proposal from the Commission, including the provisions on forestry policy contained in the report on the main lines of the common agricultural policy; we could then agree with Parliament on the specific needs in the forestry policy sector for presentation in a proposal to the Council.

Mr Hutton. — I must thank the Commissioner for his answer and congratulate him on his new term of office. At the same time I must express my disappointment that he did not feel able to bring this information forward voluntarily to Parliament but had to bring it out in a reply to a question. Could I ask him when the Members of this Parliament will see the chapter on forestry to which he has referred in his answer?

Mr Gundelach. — (*DK*) Mr President, until now I had quite naturally supposed that I had voluntarily made arrangements for this communication of 3 December on the common agricultural policy, including a chapter which places strong emphasis on the need for a common forestry policy, to be forwarded to Parliament. The Commission had decided to do so and the document was directed to Parliament and Council alike; I shall naturally take steps to ascertain why this paper has failed to reach Members of Parliament. It is not a matter of deliberately withholding information, since it was our intention from the outset that this paper should be submitted to Parliament.

Mr Balfour. — I would like to ask the Commissioner what progress has been made in the last two years in the different Member States in passing into domestic legislation the measures he introduced for protection of the oak forests in Europe and the importation of unseasoned red oak from the United States in particular. What point have we reached in the Community now?

Mr Gundelach. — (*DK*) That question has nothing to do with a common forestry policy to which the original question referred but concerns the protection of our own forests against the possibility of diseases caused by imported fresh timber. At present the situation in this respect is satisfactory. As I informed Parliament on a previous occasion, we have carried out a series of inspections and have ascertained that similar verifications are made at the level of the individual Member States; there does not appear to be any problem in this respect at present. We shall continue to give our attention to this aspect because any change in the situation may bring substantial costs in its wake. For the present the control measures which were felt necessary have been carried out by all the Member States.

President. — As its author is absent. Question No 14 by Mrs Nielsen will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 15 by Mrs Castle (H-562/80):

To ask the Commission if they will publish each month a list of the sub-programmes in the United Kingdom approved by the Commission under Regulation 2744/80, giving the nature of the programme, where it is situated, its total estimated cost, its estimated date of completion, the percentage grant given by the Community and the date on which the project was originally planned?

Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission. — (I) The information to which the question by Mrs Castle refers, on the subject of the programmes undertaken in the United Kingdom on the basis of Council Regulation No 2744/80, is governed by Article 4 of that Regulation which requires the Commission to publish in the Official Journal of the European Communities the complete text of the decisions on financial contributions to be made available within the context of the supplementary measures for the benefit of the United Kingdom. On the basis of the provisions of Article 4 to which I referred, these decisions contain almost all the elements of information referred to in the question by Mrs Castle. Moreover, in addition to the formal requirement to provide information laid down in Article 4, the United Kingdom has made available a summary of the programmes which contain the main body of information referred to by the author of this question.

Mrs Castle. — Is the Commissioner aware that the item of information in which I am most interested is the date on which the project was originally planned and that this information is not currently available? Is he aware that, according to a British Treasury press release I have in my hand, the money Parliament has agreed to vote is going on schemes which have been planned before the decision to make a refund at all was made and so is not an addition to expenditure programmes already agreed? Is this not contrary to the whole intention of Parliament in voting the supplementary measures to the United Kingdom, which were intended to be additional monies for regional and other programmes so as to fight the disastrous and mounting unemployment in the United Kingdom?

Mr Giolitti. — (I) The Commission can only know the date on which the formal request is made. That is the date to which we refer, and we cannot have information on the time taken for preparation of a programme which is subsequently submitted to us by the United Kingdom.

Given the nature of these measures, the very short times allowed and the urgent need for the measures

concerned, it is quite clear that in many cases these programmes had already been prepared and were merely finalized to benefit from the contributions stipulated under the regulation on supplementary measures. I believe it would have been extremely difficult to submit totally new programmes in the short time available; it was therefore necessary to choose programmes which had already been examined and prepared previously.

Mr Price. — Mrs Castle seems to be seeking the maximum possible difficulty and delay in this Community money reaching the United Kingdom. I share the general view of Parliament that the principle of additionality is important, but will the Commissioner give an assurance that the Commission will enforce this principle no more and no less against the United Kingdom in respect of these special measures than they do against the other nine Member States in respect of the Regional Fund?

Mr Giolitti. — (I) I believe that a correct analogy has been drawn between the method used to make Regional Fund contributions and the method chosen for supplementary measures for the United Kingdom to ensure a satisfactory level of additionality of Community and national interventions.

Mr Key. — My understanding — and I would like the Commission to comment on this — is that this was for supplementary aid, i.e. extra, additional. One is led to believe, on reading the reports that have come out, that it is not that. All it is is that the British Government will submit invoices for things that have already been committed, often in many cases things that have already been spent. I understood from what the Commission said earlier, and what the Parliament was quite definite on, that this should be extra money. Could he reassure me or give me anything to indicate that I am wrong in that impression?

Mr Giolitti. — (I) The term 'supplementary' used to define these measures must be understood to have two precise meanings: these measures are supplementary because they are additional to those normally stipulated under the existing Community regulations and instruments, in that they supplement, for example, regional fund measures or measures under the guidance section of the EAGGF or the Social Fund. They constitute supplementary financing for the United Kingdom over and above the ordinary instruments.

Secondly, these measures supplement the programme financing from the United Kingdom budget, in that they are additional to the financing already earmarked by the United Kingdom for these projects. Our task is to ensure that Community action is effectively additional and supplementary to measures financed from the national budget.

¹ See Annex to Debates of 14. 1. 1981

President. — Question No 16 by Mr Louwes (H-566/80) has been withdrawn by the author.

Question No 17 by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-571/80):

Can the Commission reveal why it has not taken action on the proposal contained in the memorandum of 16 February 1978 on the renewal of the Lomé Convention which was to make concessions by the Community, particularly in the trading sphere, conditional on the observance of certain basic international standards concerning working conditions in all the developing countries, including those belonging to the Lomé Convention?

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) On 8 November 1978 the Commission published a communication on this subject; the honourable Member is acquainted with the text. That communication immediately aroused keen interest in political circles. In the European Parliament, the Committee on Development and then the Committee on Social Affairs gave it consideration and this led up to a debate which approved the broad lines of the communication and asked for it to be implemented by May 1979. Many Members of Parliament have expressed their concern since then that no further action has been taken — I have in mind Mr Glinne, Mrs Lizin, Mr Michel, Mr Van Miert, while Mrs Squarcialupi herself put a question during the 1980 session. The Economic and Social Committee has commented in a similar vein. All these persons and bodies have echoed the interest of workers in respect for elementary standards concerning working conditions; these standards have been referred to by the European Trade Union Confederation and the consultative meeting arranged jointly by economic and social representatives and the European Parliament in Geneva last May. The contrast with the position taken by the Council is most striking. It took more than one year for the Development Cooperation Group — a body of COREPER — to look into this matter only to shelve it again. No further progress has been made since. The permanent representatives had occasion to discuss this matter again in connection with the renewal of the scheme of generalized preferences; they were unanimous in their opposition. In other words we have a unanimously negative position by our governments.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (I) We should be delighted by a unanimous position on the part of our governments if they had not adopted such a negative position. May I now put a further question to the Commission: since it is inadmissible for it to continue to finance programmes without requesting guarantees in respect of working conditions and workers, how does it intend to propose compliance with these minimum working standards without falling in with the most abject compromise solutions, since our governments are so insensitive to the conditions of employment of workers in the developing countries?

Mr Cheysson. —ⁱ (F) There has been no compromise; the Council has totally refused to consider this matter. Its refusal has been unanimous. For the time being the matter has quite simply been shelved. The problem now is to decide how to make further progress. Should the Commission repeat its proposal which is still on the table? Parliament might also raise the matter again if it thinks fit; but all events the matter must be reconsidered. Should we act without the decision by the Community? I do not think so; I would remind you that the proposal made by the Commission included a procedure for consideration by the International Labour Office of the files and cases in which it appeared that certain fundamental employment standards had been infringed; the ILO had agreed to this procedure. However the procedure would have to be formally adopted at the request of the Community; the Commission does not wish to request such a procedure without a prior decision at Community level or discussion by the Council.

Mr Michel. — (F) I thank Mr Cheysson for his reply. We know how closely he has concerned himself with this matter to which reference has often been made in the Committee on Development and Cooperation. I would like to point out, however, that instead of improving, the situation is deteriorating. The International Labour Office published, immediately after the Year of the Child as the United Nations called it, the results of a survey showing that at present 200 million young people below the age of 14 are having to work. That being so, if Mr Cheysson is wondering, as we do, how to raise the problem in the Council again, should it not be stressed that when agreements such as the forthcoming agreement with Brazil come up for discussion, problems of this kind should also be given attention since, as everyone knows, Brazil has recently reduced the school-leaving age from 14 to 13? Is this not a disturbing situation and are we not the accomplices of a deteriorating situation?

Mr Cheysson. — (F) Yes, it is true that the situation is deteriorating and it is now dramatic with certain internal consequences if I may say so: it is practically impossible to ask our own workers to agree to consideration of a different international division of labour unless they have the impression that development overseas of industrialization will benefit the population of the countries concerned without risk of the profit disappearing elsewhere. This is a fundamental political problem. I do not think it is one that can be dealt with by this Parliament in the presence of a small number of persons, however eminent, and I think that the problem is essentially political and needs to be dealt with far more systematically in a full debate, if the Commission may venture to suggest that.

Mr Herman. — (F) Mr Cheysson, to enable us to put questions to our governments whose representa-

Herman

tives in the Council of Ministers have taken this deplorable and unjustifiable attitude, could you tell us precisely which Council meeting took this unanimous decision and who was present at it?

Mr Cheysson. — (F) I feel shame for the Community at the reply I have to give the honourable Member. We were not even able to raise this matter formally at a Council meeting since unanimity had been reached by the expert groups; the Committee of Permanent Representatives unanimously decided not to place the item on the agenda of a Council meeting. Even the Council of Development Ministers, which should have been most open to this problem, refused to include it on its agenda.

Mr Moorhouse. — One appreciates very much the frankness of the Commissioner in answering this question, and it is certainly disturbing that no action seems to have been taken in many of the developing countries. I raise the question particularly in regard to the working conditions in industry in some of the developing countries. Could he please inform me whether the ILO has any powers at all, directly or indirectly, in the enforcement of the standards which they try to set?

Mr Cheysson. — (F) The ILO carries out an annual study of compliance with the basic standards corresponding to conventions ratified by a very large number of countries. The results of this survey are published, but the ILO can do no more. Neither the ILO nor the International Labour Organization have any sanctions available to them. We could introduce a sanction in the shape of a suspension of aids for the benefit of industries which have systematically violated for years on end the existing norms contrary to the conventions ratified by their countries.

President. — I call Mrs Castle to speak on a point of order.

Mrs Castle. — Mr President, although I am thankful to have got my own question answered after a long wait, I draw your attention to the fact that in one hour and a half we have only had answers to 17 questions out of 52, and that only because 3 questions were not answered and 7 were taken together, so that, in effect, amounts to 10 questions out of 52. Could I plead with

you, Mr President, to insist that every sentence in Question Time uttered by the questioners is an interrogation and not a statement, and to insist on the cutting down of both answers and supplementary questions, and would you remind everybody that any unnecessary words spoken, even if it is only 'Thank you, Mr Commissioner', rob people waiting to have their questions answered of their democratic rights.

President. — I entirely agree with you, Mrs Castle. You will, I am sure, accept that Question Time is a British tradition, and the Commissioners are sometimes not fully aware of the need to keep their answers brief. With so many different parliamentary traditions represented in the House, it is difficult to expedite Question Time as efficiently as one would wish. If I am in the Chair for Question Time again, I shall endeavour to comply with your wishes.

The first part of Question Time is closed.*

19. *Agenda for next sitting*

President. — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Tuesday, 13 January 1981 with the following agenda:

9 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. to 7 p.m.:

- Joint debate on the Aigner and Battersby reports on the discharge of the 1977 and 1978 budgets
- Resumption of the debate on the Bonaccini report on the European automobile industry
- Delorozoy report on shipbuilding
- Joint debate on the Carossino, Maij-Weggen and Spaak reports on shipping and pollution of the sea
- Alber report on environmental protection
- Combe report on pesticides
- Hooper report on waste paper and board

3 p.m.: Voting time

The sitting is closed.

(*The sitting was closed at 8.25 p.m.*)

* See Annex to Debates of 14. 1. 1981.

ANNEX

Commission action on opinions delivered on Commission proposals by the European Parliament at its December 1980 part-session

1. As agreed with the Bureau of Parliament, the Commission informs Members at the beginning of every part-session as part of the consultation arrangements of the action it has taken on opinions delivered at the previous part-session.

2. At its December part-session the European Parliament delivered 21 opinions on Commission proposals in response to Council requests for consultation.

3. At the part-session Parliament discussed 16 reports and delivered favourable opinions or did not request formal amendment in the case of the proposals listed below:

report by Mr Pearce on the proposals for Regulations concerning the establishment of a five-year scheme of generalized preferences for the period 1981-1985;

report by Mr Gatto on six proposals concerning agricultural provisions in the Act of Accession relating to Greece;

report by Mr Cronin on the proposal for a Regulation establishing a European Regional Development Fund;

report by Mr Van der Gun on the proposal concerning the establishment of European Social Fund assistance to keep up the income level of shipbuilding workers;

report by Mr Filippi on the proposal for implementation of pre-accession arrangements for Portugal;

report by Miss Quin on the Regulation introducing a charge on salmon fishing in the Baltic by Community vessels;

report by Miss Quin on three proposals for Regulations concerning certain measures for the conservation and management of fishery resources applicable to vessels flying the flags of Sweden, Iceland and Norway;

report by Mr Lyngge on the Regulation amending Regulation EEC/3179/78 concerning the conclusion by the European Economic Community of the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries;

report by Mr Louwes on three proposals for Regulations on the opening of tariff quotas for beef and veal and buffalo meat;

report by Mr Beumer on the Directive amending Directive 72/464/EEC on taxes other than turnover taxes which affect the consumption of manufactured tobacco (8th directive);

report by Mr Giummarra on two proposals for Regulations on the importation of olive oil originating in Tunisia, Algeria or Morocco and the importation of certain agricultural products originating in Turkey;

proposals for Directives applying Directive 79/530/EEC on the indication by labelling of the energy consumption of household appliances to electric washing machines, cold-water-feed electric dishwashers, electric refrigerators, cold-storage units, freezers, and combinations thereof;

proposal for a Decision amending Decision 78/167/EEC adopting a concerted project of the European Economic Community in the field of registration of congenital abnormalities (medical and public health research);

proposal for a Directive amending for the sixth time Directive 76/769/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations (benzene);

proposal for a Regulation amending for the second time Regulation (EEC) No 2925/78 in respect of the period of suspension of the application of the price condition to which the importation into the Community of certain types of citrus fruit originating in Spain is subject,

Commission recommendation for a Regulation concerning the conclusion of the Agreement in the form of an exchange of letters amending Annex A to the Cooperation Agreement between the EEC and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

4. The European Parliament asked the Commission to amend proposals under the second paragraph of Article 149 and adopted proposals for amendments in five cases.

During discussion of the

report by Mr Dankert on the proposal for a Regulation concerning compensatory payment to Greece in respect of the financial burden arising out of the financial mechanism and the supplementary measures to assist the United Kingdom,

report by Mr Ghergo on the proposal concerning the operation of social security arrangements in the case of employed persons and their families moving within the Community,

report by Mr Ferranti on the proposal for special Community assistance for re-building areas damaged by the earthquake in Italy,

the Commission explained why it wanted to maintain its proposals.

The situation as regards two texts on which the Commission said it could accept part of the amendments proposed by Parliament is as follows.

report by Mr Taylor on the Regulation adjusting the mechanism for Community loans for the purpose of giving Member States balance of payment support

An amended proposal has been prepared and will be sent to the Council and, for information purposes, to the Parliament after its formal adoption.

report by Mr Kirk on three proposals for Regulations concerning research and reconstruction in respect of fisheries and aquaculture

An amended proposal has been prepared. It will be formally adopted in the next few days and then sent to the Council and, for information purposes, to the Parliament.

5. The Commission took the opportunity to tell Parliament what aid it had granted disaster victims since the previous part-session.

At the December part-session Parliament had already been informed of the initial aid measures adopted to assist victims in the areas devastated by the earthquake in Italy.

Since the December part-session the Commission has decided to grant emergency aid to third countries as follows:

300 000 EUA for Ugandan refugees, and

80 000 EUA for Sudanese drought victims,

300 000 EUA to repair damage caused by torrential rain in the Comoro Islands,

2 m EUA for Ugandan drought victims,

250 000 EUA for Salvadorian refugees in Honduras,

1 m EUA for re-settling refugees in Zimbabwe

6. The Parliament also expressed its views on the reports by

Mr Dankert on the draft second supplementary and amending budget of the European Communities for 1980,

Mr Ansquer on the 1981 draft budget (Section I — Parliament, Section II — Council, Section IV — Court of Justice and Section V — Court of Auditors),

Mrs Hoff on the setting of the ECSC levy rates and the establishment of the ECSC operational budget for 1981.

7. The Commission also made known its position during discussions involving it and took note of the European Parliament's opinions on the

report by Mr Battersby on the Special Committee of Inquiry's report on the EAGGF, Guarantee Section (wine),

resolution on the earthquake in southern Italy,

resolution on aid for Poland,

resolution on support for advancement and training in agricultural and rural districts,

resolution on the slump in farm incomes in Ireland,

resolution on the drastic reduction of the number of frontier crossing points for the customs clearance of iron and steel products in Italy,

report by Mr Gallagher on peat,

report by Mr Cottrell on relations between the Community and Greece with regard to transport.

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 13 JANUARY 1981

1. Approval of minutes	40		
2. Documents received	40		
3. Discharge in respect of the implementation of the 1977 and 1978 budgets — Reports by Mr Aigner (Committee on Budgetary Control) (Doc. 1-672/80) and the report by Mr Battersby (Committee on Budgetary Control) (Doc. 1-671/80)	40		
Mr Aigner; Mr Battersby, rapporteurs:	40		
Mr Notenboom; Mr Kellett-Bowman; Mr Irmer; Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr Aigner; Mr Battersby; Mr Tugendhat; Mrs Kellett-Bowman	43		
4. European automobile industry — Report by Mr Bonaccini (Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs) (Doc. 1-673/80) (continuation)	50		
Mr Martinet; Mr Müller-Hermann; Sir Frederick Warner; Mr Frischmann; Mr Pininfarina	50		
5. Tribute: Mr Thorn; Sir Henry Plumb; Mr Møller	56		
6. European automobile industry (continuation): Mr de la Malène; Mr Petronio; Mr Dido; Miss Forster; Mr Carossino; Mr Delorozoy; Ms Clwyd; Sir David Nicolson; Mr Vernimmen; Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr Beazley; Mr Michel; Mr Coppieters; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Davignon (Commission); Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur	58		
7. Urgent procedure	72		
8. Votes	72		
• Aigner report (Doc. 1-672/80): Discharge in respect of the implementation of the 1977 budget: Adoption of resolution	72		
• Battersby report (Doc. 1-671/80): Discharge in respect of the implementation of the 1978 budget: Adoption of resolution	72		
• Bonaccini report (Doc. 1-673/80): European automobile industry: Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur; Mr Pininfarina Procedural motions: Mr Rogers; Lady Elles; Mr Pininfarina	74		
Mr von der Vring; Mr Bonaccini; Mr von Bismarck; Mr Galland; Mr Herman; Mr Bonaccini	75		
Explanations of vote: Mr de la Malène; Mrs Lizin; Mr Sarre; Mr de Courcy Ling Adoption of resolution	76		
9. Directive on aid to shipbuilding — Report by Mr Delorozoy (Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs) (Doc. 1-638/80): Mr Delorozoy, rapporteur	77		
Mr Caborn; Sir David Nicolson; Mr Herman; Mrs Le Roux; Mr Delorozoy; Mrs Le Roux; Mr Calvez; Mr Remilly; Mr Almirante; Mr Paisley; Mr Andriessen (Commission)	78		
10. Prevention of pollution of the sea — Joint debate on the reports by Mr Carossino (Committee on Transport) (Doc. 1-708/80), Mrs Maij-Weggen (Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection) (Doc. 1-709/80 and Doc. 1-473/80) and Mrs Spaak (Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection) (Doc. 1-467/80)	84		
Mr Carossino; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Spaak, rapporteurs:	84		
Mr Klinkenborg; Mr Janssen van Raay; Mr Johnson; Mr Veronesi; Mr Haagerup; Mr de Lipowské; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mr Dalakouras; Mr Josselin; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Moorhouse; Mrs Le Roux; Mr Voyiatzis; Mr Moreland; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Doublet; Mrs Weber; Mr Turner; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Marko-			

<i>zanis; Mr Muntingh; Mr Percheron; Mr Franghos; Mr Dalakouras; Mr Peponis; Mr Kontogeorgis</i>	88	12. <i>Urgent procedure</i>	103
11. <i>Memorial service for Mr Gundelach</i>	103	13. <i>Agenda</i>	103
		14. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i>	103

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

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

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Documents received*

President. — I have received various documents, a list of which can be found in the minutes of proceedings.

3. *Discharge in respect of the implementation of the 1977 and 1978 budgets*

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

— the report by Mr Aigner, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the measures taken in response to the comments contained in the resolution accompanying the decision granting a discharge in respect of the implementation of the 1977 budget (Doc. 1-672/80)

— the report by Mr Battersby, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the measures taken by the Community institutions in the light of the comments appearing in the decisions giving discharge in respect of the 1978 financial year in accordance with the Financial Regulation (Doc. 1-671/80)

I call Mr Aigner.

Mr Aigner, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are having a joint debate on these reports today for two reasons. Firstly, so that we can demonstrate the continuity of our control activities, and secondly, because we want gradually to get back to observing the time-limits laid down in the Financial Regulation.

As you will undoubtedly recall, there has been a delay of over six months in the decision on the discharge for the 1977 financial year, because the Council did not submit the necessary recommendation to Parliament until 10 May.

Parliament should not forget that under the financial decisions of 1975 it bears a special responsibility with regard to the discharge in respect of the Community budget.

Mr President, the Committee on Budgetary Control hopes that by next year we shall have caught up and got back to the normal working rhythm. In this connection, I should above all like to thank the members of the Committee on Budgetary Control for their outstanding commitment to the work in hand. The special reporting system has enabled us be increasingly effective in performing the difficult task you have transferred to us. My special thanks also go to the staff of the Commission's internal control service and to the members of the European Court of Auditors. Without their exemplary frankness and willingness to cooperate this control procedure could not have been so successful as it has already been.

Mr President, although we are only beginning to develop a control system that works well, we have already saved the European tax-payer millions, an opinion that is based not only on our own findings.

Mr President, the two reports being discussed here, one by myself the other by Mr Battersby, must be seen as part of the following process. The annual decision on the granting of a discharge to the institutions of the European Community is taken during the debate on

Aigner

the next annual budget, and the discharge procedure is not completed until the beginning of the year after that. The discharge in respect of the 1980 budget should therefore, if we revert to the normal, prescribed time-table, be granted in the spring of 1982. The decision on the discharge, which is one of the few legal acts for which this Parliament alone is responsible, is of considerable importance. Article 85 (2) and (4) of the Financial Regulation requires all the institutions to obey the instructions included in the discharge decision and to report to Parliament. From this overlapping reporting alone you can see that the controls represent a constant process. The discussion of the discharge — the debate on the budget — reports from the institutions on their reactions to the discharge decision and the report of your committee to Parliament: all this is a continuous control process. Complaints and warnings about shortcomings in previous years can be made — to the same Commission — in subsequent years. It is therefore quite natural for the criticism of the implementation of the 1977 and 1978 discharge decisions to play a full part in the debate on the discharge in respect of 1979, in May of this year or thereabouts.

Mr President, the only reports so far received have been those of the Commission and the Court of Auditors. Neither Parliament nor the other organs have yet submitted a report. I feel we must be very scrupulous in applying to our own institution the standard we impose on the others. We shall therefore be very critical of the people responsible in Parliament during the discharge debate in May 1981.

I should like to comment briefly on the remarks contained in the report on the implementation of the 1977 budget. The Commission has undoubtedly made a great effort to meet Parliament's requests. It is, for example, particularly gratifying to note that, thanks to new procedures introduced at Parliament's insistence, the flow of resources from the Social and Regional Funds has been relatively brisk. But the Committee on Budgetary Control feels the Commission should urge the Member States to use Regional and Social Fund resources not as a substitute for but as a supplement to national resources.

The report on food aid certainly continues to be unsatisfactory. In a report of our own we shall be unsparing in our criticism of the deficiencies and we shall make practical demands. Despite great efforts by the Commission the supervision of Community resources spent at national level is still far from perfect. Cooperation with the Member States' supervisory bodies is only now getting off the ground. The Commission alone is certainly not to blame for this. One problem in particular needs to be stressed in connection with this report. What does Parliament have to do to ensure that the political will it expresses in adopting the budget is translated into reality when the budget is implemented?

Mr President, you can see how serious this problem is from the table on pages 8 and 9 of my report. I would be grateful, ladies and gentlemen, if you would look at the last column, which shows the percentage implementation of the modifications proposed by the European Parliament to the 1979 budget. Of all the modifications made by Parliament during the budget debates, when it had exhausted its own margin, there was 100 % or 90 % acceptance in the case of only two items. Five of Parliament's modifications resulted in less than 50 % implementation and 21 must be regarded as a complete failure. Neither the Council nor the Commission should assume that this Parliament can put up with such disregard for its political will. Mr President, we will find the situation is exactly the same in the Battersby report: there has been no change again this year. It is not simply a question of the decisions on the discharge, but also of the report on the reactions of the various organs.

Mr President, what use are our budgetary powers if from one year to the next we have increasing difficulty in gaining acceptance for our proposals from the Council? What point is there if Parliament's budgetary powers in the implementation of this policy are for all practical purposes no longer effective? This frightening realization can but result during the current financial year in the committees of our Parliament keeping an even closer watch on the utilization of the budget appropriations falling within their respective terms of reference and in their cooperating closely with the Committee on Budgetary Control in calling for prompt action.

Mr President, I would be grateful if this point could be discussed by the Bureau again. It is unacceptable that our committees should no longer be monitoring the actual implementation of operations which have been decided. I therefore urge the chairmen of the other committees to cooperate closely with the Committee on Budgetary Control in the development of a system which enables us to sound the alarm in good time and to call on the Commission to take appropriate action to ensure the budget is implemented in the form in which it was adopted.

I expect, Mr President, that in May of this year, when we discuss the discharge in respect of the 1979 budget, we shall be able to continue with even greater concentration the debate that has now begun. A Parliament which does not yet have any legislative power must — simply to maintain its self-respect — do its utmost to develop parliamentary controls into an effective instrument of political will to ensure the continued development of the Community.

I call on the Bureau of our Parliament once again to pay greater attention to the debates on our control activities and to remember that, however well the European Court of Auditors and the Commission's internal control services may work, their efforts will come to naught if the necessary political directives are

Aigner

not formulated by means of parliamentary controls and forced through by Parliament. Otherwise, Mr President, I would refer the House to the decision on the discharge and to the report before you.

I ask you to approve the resolution, which was unanimously adopted by my committee.

President. — With regard to your appeal to the Bureau, Mr Aigner, I can assure you that careful note will be taken of your request as this is in fact something which the Bureau feels should be discussed.

I call Mr Battersby.

Mr Battersby, rapporteur. — In view of Mr Aigner's statement I can be quite brief. However I would like to say just one thing concerning the reaction of the Commission to my report. It is not easy for a person or an organization to admit that it is in the wrong, and I must congratulate the Commission on its courage in admitting and correcting many of the budgetary errors which I mentioned in the report and in keeping to the agreed deadline. In this both the Commission and Parliament have been very loyally served by a small group of very conscientious and hardworking officials. I would like to thank the staff for enabling the committee to keep to its timetable.

My report was closely coordinated with that of Mr Aigner, so they can be taken together in today's discussions and I do not have to go over the ground which Mr Aigner has covered. I would suggest that the explanatory material contained in my report on the 1978 accounts which analyse the position of Parliament should be studied as a source of further background information. If you look at the explanatory statement accompanying the 1978 report, you will appreciate the special significance of the resolutions that are being put before the House by the Committee on Budgetary Control. I shall say a few words of explanation on this.

The political audit and control cycle begins with the presentation to the House of the preliminary draft budget. It then goes on with the procedure leading up to the adoption of the budget and there is, where necessary, the consideration of supplementary budgets. Then we have the decision on the granting of discharge to the Commission and now we complete the cycle by examining the Commission's reaction to our discharge comments.

The main message that I wish to hammer home is one which Mr Aigner has covered extremely well. It is that the Commission has failed to carry out Parliament's will in regard to the implementation of amendments. It is not a new issue. This failure to implement amendments has taken on the aspect of the regular routine and it has to stop. In 1978, 90 % of the amendments

were not implemented, and it is no use for the Commission to say that some of the money was spent the following year. The argument concerns amendments that are put through by Parliament, amendments that are voted by heavy majorities and which have enjoyed political support that has crossed national and political group frontiers.

It does not help us either if the Commission says that it has spent at least some of the money that was on the budget line before Parliament added its amendments. This reasoning ignores the major political significance which Parliament attaches to carefully selected amendments. In fact it makes the matter worse because it draws attention to the fact that, not only has the Commission failed to implement Parliament's amendments, but in many cases it has also failed to use the full amount of the appropriations which are already on the line. We all know that amendments to the budget are justified individually. They are examined within the specialized committees and within the political groups. They are voted through by very large and almost invariably unanimous majorities. They are the subject of negotiation with the Council. But if they are not implemented in the budgetary year for which they were intended, all the political effort, all the hours of work, are rendered to some extent pointless. The budget is an annual policy instrument. It is intended to have an impact within a matter of months of its adoption. For this we rely, hopefully, on the Commission, and in the past, unfortunately, these hopes have not always been realized.

I would like to go on to say that the only way I can see out of this problem is to go to conciliation. I am suggesting in my report that recourse be had to the conciliation procedure as soon as possible and I hope that the outcome of this procedure will be to remove all obstacles in regard to the Commission's implementation of the Community budget. I urge that this procedure be launched in the next two months or so and before the discharge decision for the 1979 financial year is taken next April.

There is one final point to which I would like to draw attention. This is the problem of inspection of Development Fund money utilization. The European Regional Development Fund is a Community fund. The money in it is Community taxpayers' money and this money does not change colour from Community to national money when it crosses frontiers. The Community must have the right to verify *in situ* by its own appointed inspectors in all the Member States that Community money has been correctly used. Unfortunately, Mr President, this is not the case in all the Member States.

In conclusion, Mr President, I should like to recommend my report to the House for its endorsement.

President. — I call Mr Notenboom to speak on behalf of the Group of the European Peoples' Party (CD Group).

Mr Notenboom. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to thank the two rapporteurs and very briefly say how my Group feels about the two reports, which I see as being connected.

The most striking feature is surely the low rate of utilization of non-compulsory appropriations, especially those entered in the budget by Parliament itself, although I realize that these items must be considered together. My Group was shocked to see, when comparing the two reports — as Mr Aigner has already said — that a number of items were not spent for two consecutive years, and in some cases even longer — but we are not discussing those at the moment — and that there has been no acceptance of Parliament's budgetary will. We cannot put up with that, Mr President. We know what is behind all this. We would be putting our heads in the sand if all we did was to continue to think in terms of conflict. We know — and Commissioner Tugendhat will surely be saying more about this in a moment — that there is a legal question at the back of this, the fact that the institutions — including the Commission and Parliament — do not completely agree whether an item, by being included in the budget, has the required legal basis to enable the money to be spent. This is not always the case, as Parliament must admit, even though we feel the Commission has adopted too extreme a position on this question.

As I have said before, we must get out of this difficulty with wisdom. All my Group feels that Parliament should not try to encroach on the Council's legislative powers, which it has by virtue of the Treaty, but then the Council must not try to encroach upon Parliament's budgetary power, one of the few it has. If we do not get out of this difficulty by examining the budget item by item — and in my personal opinion we must look at each item to see whether or not an additional legal basis is required — we shall have an unnecessary conflict on our hands, with the Council and Parliament preventing each other from taking action. The Commission must help us to avoid this conflict this year — I hope before the report on the discharge in respect of the 1979 budget, but otherwise before the 1982 budget. Otherwise we shall go on playing a cat-and-mouse game with each other. I appeal to Mr Tugendhat, who is now setting out on a new four-year mandate, and to all his colleagues — including the new ones — to think how we can avoid this — and at the same time I appeal to Parliament to be flexible. We must admit that there are items which definitely do need an additional legal basis, but the Commission must, I feel, abandon its present inflexible position.

I did not ask to speak yesterday because the agenda was so full, but yesterday we again heard that the

Commission — I do not know whether it was the old one or the new one, but I am afraid it is the new one; perhaps the Commissioner will tell us — is sticking to its ridiculous view — against the will of the whole of this Parliament — that an additional legal basis is required to relieve Greece of paying its share of the compensation to the United Kingdom. We exchanged bitter words with the Commission on this last month, but it is nevertheless sticking to its position. We find this quite ridiculous. Let us try to avoid conflict this year by respecting the Treaties, but we must also ask the Commission and Council to understand that this Parliament has been directly elected and that, as the rapporteurs have just said, it cannot simply refrain from taking advantage of the considerable strength that lies in the budgetary powers it shares with the Council. This makes the problem slightly more difficult, but I feel it also puts it in a more realistic perspective. We have a great deal to do in the coming months to resolve this legal dilemma.

I would also appeal to the legal experts in our Parliament who are not members of the Committee on Budgetary Control or the Committee on Budgets — which have been examining this question for some considerable time — and who set store by the powers and the future of Parliament, to look into this matter. It is no longer acceptable that, for example, none or only 40 % of the aid intended for the Third World, the non-governmental organizations and the non-associated countries should not be spent, money which we have set aside to alleviate the consequences of emergencies in the world and which remains unused. We cannot go on like this. It came as a shock to my Group, and the solution will not be found in continued confrontation, but by sitting down at the negotiating table, to begin with only with the Commission, so that later the two parts of the budgetary authority — the Council and Parliament — can take a step forward in this area. I call on both Commissioner Tugendhat and then on all interested and expert parties in Parliament to ensure this is done.

President. — I call Mr Kellett-Bowman to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Kellett-Bowman. — Mr President, it is no exaggeration to say that the work of the Committee on Budgetary Control is of fundamental importance to the role of Parliament. By a process of evolution, partly through the Treaty and partly through amendments to the Financial Regulation, the powers of Parliament in the budgetary sphere have developed substantially over the years, both in relation to the adoption of the budget and in relation to the control that we in this House exercise over its implementation.

Budgetary control is no easy matter. Spending bodies frequently find themselves in a situation where they can back up fully proposals from the Commission and

Kellett-Bowman

thereby arrive at a point of camaraderie and goodwill with members and senior staff of the Commission. On the other hand, when scrutinizing the Commission's work in implementing the budget and when following up allegations of misuse or waste of Community funds, the control committee does not always endear itself to the Commission. There is always a danger, too, that other committees of Parliament will fear that the control committee's work intrudes on their spheres of responsibility. However, colleagues on the control committee will be pleased to read in the December issue of the staff magazine that Mr Tugendhat's staff consider this committee the most active and dynamic of the present Parliament.

Close control of Community expenditure by Parliament is now more essential than ever because of three factors: first, we who vote the budget through are now directly answerable to the taxpayers; second, the need for greater resources for the Community will be conceded only if it is evident that we in the Community are making the best possible use of funds being spent now; and third, we have to ensure that the best value is had for Community outlay and that any wastefulness of expenditure is put right.

Control work may seem tedious, because it involves the checking and perusal of complicated and detailed issues. It means attempting to form opinions on the cost-benefit aspect of projects financed out of Community funds.

While the control committee keeps an eye on the regularity and legality of expenditure, its main task is that of carrying out political scrutiny of the way in which policies are put into effect.

I make these observations so that colleagues may have a better idea of the philosophy which underlines the committee's work. If Members wish to read a succinct account of the tasks, the achievements and the working programme of this committee, I would suggest they read closely the very useful text prepared by Mr Aigner.

The savings effected or likely to be effected as a result of the work of the committee are considerable, though not readily quantifiable. In the course of our control work, the Court of Auditors has been of invaluable assistance.

I would like to compliment Mr Aigner and Mr Battersby on the clarity of their text and their compact presentation. Sometimes reports can appear to be too long. Here we have texts which deal concisely with complex issues. The authors deserve our appreciation.

President. — I call Mr Irmer to speak or behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Irmer. — (*D*) Ladies and gentlemen, I too should like to thank the two rapporteurs for the work they have done. The Commission's reports on the action taken following Parliament's debates on the discharge are very significant, since these reports enable us to establish during the year what effect our remarks during the discharge debates has had. You will recall that a discharge was granted in respect of both the 1977 and 1978 budgets, although some members of the Committee on Budgetary Control were more inclined to propose that the Commission should not be given the discharge because of the considerable shortcomings unfortunately noted in the implementation of the budgets.

But it was decided in the Committee on Budgetary Control to propose to the House that the discharge should be given, and the House accepted this recommendation in both cases. This should not, however, be taken to mean that we agreed in all respects with the way in which the Commission had implemented the budgets. Quite the contrary: we made it clear during the debates and in the motions for resolutions tabled on the decisions relating to the discharge where we must be critical. And, of course, we can and must expect the Commission to bear this criticism in mind.

It was also clearly stated that if the criticisms we made were not followed by an improvement in the Commission's work in this area, Parliament might very easily — and this is by no means mere theory — find itself forced to refuse to give the discharge. That, ladies and gentlemen, is of course the weapon, the sanction that goes with the budgetary control powers of this House. If we did not have this weapon, we would be like a dog that can bark, but does not have the teeth to bite with. We have these teeth, ladies and gentlemen, and everyone should realize this.

The Commission's reports on the follow-up action were, I am glad to say, submitted on time. In content, as the rapporteurs have said, they are not yet satisfactory. In particular, it is again clear that our remarks on the implementation of our own proposed modifications have borne little fruit. The two rapporteurs have referred to this situation in their statements.

I feel it is a scandal to find yet again that in 1978, for example, no fewer than 90 % of the increases in appropriations decided by Parliament were not fully implemented and acceptable explanations for this have been provided in only a few cases. I am quoting from one of the two reports. In these circumstances, we can only think that the Commission has disregarded Parliament's will or, almost as bad, that it has lamentably yielded to the superior power of the Council of Ministers. That, ladies and gentlemen, must be changed, and in this respect we place great hopes in the new Commission. I must be quite frank: the proposal in the Battersby report that a conciliation procedure should be set up to discuss possible improvements with the new Commission is welcomed

Irmer

by us in every way. We hope that this will produce positive results with the new Commission.

I should like, Mr President, to refer in particular to paragraph 7 of the Battersby motion for a resolution, which says: 'The European Parliament welcomes the Commission's efforts to reduce to a minimum transfers of appropriations and transfers to the following financial year with a view to ensuring the better implementation of the budget adopted.' This simply cannot be emphasized enough. But as regards the supplementary budget for 1980, which was approved by a majority of this House, I should like to issue a very clear warning. It represents a very strong criticism of Parliament as a whole, although it does not concern my Group, since it alone voted against the increased supplementary budget for 1980.

My warning is this: if Parliament continues to insist, as it has done for years, on the principle of annual budgets being observed and on our doing without transfers of appropriations as far as possible and if we then adopt a supplementary budget which we know in advance cannot be implemented in the year concerned, we are in fact encouraging the Commission to transfer appropriations from year to year and also within the supplementary budget. I am afraid that our call for budgetary truth and transparency has been undermined by this supplementary budget. To avoid any misunderstanding, I am not talking about the legality of this budget, which I am not disputing. Nor is it fitting for me as a German representative to judge the French or Belgian Government — but if the German Government says we are not going to pay, it will, in my view, clearly be breaking the law, we shall have something that is not legally justifiable in connection with the Community's own resources, a situation which that unpleasant word 'embezzlement' might be applied. I should like to make it quite clear that I consider the supplementary budget for 1980 and also the 1981 budget to be legal and that they must be implemented. My only fear is — and I would appeal here to the members of the other Groups — that we may have created a precedent with this supplementary budget. We must revert to the principle of a true, transparent and annual budget and stick to it. If this has been an exceptional reaction to an exceptional situation, it will have no serious consequences. We should all realize that we must abide by these principles or we shall ourselves be undermining the powers of control of this House, which are of decisive importance for the continued development of the Community and its institutions.

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, thank you very much for your congratulations and those of the House.

Certainly, there has been so much discussion this morning in the brief debate that we have had about biting that I think I need to point out that I am not a piece of dead meat but very much alive, and I hope

able to provide a satisfactory reply to some of the points which have been made this morning.

May I begin, however, by making a point with which I know that Mr Aigner, Mr Battersby, Mr Irmer and indeed Mr Kellett-Bowman and Mr Notenboom will agree, namely that I too believe that the discharge procedure is an absolutely essential part of the Parliament's powers. When one thinks of the budget — and everybody knows that it is in the budget area that Parliament actually has real powers as distinct from merely abstract influence on which it has to build — I think it is important that one should think not only of the passage of the budget but also of this particular part of the procedure: the examination of how Parliament's will — on the budgetary authorities' will for that matter — has actually been carried out. These are the two sides of the same coin and ought to be treated with equal importance. If I might repeat an exhortation that I made to Parliament in the past and with which I know that the Committee on Budgetary Control is in complete agreement, I do hope very much that Parliament itself will see its way towards attaching greater importance to these debates and making them into more of a parliamentary occasion. It really is very difficult when it is only the people who are professionally concerned, as it were, in these matters who have the opportunity of engaging in a dialogue with the Commission. I think that if the rest of the Parliament could appreciate more closely some of the issues which we are talking about, it would be very much to the advantage of both institutions and certainly very much to the advantage of the budget itself.

None the less, despite that remark, with which I am sure those present in the House today would certainly agree, we are obviously making progress and the debate today is an indication of that. For the first time Parliament is being called upon, as it undertakes the work preparatory to the discharge for 1979 — the most recent financial year for which there is an annual report from the Court of Auditors — to ascertain whether the follow-up action taken by the Commission in connection with the resolutions accompanying the discharge decisions for the earlier years — i.e. 1977 and 1978 — has really taken account of Parliament's wishes. It is an innovation and I think it is a good innovation.

As Mr Battersby made clear in his speech, the territory covered by the two reports is really very similar. He forbore to go over the grounds which Mr Aigner had previously traversed and I think it is probably best if I tend to deal especially with Mr Aigner and Mr Battersby together and in many ways the others too, though Mr Irmer made a number of particular points which I thought, I must confess, were very substantial. I thought in particular his point about the annuality of the budget and the need for Parliament to maintain a coherent position between demanding annual implementation from us while also making it possible for the

Tugendhat

money to be spent, was a good one. My views on the supplementary budget are well known. I am 100 % behind the view which the President of the Commission expressed on behalf of the whole Commission yesterday. But when we were talking about the supplementary budget before Christmas I did draw the attention of the Committee on Budgets and of the House to the fact that such a procedure, imaginative and understandable as it was, did have consequences for implementation which all of us would have to take into account. I am grateful to Mr Irmer for reminding us all of those points.

Mr Aigner and Mr Battersby both returned a generally positive answer to many of the questions that have been raised about the Commission's discharge of its duties. I would like to reply in an equally positive fashion. For instance I would like to point out in particular that, in connection with all the discussion about implementation, the reason why we reached the impasse we did before Christmas over the Social Fund was precisely because our record of spending in the Social Fund has improved so enormously. It has also improved very greatly in the case of the Regional Fund. It is interesting that in a sense two debates are taking place in parallel at the moment. There is the debate over the supplementary budget arising out of our very success at spending money and there is the debate which Mr Battersby and Mr Aigner have been engaged in this morning about what they allege are inadequate expenditures of money. Now I would go some way towards meeting them on the second point. I will come to that in a moment, but I think it is interesting to observe that the debates about inadequacies in terms of spending takes place in the same context and at the same time as a debate about a supplementary budget designed particularly to make up for a shortfall arising from our own success at actually disbursing money that had been voted into the budget.

I think it is important to bear these points in mind; I think it is important for Parliament — which sometimes is a little reluctant to recognize its own successes — to recognize that the injunctions it has rained upon us to improve our rate of expenditure have fallen on fertile ground, and in some important areas we have been very successful at that, more successful than the Council — which is unfortunately, I think, wholly unrepresented here today — has been willing to accept.

Now there is also a certain amount of discussion about the question of the legal base. Mr Aigner, who has frequently referred to this issue and Mr Notenboom who has fairly frequently referred to it as well, both raised it. This is a problem on which we have frequently had occasion to exchange views and it is a problem which is of very great concern to me and one to which I have been trying to turn my mind, amid various distractions, during the break over Christmas and the New Year. I think it is a point on which it is highly desirable for all three institutions of the

Community to see whether they cannot find a way out of the present impasse, to see whether they cannot find a way of doing things which is more in keeping with the realities of the situation and the needs of the Community.

It is perhaps worth going over old ground just a little because I recall that Parliament's position was last made clear in a formal sense on 6 November 1980 on the initiative of Mr Adonnino, the rapporteur for the 1981 budget, when he recognized, and I quote: 'In the case of new and far-reaching policies, requiring the adoption of detailed regulations, the implementation of the relevant appropriations should be subject to the adoption during the financial year of the necessary Commission proposals and Council decisions'. That is what Mr Adonnino said as recently as 6 November 1980. On the initiative of Mr Aigner Parliament had before that already criticized the Council in its resolution of 11 July 1980 for not, and I quote: 'having taken the legislative decisions which are a necessary consequence of the entering of appropriations, particularly where these concern new policies.'

The position of Parliament and of the Commission are close to one another, particularly since we believe strongly, as I have said before, that certain items of a more restricted scope may be implemented by so-called *actions ponctuelles* — the nearest English approach to that word is *ad hoc* measures — on the basis of the budget alone. I think both of us agree with that and both of us are interested to see how that particular concept can be developed and built upon.

Now as I have told Parliament on several occasions there may also be cases where Parliament would take the view that implementation is possible on the sole basis of the adoption of the budget and where the Commission might take the view that a separate legal basis is essential. That is why Parliament, with the full support of the Commission — I emphasize the full support of the Commission — proposes a conciliation procedure in order to reach a consensus. I was very glad that Mr Battersby returned to that point with a good deal of vigour not only in his resolution but also in his speech today.

I should also like to say that the Commission is working as fast as it can on proposals which it has been asked to put forward and is continuing to try to persuade the Council to adopt without further delay draft regulations which are still pending.

So, if I might go over the ground again, we share Parliament's concern about this whole problem of the legal basis. We support Parliament's desire to have a conciliation procedure in order to try to find a way out of the present *impasse*, in order to seek to develop ideas and operating methods which are more in keeping with the realities of the modern and developing Community in which we live. We are also very much concerned by the Council's practice of some-

Tugendhat

times simply holding up measures, with the result that nothing can be done from one year to the next. (This will bring me onto the question of implementation in a second.) There has to be good faith between the two institutions; we cannot have a situation where an institution in practice constantly refuses to take action without actually saying it is not going to take action, without actually coming clean and saying that there is a difference of view, but simply for ever putting something off, so that one is never quite clear whether it is merely a matter of a decimal point here or a full stop there. What we need is a much clearer understanding of when and why and in what circumstances proposals are being held up. We must not have difficulties over agreement being allowed to undermine the normal decision-making procedure. The decision-making procedure must be a reflection of the legitimate rights and aspirations of the two halves of the budgetary authority.

I hope I have said enough to show that, though we do find this a very difficult and complicated problem, it is one which we wish to approach in a constructive spirit. It is one where we believe evolution is necessary. It is one where we believe that the present situation is not in the interests of Parliament, nor in the interests of the Community as a whole. It is one where we will lend our best efforts to finding a solution more in keeping with, as I say, the realities of a developing Community.

I now come to the question of implementation, which both Mr Aigner and Mr Battersby discussed at some length in relation to the brevity of their speeches. Both of them recalled their earlier criticisms.

Let me begin by making one point which I think it is worth making in this connection. This is quite a new problem. It was only in 1979 that we began to be asked whether we could actually spend money, and it was only in 1980, after the direct elections, after this Assembly had taken on its present form, that the quite specific questions were put to us by Mr Dankert in his resolution and then subsequently during discussions in the Committee on Budgets about whether we could spend the money or not.

As, I think, came through from Mr Irmer's remarks — and I know it is something which those concerned with these matters in the Parliament fully appreciate — Parliament has a part to play as well; but if Parliament insists, as it has a perfect right to do, that something should go into the budget which we have said we doubt we shall be able to spend, it cannot then be surprised at the end of the day if it turns out that, for the reasons which we explained at the outset, we have been unable to do as much as we would have liked. Parliament asks the questions, but it needs sometimes to listen to our answers.

Now I would make a number of points, of which the first is that we recognize the difficulty, we are doing

our best to improve the rate of spending. The Social Fund is a tangible example, and I will not say any more on that because I said enough at the beginning of my speech. Secondly, I would say that we are not the only party involved. We are not, if we may continue the canine analogy, the only person at whom you should be barking, not the only person who might in the end deserve a bite or two: there is also the Council and the speed with which it takes decisions, and there are the individual Member States and the speed with which they put forward projects and the speed with which they asked for payment from us, because clearly, we are not operating in a vacuum. Every one who is familiar with the way the budget works knows that the speed of decision on the part of the Council is one element, and that the way in which the Member States carry out their own activities, the speed with which they bring forward projects, and the speed with which their bureaucracies submit bills, are other problems as well.

The second point I would make is yes, it is important that Parliament's will should be complied with. That is very important. But Parliament has more than one will, if I might say so. Parliament has the will to ensure that its amendments are implemented. Parliament has a will to see that money which it wishes to see spent, is spent. But Parliament, especially the Budgetary Control Committee, also has a will to see that money is not wasted, that money is not subject to fraud, that money is not poured down the drain and there is always a difficulty when one is seeking to spend money quickly to make sure that it is also well spent.

I think all of us know from our personal experience that, on the whole, it is not too difficult to spend money quickly. Most of us, I think, in general find it a greater problem to restrain our expenditure than to increase it, and certainly I must confess that I have always found that it is easier to increase expenditure than to restrain it.

While it is necessary to ensure that money is spent on the objects for which Parliament has said that it should be spent in the right time-scale, it is also important to ensure that all the procedures are gone through, that the financial controller is able to conduct the right sort of investigation and enquiry and that money is not being applied in the Member States for whatever reason in ways which we do not believe is right and which the Parliament does not believe is right and which may indeed not be right in terms of the regulation. There is always a slight conflict between the need to spend money in due time and the need to make sure that, when money is spent, it is spent in the proper way and subject to the proper control procedures.

I know very well, and I do not complain about this, that if the occasion were to arise in which money was not spent on the right objects, if money was wasted, if money was put to wrong usage, Mr Aigner and Mr Battersby and Mr Irmer and other people who have

Tugendhat

spoken in this debate would quite rightly be among the first to criticize us for doing so. So I ask you to remember our twin responsibilities and your twin desires.

The next point I would make, and this is something which I have also said before, is that I really do not believe that Parliament ought to down-grade its own position in the decision-making procedure. Of course one can see where Parliament has made amendments. One can follow the stages rather like a geological examination. But when eventually a line is in the budget with 100 000 000 units of account or whatever the figure may be, it really is not right to say that the Council was responsible for 80 000 000 of those and the Parliament is responsible for only 20 000 000 of them. The fact of the matter is that the Council and Parliament are both of them responsible for the whole 100 000 000 and both of them ought to be concerned to ensure that all that money is properly spent in the time available.

There is a danger in the way in which the argument is developing, namely Parliament saying that while you are on the 80 000 000 that is no concern of ours, it is only when you get on to the 20 000 000 that you are dealing with the point that really concerns us. It is rather as if one had a churn of milk and Parliament said it is not interested in the milk but only in the cream and, while you are draining off the milk this is no concern of ours, it is only when you get to the cream that our interests begin. I would argue that Parliament ought to be concerned with the whole can of milk and not just with that part which arises from its own amendments is part of the whole proposal to be dealt with on the basis of equality with the rest.

That is why I think it is misleading to look at the figures for implementation in the way in which Mr Battersby has done in his table and the way in which Mr Aigner mentioned in his speech. I would say that the key point on which the Commission should be judged is the speed and the effectiveness of its implementation, and effectiveness covers both ensuring that the money is not wasted and the actual laying out of the money. Here, if one looks at the appropriations for payment entered in the budget lines for 1978 as affected by Parliament's amendments, we find that 48.5 % of these were spent in the first year and 94.47 % over the first and second year. Now that, in my view, is a more realistic way of looking at the issue than simply looking at the percentage of the final amount of money which was added by Parliament. If you say that we spent only 5 % of the amendment in the first year, that is a very misleading way of looking at it. We spent 48 % of the total appropriation. Even on that basis in the second year you find that our expenditure is up to 85 % of the amendment and 95 % of the total appropriation.

Mr President, what I am trying to do is to put the whole thing into context. I accept, and I do not want

anybody to misunderstand this, that there is a problem, I accept that it is necessary to improve the rate of spending. I think that in the Social Fund we are capable of doing that, but I ask you first of all to widen your criteria in the ways that I have suggested, or at any rate take into account the criteria that I am suggesting. I ask you, secondly, to remember that we are not the only players in this game. The Council as such and the Member States as such are also involved. If you find the present situation unsatisfactory go at us but also go at the Member States and go at them both in the sense of trying to knock them into line and also trying to find ways — and we would cooperate with this — of improving their procedures to actually ensure that the money is spent. That's all I have to say on that point.

Just to conclude, Mr President, very briefly: there was a third question, namely, the time-limit for the Commission to draw up its report on the follow-up to the discharge. Mr Battersby would like this report to be made from now on in November, not in the May following as provided by the current regulations. In its proposed modification of the Financial Regulation the Commission has made no proposal for change in this area. Indeed, the method of having a full account delivered in May of the year following the discharge decision preceded by an interim report in October, as we have done this year, seems more practical than having one single report in November. In the Commission's view, the present method meets Parliament's requirements by allowing the institutions to examine issues raised in a timely manner.

Now on the other matters in the draft resolution the Commission is either not directly concerned or has no additional remarks to make. Some of them are matters which the responsible committee and the Commission can certainly pursue which ought subsequently to come to the floor of the House.

Mr President, I have spoken at rather greater length than I had intended, but the points about the legal base and the implementation are of central importance. Several references were made to the fact that we are a new Commission, albeit with some familiar faces. I wanted to show that we not only share Parliament's preoccupations but enter into these problems and their resolution in a constructive and positive fashion.

President. — I call Mr Aigner.

Mr Aigner, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, I too should like to begin by thanking Mr Tugendhat for his statement. I feel it has become clear how important this debate is. We therefore intend to discuss the future function and organization of our control activities with the Bureau as soon as possible.

Mr Tugendhat, you once rightly said that if this Parliament does not grant a discharge, the Commis-

Aigner

sion must resign. That is true not only of the old, but also of the new Commission. That alone shows that this Parliament has important powers in connection with the discharge.

Mr Tugendhat, Parliament's Committee on Budgetary Control does not devote 90 % of its work to urging you to spend more, but to ensuring that you spend the money correctly, in other words, in such a way that a maximum of success is achieved with a minimum of effort. During the debate on the 1977/78 discharge we placed the emphasis on the discharge, on spending and so on the implementation of policy because Parliament's principal right is involved, the right to be involved in the determination of Community policy through the budget. If then, as the budget is implemented, this right is not recognized, Parliament must obviously defend itself.

I am particularly pleased to note, Mr Tugendhat, that the Members of the new Commission who also belonged to the old Commission have proved very capable of learning, because when I compare your first speech four years ago on the effect of items of expenditure and on budgetary powers in relation to the Council's legislative powers with your statement today, it is quite obvious you have taken more than one step forward. I am very grateful to you for this. President Thorn and those of his colleagues who are interested — I am also referring to Mr Davignon — should have a meeting with our Committee on Budgetary Control as soon as possible to discuss ways of implementing the policy for which we once coined the term *formule magique*. To put it another way, the adoption of the budget must represent an adequate legal basis for the Commission to implement it, even if the Council as the legislative body does not act.

Mr Tugendhat, on one point we certainly do not disagree: there are new policies or simply policies in the Community that require a legal act apart from the legal act constituted by the budget.

This is not true of all new policies, and the old Commission often proved that, when it had the political courage, it could force through new policies even when the Council was opposed on the grounds that it first had to create the legal basis.

I feel that once we have agreed with the Commission on this *formule magique*, which we apply to every budget and to every budget item, if we believe the budget itself is sufficient as a legal basis, the Commission must abide by these legal positions when implementing the budget, regardless of whether or not the Council cooperates.

The Commission is and remains the budget implementing authority, and we find it completely inexplicable that the Council should in recent years increasingly develop into the Community's implementing body, while the Commission has increasingly

appeared to be the Council's assistant. The new Commission must put an end to this.

My last point is very close to my heart. In recent weeks, Mr President, we have had some very tough discussions with the Commission on export subsidies. After a tough discussion one morning the Commission informed us of its decision that no further subsidies would be paid on exports to the Zaire region. In the last few days we have found that in practice this Commission decision has been circumvented with the aid of a new tariff number, mixtures of 30 % butter fat and 70 % coconut fat being exported to the Soviet Union, for example. The subsidy is now so high that butter exported to the Soviet Union is cheaper than the butter we are supplying to Poland. This kind of thing must not happen. Communication within the Commission must be such as to prevent a decision of this kind from being by-passed. Our natural opponent, Mr Tugendhat, just happens to be the Council, since in its national short-sightedness and claims to omnipotence it is for all practical purposes blocking the continued development of the Community.

The Commission and Parliament can break this blockade, but we must act together if we are to succeed. We therefore expect the new Commission to be more willing to accept concerted action than its predecessor.

If we want to assess what proportion of resources intended for a given policy has been spent, we must consider the total appropriation, that is the appropriation approved by the Council plus the increase made by Parliament. In this respect, Mr Tugendhat, you are right. But throughout the budget debate we proposed increases only in respect of those items on which the Commission assured us it would be able to spend the additional resources. That was the assurance the Commission gave us in 90 or 95 % of cases.

I have been a member of the Committee on Budgets for almost 20 years. We have repeatedly asked ourselves when considering every individual appropriation whether you can in fact spend the funds. When the Commission has told us it cannot spend them, the Committee on Budgets has not proposed increases. If we make increases where we believe the Commission cannot spend all the resources, we are blocking our own policy because our margin is limited. If we know from the outset that the money cannot be spent, we prefer to spend it on another policy, in which we know we can achieve a new breakthrough.

Mr Tugendhat, there will certainly be no confrontation over this point. I simply feel we must cooperate more closely in our joint policy — and that means against the Council. If Mr Battersby's and my own report have helped us to achieve a wider measure of political agreement, then I feel this has been a good debate.

President. — I call Mr Battersby.

Mr Battersby, rapporteur. — I would like first of all to thank Mr Tugendhat for a most refreshing reply. I feel that with this new Commission we are seeing a wind of change and more constructive budgetary philosophy. I would also like to thank him for drawing our attention to the fact that there are other parties involved in the budgetary procedure and for asking us to save a tooth for the Council and for the Member States.

I would like just to say one word about Mr Notenboom's remarks on food aid. I would like the Commission to consider the possibility of multiannual aid programmes, because the effects of famine and flood and drought, the grinding poverty that a lot of the world lives in and all the human misery in the world do not go away every year on 31 December. They are going to be with us for a very long time, and I feel that we must take a longer term budgetary view a food aid funding and food aid planning.

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I should like to say just one word to Mr Aigner, because he did raise one important new point in his second speech, namely, the question of assurances from the Commission. This whole question about the importance of whether or not the Commission can spend is, as I said, of relatively recent origin. It arose first in 1979, though not until 1980 did it really arise officially, and we are still talking about an era rather before that. I would not deny for one moment that where one has a specialist committee — it does not matter which it is — and one has an official from the Commission, perhaps even a Commissioner, in front of that committee, both of them actually want to jack up the policy concerned. There is thus a temptation to attach rather little importance to the ability to spend and for the one to assume and for the other to assure.

However, a lesson we have learned from the events of the last two years, and, I believe, a lesson that Mr Aigner and his colleagues would agree with, is that we need to have a much more formal procedure whereby — and I have heard Mr Dankert say this in this chamber as well — the Commission is asked and gives its answer. Parliament can, of course, disregard the answer, since Parliament has its own sovereign right to put something on the line anyway. Parliament may feel that in doing so it is putting a prod behind the Council, and it may be right. However, it does need to ask us, and we need to have a formal response procedure which is quite independent of the political value of the policy in question. We may well say this is a matter of the highest political importance which we wish to see developed as quickly as possible but which

we nonetheless have to tell you in present circumstances is likely to be difficult to spend money on. We can then talk together about the best way of trying to ensure that it is given political momentum, but there has to be a distinction between the precise question of expenditure and the, perhaps, more important but nonetheless more diffuse question of political desirability.

We need to talk together in order to establish a procedure whereby neither of us can be under any misunderstanding and where there is a clearing house for undertaking these kinds of assurances across all the budgetary lines. I hope that the House will find that satisfactory.

President. — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Mr President, I believe that it is quite outrageous that, on a point of this importance, a matter which concerns the whole future of the Community, the Council should be totally unrepresented.

Could you, in your capacity as the President of this Assembly today, raise that matter with the Council and ask it to have at least a representative here while these matters are being discussed?

President. — Your comment has been noted.

The debate is closed.

The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

4. *European automobile industry*

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the report by Mr Bonaccini, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the European automobile industry (Doc. 1-673/80).¹
I call Mr Martinet.

Mr Martinet. — (*F*) Mr President, if we intend to press for a solution to a problem which is very complex in nature, we must get to the root of the matter.

In the case of the crisis in the automobile industry, the root of the matter is 'Japanese competition'. Let us have no illusions about the strategy applied by Japanese companies. I must, of course, refer to all the

¹ See report of proceedings of 18 December 1980.

Martinet

obstacles, all the non-tariff barriers which our exports face. This will help us to justify the action which, in my opinion, must be taken. But it would be illusory and childish to believe that in exchange for agreeing to the growth of Japanese exports to Europe we can achieve a significant increase in our sales to Japan, firstly because we shall not change Japanese structures and secondly because, for the reasons referred to in Mr Bonaccini's report, we shall continue in the next three, four and perhaps five years to produce cars which cost 25 to 30 % more than Japanese cars. The truth is that there will be no commercial limit to the Japanese offensive during this period. There can only be political limits, as the managers in Tokyo know full well. That is why they are proceeding step by step. Hardly have they swallowed up another part of the market than they begin to hide their true intentions behind a show of good will. But basically nothing has changed:

Japan intends to conquer the world automobile market just as it has already conquered the motorcycle market. How are the Europeans reacting to this offensive? Just as the Western democracies reacted in the years preceding the Second World War. We all protest together, and then we act separately. Some countries impose quotas. Others reject them. A delegation goes to Tokyo to ask Japanese industrialists to temper their ardour, while at the same time Volkswagen, Alfa-Romeo and British Leyland are signing agreements with Nissan and Honda. These agreements we are told — and it is true — are limited in scope. But they are in line with the goal the Japanese are pursuing: to divide the Europeans and prevent them from taking temporary protective measures. It is obvious that in the absence of such measures the crisis in the European automobile industry is threatening to assume dramatic proportions. Why are these measures not being taken? Because we do not want to be accused of violating the sacrosanct principle of free trade. But everyone knows that Japan and the United States are ten times more protectionist than we are. The fact is that we are doing nothing because we lack the political will.

But in the automobile sector we have a major asset. Most of the cars we sell remain within the Common Market. Of 11 300 000 cars produced in Europe in 1979, 9 400 000 were sold in Europe, which means that, even if our exports to countries outside Europe — which amounted to 1 900 000 cars in 1979 — fell — and fall they will because of Japanese competition and also because some European companies are installing plants in the United States and Latin America — and even if our internal market grew to only a slight extent — as you know, the forecast is that sales in 1985 will be up by 1 000 000 to 1 500 000 cars compared with 1980 — even in these two cases, which are equally probable, we can save most of our productive capacity on condition that the Japanese offensive is stopped dead by means of self-restriction agreements, where possible. Of course, there will be no self-restriction agreements if we do not show our

competitors that we are determined to resort, where necessary, to temporary protective measures of the types referred to in Mr Bonaccini's report. What we are discussing is undoubtedly an economic problem, but it is above all a social problem. The Ford company in Europe has made a forecast of the jobs that will be lost in the automobile and ancillary industries between now and 1985. The forecast is that 560 000 jobs will be lost. And I personally fear that this will turn out to be an optimistic forecast if we continue to act as we have done so far. I believe three conclusions must be drawn.

Firstly, we must stop tackling the problem of free trade in mythological terms. We cannot oppose the development of free trade: we must be in favour of its development. And we cannot oppose this or that export of capital. But we cannot ignore the extremely protectionistic nature of the American and Japanese economies or the damage done to employment in Europe by some exports of capital, which I would call 'boomerang' exports.

Secondly, some of our companies and some of our governments must also stop behaving quite so egotistically. There is no French solution, no German solution, no British solution, no Italian solution and no Belgian solution to the crisis in the automobile industry. There can only be a European solution, which means cooperation agreements among the companies, the restructuring of companies making components and the sharing of technological advances. Community protection against Japanese competition will serve a purpose only if we use the next four or five years to become competitive again, and we shall prevent the decline of Europe only if we have common industrial policies.

Thirdly, the Commission must at last provide us with statements on commercial trade which are couched not only in terms of monetary value — we have earned this or we have lost that — but also in terms of jobs created or lost. After all, we must forget that we have reached and passed the threshold of 7 000 000 unemployed in the Community. This is a scandal. In plain terms, it would be intolerable to add a further half million workers from the automobile and ancillary industries.

IN THE CHAIR: MR HANS KATZER

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Müller-Hermann.

Mr Müller-Hermann. — (D) Mr President, on behalf of my Group, Mr Hermann, already said in December that my Group generally endorses Mr

Müller-Hermann

Bonaccini's report. But I certainly do not view it in the same light as the last, Socialist speaker. I should like to make three comments on the situation in the European automobile market.

Firstly, we abide by the principle, also stressed by the President of the Council in December, that each company and each sector is itself responsible for its own destiny and also for adjusting to changes in the market. It would simply conflict with our economic order for companies which make good profits in good years to call on the State in bad and difficult years to pay for the losses or to take protective measures. No one in this House can deny that the European automobile industry had a number of outstanding years up to, I would say, 1979. But obviously a number of companies were too content too long to rest on their laurels and to put off the adjustment to changes in the market and to the energy situation.

Secondly, Mr President, the Community must ensure that the basic conditions exist for fair competition within the Community and in the world markets. I believe it would be completely wrong of us to reproach the Japanese companies, for example, for marketing good products. On the other hand, we must point out to the Japanese Government and to Japan itself that trade relations between Japan and the European Community must be balanced, that on no account must they be or remain a one-way street. In this context, we have, of course, a number of requests to make to Japan. In view of the imbalance in trade relations, I feel Japan would be ill-advised to pursue an overly aggressive sales policy in the European market. Japan must do more than in the past to open its market to European products. This, I believe, gives rise to a question which must be put very fairly and also very frankly to the Japanese Government, as I expect the delegation from the European Parliament which will be visiting Japan in the second half of February will do. Is it not true to say that Japan can do a very great deal more for the promotion of its industry specifically because it undoubtedly has not assumed sufficient responsibility for the defence of the Western alliance, because it does less for the Western hemisphere and because it is more reticent on the question of development aid than the Community? Japan itself must help to achieve equilibrium in the balance of trade and trade relations, but of course we Europeans must also make a greater effort than in the past. European companies must be encouraged to be more active in the Japanese market.

Some assistance from the Commission may be needed here. Otherwise, all I can say from my own observations is that the European companies continue to be far too reticent, which may be partly due to laziness. How many Members of this House can make themselves understood in Japanese? And yet we fully expect the Japanese to have a command of the European languages. We have a great deal of catching up to do in this respect.

Thirdly, and lastly, Mr President, I believe we in the Community face a tremendous task. Everyone should see with his own eyes the dynamism, the will to achieve, the productivity that exist in the Far East and above all Japan. Protectionism is no answer. I believe, ladies and gentlemen, that all of us in this House realize how very dependent the European Community in particular is on imports of raw materials and that we can pay for these imports only if we are efficient exporters. With protectionistic measures we shall simply be cutting our own throats.

We politicians, the Commission and our governments must mobilize the will to achieve at all levels of the Community and in the Community. We must substantially increase our productivity, and this appeal is directed primarily not at the workers, but at management and the engineers. The management level must make the effort needed to reduce the lead the Japanese have gained, and management must show far more acumen and flexibility than is, partly at least, the case at present.

Let us have no illusions, ladies and gentlemen. The pivot of the world economy and of world policy will move consistently and logically away from the Atlantic area and Europe to the Far East and the Pacific. We must see the activities of the Japanese in the automobile market as a challenge and as proof of the need for a great new effort in the Community. I feel that the interpretation we should give Mr Bonaccini's report is that we should not resort to or rely on protectionistic measures. Our first need is to meet Japanese competition with our own achievements. That is my appeal to this House.

President. — I call Sir Frederick Warner.

Sir Frederick Warner. — Mr President, that was indeed a remarkable speech we have just heard from Mr Müller-Hermann. I would like to say how deeply I agree with what he said. I certainly do not share the views of the speaker before him, that we are now approaching a situation similar to that which existed before the Second World War and so on. The Japanese are part of the whole trading system of the world today, and we have got to learn to get on with them. We have got to compete with them and we have got to integrate them and make sure that they respect the standards which we have set.

Mr President, I have the honour of serving as chairman of this parliament's Japan delegation, so it is about the relationship between the Japanese and the European motor industries that I shall speak.

First, the major cause of unemployment in the Community's motor industry is undoubtedly, as many others have said, the import of Japanese cars. Some Japanese spokesmen have tried to deny this. They say the British motor industry is being destroyed by

Warner

imports of French or German motor-cars, that the French motor industry is threatened by imports of Italian and Spanish motor-cars, and so on. We must answer to them that we have one Community market of over 6 million cars a year and that every one Japanese car that enters that market displaces one car made in Europe and therefore damages the men who make it. And so a Japanese share of our market at 10 % is intolerably burdensome on our industry. To allow it to rise to more than 20 %, as in the United States, would be really catastrophic. A European disaster must have a European solution, and from now on manufacturers will be faced with a united European response — not with nine national responses, but with a united European response.

Secondly, the answer to our problem, as other speakers again have pointed out, does not lie in an imagined opening up of a market in Japan for our own car industry. The Japanese domestic market is small when compared with our own. Whatever technical and administrative barriers to imports remain are in fact quite few. Japanese tastes and habits are the real obstacles to our cars, but even if these were changed the scale of the Japanese motor industry means that their products will always be cheaper than ours for years ahead. Let us have fair trading, but the solution we look for now is fewer Japanese cars in Europe rather than more European cars in Japan.

On the other hand, my third point is that the Japanese motor industry uses only Japanese components and that this ought to change. Our own cars often contain at least 50 % of imported value. This is what sophisticated trading is all about and if the Japanese want to be part of our sophisticated system and reap its huge advantages they cannot fly in the face of it. The attempts so far made by the Japanese to use our components are insignificant, pitiful. Only in joint ventures within Europe such as the Leyland-Honda agreement have they admitted the need to use European components. Perhaps such agreements, therefore, will prove to be the best way for Japan to share in our market and will be to our advantage, as I firmly believe.

Fourthly, I have already remarked on the low price of Japanese cars, which comes from economies of scale. My colleague, Mr Hopper, has argued forcibly that these low prices are reinforced by a low rate of exchange artificially maintained. I need not add to what he has said. The Japanese might well ask themselves whether past attempts to flood our market with low-priced vehicles has not proved counter-productive and whether they might not earn just as much foreign exchange by a less aggressive approach further up-market.

But everything said in this debate today shows that only a voluntary regulation by the Japanese industry of its exports to the Community can provide the solution we need for the next few years. Whether those

exports should be fixed at 3% of our market or at 5 % or higher is not for us here to say. Our manufacturers in the CCMC have already expressed their views in Tokyo. They will be meeting again with the Japanese manufacturers in April. They will now know that they have the full backing of the Commission and of this Parliament. If they do not succeed in getting the voluntary restraints that they seek and should get, we shall conclude that other action will have to be taken by the Community's institutions. But until we have reached that stage let us reserve judgment.

Finally, we may learn a lesson from all of this. The overpowering strength of the Japanese car industry was built up behind high tariff and quota barriers. For the first 20 years of its life, until 1970, the Japanese car industry enjoyed between 30 % and 40 % protection. Only in 1978 when it had become impregnable were tariffs finally abolished. The Japanese motor industry is not the only one that has been nursed by its government. The same mighty industrial base has been created for computers, for communications equipment, for micro-electronics. In dealing with the present let us think also about the future. It is already with us.

Mr President, these are the views which your Japan delegation will be putting to Members of the Japanese Parliament when we visit them in February this year.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Frischmann to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Frischmann. — *(F)* Mr President, the French members of the Communist and Allies Group share the general and growing concern about the worsening situation in the automobile industry.

In France several tens of thousands of jobs have already been lost, and further massive redundancies have been announced this month, while tens of thousands of others live in fear of their future. We therefore share the view that urgent measures and above all genuine solutions are needed in this crisis.

The report before us does contain some proposals along these lines: a measure of market protection, account to be taken of the dangers of enlargement, account to be taken of the dangers of outside investments in Europe and of investments by European groups elsewhere, the need to encourage research and development, energy savings and so on.

But we feel that these proposals alone will not be enough to provide a genuine solution to the crisis in the car industry. This industry cannot, in our view, be considered in isolation from the crisis and austerity which each country is experiencing. The decline in the incomes of the workers and farmers is depressing the

Frischmann

car market and the economy as a whole. As the cost of cars, insurance, the various taxes, petrol, motorways, repairs increases and as pressure is exerted on wages and social benefits or on farmers' incomes while unemployment grows, the car becomes a product that millions and millions of families cannot afford. We cannot therefore approve and coordinate austerity policies in Europe and then complain about a shortage of outlets or of demand for cars or any other products. But now it is claimed that wages and social benefits should be reduced further so that the industry may become more competitive with its Japanese rivals. We reject this argument because no one can claim that Renault, for example, is not a competitive company. As a result of the workers' struggle this national company has long been exemplary as regards wages and the social advantages that have been acquired. The French working class will never agree to adopt the Japanese model, which for them would mean a return to the Middle Ages in social terms. The basic principle therefore continues to be that the needs which must be satisfied are above all the needs of the people. The car must be within everyone's reach, which presupposes the elimination of austerity. The car industry itself must meet the workers' demands with regard to wages, the reduction of the working week to 35 hours, the improvement of working and retirement conditions and investments which create skilled jobs as a priority. And all this is quite possible if, of course, there is the will to ensure growth in this sector, to work together towards the production of all types of vehicle, to increase trade with all countries and if there is a will for further nationalization and the democratization of the management of companies, since we now have proof of the failure of technocratic management. How can we talk about European solidarity at a time when the German Volkswagen group is concluding an agreement with the Japanese Nissan company and other European companies are preparing to do the same.

The report contains a proposal for a European plan. We reject this solution after the terrible experience the workers have had with plans for the coal, iron and steel, shipbuilding and textile industries. Why should it be any different with the car industry? In fact, only development on a national basis can ensure genuine international cooperation between the ten countries of the Community and the other countries with respect for mutual interests and based on equality rather than domination, hierarchy and cut-throat competition. That is what we are fighting for in France, with the workers concerned, and because these considerations conflict with the ideas of the report of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, we shall vote against the resolution and any amendments to it.

President. — I call Mr Pininfarina.

Mr Pininfarina. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, since the continuation of the debate on the

crisis in the automobile industry has been deferred until this sitting, we are now able to discuss the matter in the light of recent developments which permit a more thorough examination of the problem than was possible in December.

The anxiety felt since last spring, which prompted the resolution I had the honour of presenting in June, tends to be fully justified by the first statistics available on the general trends of 1980.

Since then the situation in the automobile industry, as far as production and sales are concerned, has been gradually worsening. The balance sheet for 1980, as well as the predictions for 1981 and 1982, reveal that the crisis in the automobile industry is one of the greatest trouble spots in the Western economy.

Changes in the markets over the last year have caused considerable modifications in the map of the world automobile industry and in the relationships between the various geographical areas concerned.

The total amount of production in the EEC countries, including that of North American companies located in Europe, still puts the Community in first place among the large producers of motor vehicles, though by a narrow margin.

At the same time, however, the United States, for the first time in the history of the automobile, has been overtaken by the Japanese, who produced about a million more vehicles in 1980 than did the Americans.

Japan, moreover, is the only producer which can claim an improvement over the previous year, with a 20 % increase in production and a 33 % increase in exports.

The United States is at the opposite end of the scale, with a 24 % decrease in production and a 25 % decrease in exports.

This is a fact with serious economic repercussions, for as early as September the three major American automobile manufacturers announced a 3.5 thousand million dollar deficit. This in turn provoked alarming social consequences which are amply illustrated by the number of American auto workers currently laid off: 182 000 not including the 45 000 early retirements effected on a total labour force of around 780 000 people.

As many as 13 American plants out of 40 will resume production after the Christmas holidays beginning only next week, due to the significant fall in demand.

The 1980 statistics for Europe are no less alarming: according to available estimates the production of motor vehicles declined by 8.4 % in Germany, by 7.5 % in France, by 13.1 % in the United Kingdom, and by 2 % in Italy, where exports, however, showed a decrease of 17 %.

Pininfarina

Even the strongest countries, which only a few months ago did not feel themselves seriously affected by the crisis, are now faced with balance sheets calculated to provoke anxiety. A few days ago the French auto workers' unions called for emergency measures in the automotive sector, and the difficulties of the Italian and British industries are well known.

It is therefore impossible to underestimate the importance of this problem, and our Parliament has certainly done well in confronting it seriously at the proper time.

This is important also in political terms, for the new role of our Assembly depends on its ability to make a timely identification of the major problems of our Community and to serve as an active participant in their solution.

In this regard the preparatory work accomplished since last June by three parliamentary committees has had excellent results.

The document presented by Mr Bonaccini for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs contains the substance of this work and reflects, both in its analysis and its proposals, a clearcut, rational and constructive position. It can offer a highly useful contribution to the efforts to be made by the Council of Ministers and by the Commission in this sector.

I am therefore pleased to announce our Group's favourable opinion on this position, and I am particularly pleased to give credit to Mr Bonaccini, who has proved that it is possible in this Parliament to go beyond ideological prejudice and mere Group loyalty.

In recent years the automobile has been the subject of ideological disputes, especially in Italy, but in other countries as well. Much has been said concerning the undesirability of the individualistic model of development represented by the automobile, in contrast to a hypothetical and more 'social' model of development based on the use of mass transit facilities.

This apparent contradiction was but an ideological pretext based on a reactionary viewpoint, for in reality the development of public transport is anything but incompatible with private transport. This is amply demonstrated in those countries which have succeeded in providing alternative means of transportation for their citizens and workers without however abandoning the concept of private transportation.

The fact is that such disputes contributed to delays in the development and renewal of the automobile industry during the difficult years of the crisis in energy costs and supply, years which are still with us today.

These delays affected the vitality of the companies concerned, and the disputes themselves influenced governmental policies to the extent that development

in the sector of private automotive transport was often penalized.

In some countries in the Community, then, the automobile industry was obliged to fight on a 'domestic front' even before it could begin to respond to the double external challenge posed by the United States and Japan.

In my opinion, the automotive policies which can be carried out by individual members of the Community within their national frontiers cannot be other than limited and insufficient.

For this reason we have called for an automotive policy at Community level as proposed in the Bonaccini document, which calls upon the Commission to take action immediately, as stressed in the Barbagli opinion, before it is too late, as was the case in the iron and steel industry.

European automobile manufacturers, in the course of the hearing held by the Liberal and Democratic Group last December in Brussels, told us they would not welcome a Community policy if it were to mean restrictions and excessively burdensome demands on the industries concerned.

This is not the sort of policy we would wish to see, however, for I too am of the opinion that the Community should above all guarantee a precise and solid framework of reference, and in particular a clearer and more flexible use of opportunities and incentives.

We do not therefore call for a supranational policy of Community intervention to be imposed on the Member States, but rather for coherent and constructive measures which would recognize the structural nature of the crisis and offer concrete indications, valid for all, of a possible solution.

In my view, there are four major areas calling for priority attention:

- funding for common research programmes on subjects of public interest such as energy savings, new materials, and new technologies;
- encouraging increased concentration in the components sector, developing programmes already in existence and initiating others in new installations in the depressed areas of the Community, beginning for example with those affected by the recent earthquake in Italy;
- improving the relationship between the social partners concerned and creating a more thorough legislative standardization in Community-wide industrial activity. The representative of the Japanese manufacturers, during the meeting with our political group, told us, not without pride, that his country's success was due to two factors: the stimulus of competition and the good relations between social partners.

Pininfarina

This is a simple recipe which deserves closer study, so that we can at least tell the difference between real and short-term or illusory social progress.

— activating private European instruments to finance the restructuring of this industry. This could be done through the introduction of a Community guarantee on debts issued in EUA's by automobile or component manufacturers. The Commission could intervene with an interest subsidy contingent upon the pursuit of predetermined economic and social objectives.

This would serve especially as a means of reinforcing the EMS, and it would be consistent with the basic principles of Community financial policy.

As you can see, these suggestions reflect an attempt at a gradual approach to the problem based on as realistic an evaluation as possible, and they share certain aspects which I think it important to emphasize:

- (1) the desire to influence structural factors, which, aside from the present circumstantial difficulties, are the most alarming;
- (2) the need for a long-term approach to the problems inherent in a long term crisis;
- (3) the pro-European inspiration of this programme, since European unity is built upon concrete measures and not upon abstractions.

Ladies and gentlemen, in this context it is also easier to picture the so-called Japanese problem, on which I would like to touch briefly before I conclude. The current Japanese export policy is very aggressive, but the European market must prudently and rationally maintain its openness and be aware that:

- (1) protectionism is only possible if seen in terms of a definite time-limit, for otherwise the disadvantages outweigh the eventual advantages;
- (2) the choice of a free market cannot however be unilateral, for Japan as well must assume the risks and the burdens of free competition;
- (3) the choice against protectionism leaves no room for inertia, but rather calls for the rapid implementation of measures designed to improve our competitive ability;
- (4) until measures for strengthening and stimulating the European industry can be made effective, it will probably be necessary to adopt temporary, gradual and limited protective measures if no positive results are obtained from the negotiations the Council of Ministers is now pursuing with Japan, negotiations which are following what appears to be the wisest course at the present time.

I believe that the discussion of these matters poses a difficult challenge to national egotisms, to the interests of the various companies, to the provincialism of the unions and to the prejudices of the political groups which viewed the crisis in the automobile industry

only from a protectionist and restrictive standpoint apparently generic to the problems concerned.

Protectionism is certainly the simplest answer, but protection alone is useless, for it serves only to aggravate the problem if no simultaneous effort is made to remedy the ills that made protection necessary.

Our liberalism is therefore not based on ideological prejudice, but represents rather a concrete and pragmatic search for the solution best adapted to an economic system whose strength resides in its freedom, and in the hope of a more secure future that this freedom sustains.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

5. *Tribute*

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, we have just learned with deep sorrow of the death, a few hours ago in Strasbourg during this par-session, of Mr Finn Olav Gundelach. Stunned as we are by the news, it is difficult to express the depth of the grief and the loss we feel at this moment.

Mr Gundelach was born on 23 April 1925. After a brilliant career of studies in political economy, he entered the Danish Foreign Ministry where he was noted for his professional capabilities and his open and affable character. As head of the Danish delegation to the European Communities he played an active role in the negotiations leading up to Denmark's accession to the Community where he became first a Member and, from 6 January 1973, Vice-President of the Commission. He had just been re-appointed to that post.

During these years he worked tirelessly for the people of Europe in promoting progress and justice in Europe. His whole life was devoted to the people of Europe and he truly gave his life in the accomplishment of the tasks assigned to him. In this house Mr Gundelach won not only the respect but also the affection and friendship of all its Members irrespective of political group or nationality.

On behalf of Parliament I extend to his family, his children, his fellow citizens and to his Danish colleagues, who are the ones most closely affected by this loss, as well as to the Commission our deep sorrow and sincere condolences.

I call Mr Thorn.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — Madam President, the Commission is shocked and dismayed to

Thorn

hear of the death of Mr Finn Gundelach at 9.30 this morning, a short time after he was taken to hospital in Strasbourg.

We join with you, Madam President, in conveying our condolences to his family, so cruelly bereaved in this way. The loss that Finn Gundelach's death represents for the Community, for Europe and, of course, for Denmark is immeasurable.

At a time when our institutions face the task of finding solutions to such serious economic and institutional problems, he was to have played a particularly important role in our immediate programme.

Perhaps more than others, the Members of your Parliament have had the opportunity of assessing his courage, his knowledge, the complete devotion with which he went about his tasks. This devotion, let it be said once again, was total and absolute.

Finn Gundelach never spared himself. I wish he had done so. It is no exaggeration to say, as you have just done, Madam President, that he gave his life for the Community cause. I recall that he first fell ill here in Strasbourg last July, after a debate, but despite this he went on. When it was recently suggested to him that he might perhaps give up one field of activity, he said, 'Yes, I know, but I have to finish my work as a negotiator on the fishing policy.' So you see he gave his all to his work and he constantly surpassed himself.

As you said just now, Madam President, he was the architect of the accession of his country to the Community in his capacity as Denmark's chief negotiator at the time of the first enlargement.

In 1973 he dealt with the internal market. He was involved in the commercial policy, and his name will always be associated with the Community's agricultural policy and fisheries policy.

With the death of Finn Gundelach our Commission has lost one of its best men. It has lost a friend. It has lost a very great gentleman.

(Parliament stood and observed a minute's silence)

IN THE CHAIR: MR HANS KATZER

Vice-President

President. — I call Sir Henry Plumb.

Sir Henry Plumb, Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. — Mr President, this whole House will be shocked to hear the news which Madam President has

now given us. May I, on behalf of the members of the Committee on Agriculture, say in particular how saddened we are at this news. No one has known better than the members of the Committee on Agriculture the total dedication of Mr Gundelach to the cause of agriculture in the Community. It is so sad that at this time, when he himself had produced a very personal report on the improvements of the common agricultural policy and that we ourselves were going to be involved with him only this very morning in discussion of those possible improvements, we should now be denied the opportunity of working together with Mr Gundelach on those improvements he had in mind and which we also wish to see brought about. It is therefore my responsibility, on behalf of the members of the Committee on Agriculture, to join with Madam President in saying how sorry we are and in offering our sympathy to Mr Gundelach's family, his very close personal friends and to all his colleagues in this Parliament and in the whole Community.

President. — I call Mr Møller.

Mr Møller. — *(DK)* Mr President, the news of Finn Gundelach's death comes as a terrible blow to the Danish Members of this House. In Denmark Finn Olav Gundelach was highly esteemed and respected as one of the most gifted Danes appointed to a European institution. We were proud and pleased that he was given the task of harmonizing the common agricultural policy, a task which also meant a great deal to his own people. I wish to say that I am in Strasbourg not merely as a Member of this Parliament, but also because I was to discuss with Finn Gundelach a prize which we were to present to him in a few months' time and to fix the date for the presentation. I was unable to do this. Question time yesterday took up his whole time and he was as committed to that as to everything he undertook. This dedication characterized everything he did.

It will be difficult for Denmark to find someone worthy to succeed Finn Olav Gundelach in the Commission. He was a committed European who saw things — in particular Europe's agriculture and its fisheries problems — from the European point of view, and in Community negotiations he subordinated his own country's interests to those of the Community. But let me also say that, as an eminent and patriotic Dane, he was deeply concerned also for Denmark's interests. He never forgot that he came from that small country and now had the task of coordinating the agricultural policy of the whole of our large Community.

As Danish Vice-President of this Parliament I wish to express my profound sympathy for those who have lost a good friend, a member of their family and a close acquaintance. I also ask you to understand that all the Danish Members of this House feel that we have lost someone of whom we valued highly.

6. *European automobile industry (continuation)*

President. — I call Mr de la Malène to speak on behalf of the Group of the European Progressive Democrats.

Mr de la Malène. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is somewhat difficult, after what has just happened, to turn with a light heart and a calm mind to a debate on the car industry.

But this is a matter of capital importance for our countries and for Europe, as everyone has said during this debate. Everyone has referred to the important place the car industry occupies in the economic life of our countries and in employment. Everyone has stressed its importance, and I shall not dwell on this. But it is a point which I shall take as the pivot for my statement. Having assessed the seriousness of the problem, it is important that we do not wander off in a direction which will not lead us to the solution. This is not a crisis that has been caused by our industrial structures, our productivity or the leaders of the car industry. It is a crisis caused by external factors. It is not a question of trying to decide whether or not there is enough concentration and modernization in our industries. It is not a question of shifting the blame elsewhere, it is a question of reacting to a problem raised by the aggressive strategy the Japanese industry is using against the car industry throughout the world and particularly in Europe. That is where the problem lies. It is not a question of seeing if we have a satisfactory level of concentration or not, if our productivity is good or bad. It is a question of reacting and of immediately — it is already very late — taking action in response to the aggression of the Japanese car industry.

And the response must be a global one: it must be aimed both at our internal market and at our external markets, and if needs be, it must extend beyond the car industry to include other industrial sectors so that the response is commensurate with the aggression. We have already left it very late. We have undoubtedly delayed too long. We have seen how the European industrialists have reacted here and there in different ways. We regret that the European Council meeting in December did so little to organize Europe's response. So much time has been lost. Thought has been given to the matter, committees have been set up, studies made, but those at grass-roots level, the manufacturers, cannot wait. And we can see how the manufacturers have reacted. These reactions are not good for European industry.

Today we are having a debate. I am not convinced that Mr Bonaccini's report will lead to a clear policy allowing a response to the challenge the leaders of Europe face. Before adopting a position on this report, we shall, of course, wait and see if various amendments that might strengthen the text, which seems to us to imply too vague a response, are adopted by our

Assembly. But we must be very careful in our assessment of the importance of what is at stake. A great deal is at stake for Europe. If we do not respond together as we should, the national leaders will have to find the means — and this will be a poor solution — to protect employment and the industries in their countries. Europe will have gained nothing. Quite the contrary. And I am not sure that that would satisfy anyone.

We feel it is late to be taking action, perhaps too late. We must not be mistaken in our objective, and we must not look inwards but outwards. We do not think that the solution will be found by shifting the responsibility to some government or other. The solution will be found if we face the problem. The solution, as I said just now, will come if Europe organizes itself to respond as a whole to a strategy of industrial aggression. That is the response. We must accept a global solution, because if we do not, we must realize that there will be responses by individual nations, and that would not be good for European industry or for Europe.

To conclude, I would remind the House that we have tabled a motion for a resolution and that, with the aid of amendments, we hope to improve Mr Bonaccini's report. If they are not adopted, we feel pessimistic about the European industry's future, and Europe will have once again missed an opportunity of responding in a satisfactory way to one of the major industrial challenges of our times.

(*Applause*)

President — I call Mr Petronio.

Mr Petronio — (*I*) Mr President, the data we have available for analysing the serious crisis in the automotive sector is well known, and it would therefore be superfluous to quote any more statistics. The Japanese challenge has already been unhesitatingly defined as a 'genuine assault on the European market'. As Mr Hopper correctly stated at the previous sitting, this assault is supported by a play on the exchange rate of the yen, and it has resulted in a decrease in production, a fall in sales, especially to non-Community countries, and in an alarming increase in unemployment.

At this point we find ourselves faced with the dilemma already mentioned: either we choose to adopt protective measures which later lead to outright protectionism, or we attempt to develop means of cooperation capable of solving the problem of the European automobile industry, accepting the Japanese technological challenge and responding to it adequately. We believe that the second choice is infinitely preferable, and that it should be launched with sizeable investments from the risk capital market. It is certainly

Petronio

impossible nowadays to think of closing the frontiers, especially after the GATT agreements. Protective measures can be envisaged only if the current negotiations are caught on the snags of purely artificial technical obstacles. At the same time the principle of competition should be encouraged and its concrete meaning extended to include cooperation, harmonization, professional qualification, technological research, energy conservation, and finally, standardization of components.

Another possible course of action, which would obviate the need to resort to protective measures, would call for the harmonization of technical specifications, especially in the areas of inspection and control, as well as in that of insurance and tax procedures.

We could also turn our attention to the much praised small and medium sized companies, which could accomplish much in the sectors of assembly, components, research, and development. At this point however it is necessary to permit easy access to Community loans which should be supported by an adequate information policy regarding the nature, effectiveness, and desirability of such financial measures.

There are still other avenues to be explored if protectionism, which could lead to dangerous reprisals, is to be abandoned. The development of electronic technology and aerodynamics could be promoted together with energy conservation methods and experiments with alternative energy sources, linked with close attention to consumer protection and the improvement of working conditions.

Efforts could be made in the area of common research programmes, of combined automotive production and testing, and other forms of collaboration, not excluding joint ventures with third countries. This would make possible substantial economies of scale and increased productivity. The employment benefits to be derived from such programmes should not however lead to an increase in our technological dependence, which would eventually turn Europe into a sort of industrial colony or protectorate whose companies would be reduced to secondary status or simply absorbed by their foreign partners.

Finally, close cooperation will be necessary among producers, insurance organizations, and car repair firms.

These appear to us to be the basic elements of an automotive policy capable of providing a positive response to today's challenge; a policy which would leave the frontiers open while facing competition with a spirit of innovation, a capacity for modernization, courage in the adoption of technological novelty and above all with cooperation between Community and non-Community companies, for economics is now a

global matter and markets no longer have natural geographical limits.

President. — I call Mr Didò.

Mr Didò. — (*I*) Mr President, in the report and motion for a resolution draw up by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs correctly analyse the causes of the crisis in the European automobile industry. The suggested counter-measures emphasize in particular the goals of increased productivity and market harmonization. These measures are rich in possibilities, and I approve of them, but we believe that they are insufficient to produce substantial adjustments in the structural causes of the present crisis.

In Italy, for example, the large automobile manufacturing companies experienced a significant increase in productivity owing to a drop in absenteeism and a stepped-up work rhythm, both consequences of a realization on the part of the workers of the gravity of the crisis. The resulting increase in production, however, has caused even greater difficulties for the companies, which are beset by an ever-increasing number of unsold automobiles. The problem of productivity exists, but it is certainly not the only problem, nor even the principal one. One must bear in mind that the greater productivity of the Japanese firms is due to a type of work organization which could only with difficulty be adopted in our own countries, and that, in any case, the general recourse to automation and robotization cannot ignore the union's fight for a less alienating type of work organization and a fuller recognition of the professional personality of the worker.

If we consider that the future threat will come perhaps more from the United States than from Japan, as indicated by the enormous sums committed to research and restructuring by the principal American car manufacturers and following upon the recent consolidation of the US position in the sectors of electronics and data processing, we see that the real problem for us in Europe is to develop a European strategy for automobiles while recognizing that the product must be modified to meet a new kind of demand. It is not only a question of creating a common market for automobiles and of harmonizing standards and taxes; it is also and above all a question of implementing a common industrial and commercial policy in this sector. Here in particular progress is very slow or almost non-existent. It is the lack of a true Community policy which leads individual companies to try to solve their problems separately by means of international agreements, especially with Japanese manufacturers, a measure which will eventually result in greater competition among the European companies instead of a rational solution of the problems already besetting the automotive sector. Common industrial policy means the pooling of the national resources available to each Member State for

Didò

the purpose of stepping up research efforts. I must add in this regard that the attempt by certain Member States to solve this problem on an individual basis, taking advantage of some gains achieved, is completely illusory, and it will be short-lived when confronted by the economic power of countries like the United States. The French Government, for example, may have reason to hail certain agreements with the Japanese, but it should not then compound its negative attitude by boycotting Community research centres.

I believe that immediate action could be taken in this field by invoking the ECSC Treaty, which in Article 54 provides for the loans by the Commission for sectors which use steel, and certainly the automotive sector can be considered one of these. In this way, through a lending policy adopted by the Commission, programmes to increase the competitive potential of the Community's automobile industry could be financed. I believe this suggestion is important and I wish to call it to the attention of the Commission.

A common industrial policy also involves the attainment of a certain level of integration among the European companies — which is not opposed to protection of the various makes of automobiles — and the common manufacture of components, taking advantage of a large scale economy and making use of a coordinated public demand on a European level, especially in regard to electronics and data processing. A common commercial policy means jointly adopting the measures necessary to wage the commercial war declared at this particular moment by Japan. We are well aware that this war is conducted by means of a kind of social dumping and by playing on the exchange rate of the yen, with the additional aid of protectionist measures. For us there can be no question of seeking refuge in protectionism, for such a choice would lead us to defeat within a few years; we should, however, in the present situation, provide ourselves with an adequate defence against an unacceptable strategy of commercial penetration. Mr Martinet's speech was very clear on this point.

The other question to be faced in the Community is of a more general political nature. It is impossible to develop a common industrial and commercial strategy without providing the Community institutions with the powers and financial means necessary for its execution. Recently, in order to tackle the steel crisis, the Community adopted measures which can be defined as 'negative planning', imposing cuts in production to improve market conditions and permit reorganization. For the automobile, on the other hand, measures of 'positive planning' should be approved, adapting common productive, commercial, and social policies to be administered by Community authorities. There can be no doubt on this point. In the report by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, however, no mention is made of this problem. If this omission is due to a choice made on grounds of a

certain 'realism' in the face of the crisis now evident in the process of Community integration, then we must frankly acknowledge that, in spite of the fine speeches we can make here, the Community is headed for a costly defeat in the current struggle due to an international division of labour which tends to leave Europe out of account.

It must also be borne in mind that the reorganization of the automotive sector will eventually create serious employment problems which cannot be dealt with solely by means of sectoral measures, but which can only be solved through an overall policy of Community economic and industrial development.

Finally, the other issue demanding a concrete response is the recognition of the vital role of participation by workers' representatives — and this means the unions — in the decisions to be made regarding the reorganization and productive conversion of the automobile industry and its related undertakings.

The problem has a Community-wide impact, and for this reason organs for participation must be created not only at the company or national level but also at the Community level, so that it is possible to define a general strategy embracing workers' problems concerning employment and work organization and ensure a constant monitoring of the situation. We are convinced that no one can cherish the illusion that these complex problems can be solved without cooperation from the workers and their unions. I believe that Mr Pininfarina is of the same opinion on this point, and I think it important that members of the Liberal and Democratic Group have also emphasized this aspect, which we Socialists hold to be decisive.

President. — I call Miss Forster.

Miss Forster. — Mr President, many reasons have been given for the success of the Japanese car industry and there is no doubt that, unless fundamental changes occur in the European industry, the Japanese will continue to undercut us, not only in the home market, but in third country markets as well. We can ask them to curtail their exports voluntarily, but they have the jobs of their own employees to think about, and it is possible that such voluntary restrictions would be only short term and not as great as we might want.

We cannot increase our tariffs because of GATT, but we could threaten to impose quotas for a period during which some restructuring of the European industry could be achieved. However, it is in the interests of the Community and of Japan that trade should be as free as possible, and quotas should only be used as a last resort if voluntary arrangements break down. It is vital that the Community act as one in this, and I should like to suggest that the Japanese should limit themselves to not more than 9 % of the EEC market.

Forster

At present, Italy has a bilateral agreement which means that Japanese exports to Italy are negligible and the French have an arrangement whereby Japanese exports are limited to 3 % of the home market. I hope therefore that France and Italy will act jointly with all the other Member States so that the Community as a whole can be equally successful in making sure that the Japanese limit their exports voluntarily or, if this fails, by quota, to the target figure of 9 %.

It is in the interests of all of us that a respite of perhaps two or three years be given to enable the industry to restructure. This restructuring will not be done by intervention by the Commission; the way forward is by free competition amongst the car manufacturers, so that the stronger firms survive and can compete with the USA, Japan and other countries.

In this connection I should like to put in a strong plea that the articles of the Treaty relating to competition be interpreted in the context of the modern world where other countries sometimes compete unfairly, and that market dominance should be measured in Community terms rather than at national level. Similarly, manufacturers should be permitted to come to an arrangement between themselves of a temporary nature if this will facilitate restructuring. And such plans should not be declared illegal, as happened in the case of the synthetic fibre industry.

There is no doubt that rationalization of the car industry will continue, with possibly more mergers of the Talbot-Peugeot-Citroën type, to achieve economies of scale and more joint ventures like British Leyland-Honda arrangements which will speed up the transfer of technology and the introduction of new models. This rationalization will also help the components industry, as larger numbers of components will be required and some manufacturers may decide to purchase components jointly.

I do not believe however, that the components industry can be helped to restructure by attempts to force the standardization of parts. For example, the standard of performance of car lights and their position on a motor vehicle could be harmonized at the Community level, but the actual design of the lights must remain the choice of the producers themselves, according to the design concepts and specification of the complete car.

Rationalization of the supply of car lights must therefore follow after the rationalization of car production; it cannot precede it and it cannot be imposed by the Commission or by any other outside body.

The Community can best help the industry by action in the areas of research and development and by assisting such projects as the Channel Tunnel and improvements in the road system. In the short term, however, the most urgent need is for money to be spent on helping workers who leave the industry to find and

train for new jobs. Ford have forecast that by 1985, as many as 160 000 jobs may be lost through improvements in productivity, and even if this happens a further 340 000 jobs are potentially at risk because of higher imports of cars into the Community and lower export sales. Personally, I would rather see some jobs lost through productivity gains, and those workers helped to find new jobs in other sectors, if this means that the industry could make and sell cars at prices which meant that they won markets rather than lost them. I feel sure that this would guarantee the continuation of the other jobs in the industry and in the components industry far better than anything else we can do at this time.

President. — I call Mr Carossino.

Mr Carossino. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the problems which the European automobile industry is now facing provide a meaningful picture of the delay and the resistance which still obstruct the effort towards effective industrial cooperation among the Member States of the Community.

The principal merit of Mr Bonaccini's report, which we Italian Communists fully support, seems to us to consist in the fact that it offers a precise and realistic analysis of the situation and of the problems to be confronted in the medium and long term. It suggests several courses of action and assigns an important role to the Community, which emerges as an active protagonist rather than a passive observer in a complex process of restructuring the industry. It recommends acceptance of the external challenge rather than recourse to protectionism or programmes of government assistance, and aims at increasing the European automobile industry's efficiency and competitive potential in the area of quality and prices, while at the same time working to preserve employment within the industry.

This is the only valid choice possible if we want to guarantee the present and future autonomy of the automobile industry and prevent it from being reduced to a mere subcontractor while the strategic decisions are made outside of the Community.

This programme is based on confidence in the vitality of the automobile industry and faith in its ability to rise to the challenge. We are, moreover, convinced that the great financial, technical, and administrative effort needed in Europe cannot be accomplished by each nation separately, but rather must take place at European level, by means of a common industrial and commercial policy, as Mr Didò said a moment ago.

Today there is no real European automobile market, but only a series of industries. One of the structural weaknesses of Europe, in comparison to the United States and Japan, is precisely this excessive fragmenta-

Carossino

tion, as experts have unanimously agreed. The measures for energy conservation and the launching of a global transport policy, along with the necessary standards for safety and environmental protection, should therefore constitute the pillars of the programme indicated in the motion for a resolution. They would contribute towards the creation of conditions favourable to market unity and cooperation among the companies.

It is evident that these proposals do not in fact aim, as some seem to fear, at instituting some sort of centralized control which would take over the market and limit competition. Those who lament the restrictive nature of the market should be reminded that the existence of national barriers in this sector responds to specific interests of the industries, which were able to enjoy profitable and protected positions — a fact which in itself contributed towards higher prices for European cars and the consequent weakening of their competitive position in the markets. To be consistent we must support — and not reject, as was done in committee — the amendment proposed by our group, calling on the Commission to take all possible action to ensure the transparency of prices, to identify profits due to geographical advantage, and to isolate elements of market control which artificially reduce demand.

We consider, moreover, that the theme of those who reduce the problem of competitive ability to the slogan 'more work and less pay' is both illusory and dangerous.

This approach is dangerous because it would inevitably provoke a clash with the labour movement, which will never willingly yield the gains it has made; it is illusory because it does not take into account the inefficiency, the waste, the delays in technological innovations, and the errors in commercial policy for which the industry has in specific cases been responsible.

Production can only be increased if action is taken in all fields pertaining to it. We must realize that the role of the Community is to stimulate and promote industrial cooperation among the Member States, the manufacturers and the social partners, without substituting itself for them. This role, however, cannot be limited to merely increasing a contribution to be subsequently entrusted to the discretion of the companies. In the face of the social consequences which restructuring will have regarding labour mobility and requalification, it is necessary to adopt a strategy conceived and implemented in a democratic manner, through appropriate procedures and information measures and consultations between social groups; it is also necessary to direct the processes of restructuring towards the priority goal of maintaining employment. The community should be given the task of promoting the political, legislative and financial conditions necessary to inaugurate this process of cooperation.

These, ladies and gentlemen, are the opinions and proposals which the Italian Communists intended to offer in support of Mr Bonaccini's report.

President. — I call Mr Delorozoy.

Mr Delorozoy. — (*F*) Mr President, the automobile industry in the European Economic Community employs 6 million people. Almost 35 % of all cars produced in the world are European. But the car is not simply a tool, an object, a piece of equipment: it has symbolic value and is often the expression of a certain standard of living. It plays the role of a fetish, as one Member put it last month in Luxembourg. This is true, and it should encourage us to take careful account of the grave social consequences that a real crisis in the automobile market would have.

But for the moment, even though the market trends vary from one country to another in the Community, the problem we face is principally one involving competition and is undoubtedly one of the most serious we face. It will require, to say the least, a strategy far different from that used in the past to deal with crisis situations, for example in the iron and steel, shipbuilding and textile fibre industries or in rapidly expanding high-technology sectors such as electronics. The basis objectives to be achieved, as Mr Bonaccini's report very rightly says, are increased productivity in the European car industry and an improvement in its competitiveness at world level.

There is no such thing as a European car industry — as another speaker has just said. What we have are a number of national industries all endeavouring to dominate their domestic markets. It is true that the problems differ in scope and nature and that the solutions must be adapted to the situation in the various Member States, but we must improve European competitiveness. And the Economic Community can demonstrate its ability to respond to a challenge of this kind if the Member States have sufficient will to create the necessary conditions by harmonizing their strategies, coordinating their actions in every possible and necessary area: costs, technology, financing, tax and social aspects. Rather than a policy of support or assistance we must quickly adopt a range of measures designed to facilitate and encourage cooperation among the companies in research, experimentation and rationalization of production and even the restructuring that is needed. As the report says, it is important to act openly. The results will be all the more positive and effective if the means used are realistic and free of all Malthusian restrictions and do not simply result in the postponement of the necessary decisions. If the Commission and Council do not succeed in taking early decisions to act, history will be very critical of their inability. And we would long have the proof that we are unable to take this new and essential step in industrial cooperation, without which

Delorozoy

Europe will never have the economic power to keep a significant place in the world of today, which is waking up and on the move and even less in the world of tomorrow, which will show no consideration for old Europe.

At present, and to be brief, it can generally be said that the United States of America and Europe, including the American subsidiaries in Europe, produce on the spot what they sell, whereas Japan produces 10 million vehicles for a domestic market of 4.3 million. Safe in its fortress, Japan imports only about 50 000 vehicles each year, which is practically nothing. In addition, as you know, Japanese manufacturers have a will to penetrate, an aggressiveness towards the European market which makes us look passive in comparison. In the face of Japan's devastating commercial imperialism we must adopt a firmer and more realistic approach. While reaffirming our desire to make progress in a policy of free competition, in a European market open to international trade, we must accept the need for action that is now — I hope the Commission is aware of this — justified and a matter of urgency in the context so admirably defined by Mr Pininfarina this morning.

But we must admit that, in the absence of a voluntary limit on sales by the Japanese and faced with wide variations in the response from one Member State to another and above all — of this there can no longer be any doubt — with the will of Japanese manufacturers to conquer markets come what may, various safeguard measures of a protectionistic nature — let us not mince matters — should be taken for a transitional period of adjustment, which should be as short as possible. We are not seeking to protect profits or to support inefficient companies. Our aim is to prevent the destruction of an industrial sector that has come under excessively abnormal attack. The fate of hundreds of thousands of European workers is at stake. The future, the very existence or destruction of the European automobile industry is at stake. The Commission will have a great deal to account for if it does not react as the situation requires and with the necessary urgency, because there is also a danger of the social and economic balance being upset, which would seriously affect the future of the whole of an important sector of industrial Europe.

President. — I call Ms Clwyd.

Ms Clwyd. — Mr President, I have been waiting so long to take part in this debate that it is quite a shock to be actually called. I must protest that the debate has taken place in three parts over several months now. I have protested about this in Parliament before. It is impossible to have a coherent debate on a subject when it is split up in this way and I hope this protest is taken note of by the Bureau yet again.

Mr President, diagnoses differ but the fact remains that the patient is sick. The symptoms of the current problems in the European motor industry are all too familiar, and the results are familiar too: massive job losses and short-time working. As recently as Christmas, British Leyland in the United Kingdom announced the loss of a further 1 300 jobs to add to the growing toll of job losses in the motor industry in the United Kingdom. The most serious effect on the economy has been caused by the penetration of our market by foreign car imports — not only, it must be said, Japanese imports, but imports from other EEC countries too. That import penetration reached 60 % last year in the United Kingdom. Needless to say this has had a devastating effect on regions such as Wales, where not only are there car manufacturers but a host support or feeder industries.

The impact, Mr President, on the steel industry has been well documented in this Parliament. Imported cars are made from imported steel and this, together with the withdrawal of government support and the imposition of set financial and time targets, has contributed to the loss of 72 000 jobs in the steel industry in the United Kingdom alone. Producers of tyres, components, leathers, cloth, glass and paint have all been forced to dismiss workers. And the steel that goes into foreign goods, and the foreign goods which penetrate our market, are carrying many hidden subsidies seriously damaging our steel industry.

Mr President, the report and the opinions on the report stress the importance of social policy in restructuring older industries. We have spent many months both in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, of which I am a member, and in Parliament talking about social measures, voting for social measures, and to no purpose. Both the Commission and Parliament said the traditional methods were not enough in the present situation in many of our older industries; that allowances were needed for early retirement and earnings compensation for a reduction in overtime. And indeed Parliament and the Commission have been progressive in their attitudes.

But, as we know, the Council of Ministers has shunned these methods and these measures and rejected Parliament's opinion, arguing that traditional methods are sufficient. In the view of the Socialist Group this is a blinkered and callous attitude by the Council to the plight of thousands of steelworkers and other workers throughout the Community. While the Council continues to meet in secret, the citizens of the Community will never know where to pin the blame for reactionary and inept policies. And with the experience of the lack of social policies as far as steel workers are concerned, what hope is there for a more enlightened policy as far as car workers are concerned?

In a debate on steel a few months ago my colleague Hans Peters emphasized that modernization must not

Clwyd

take place at the expense of the worker. But the only social aid available, colleagues, to that worker is assistance when jobs are lost; where the worker is bought off and left on his or her own too often for the rest of his or her working life. Given the experience in the steel industry, where thousands of workers have no opportunity of finding alternative jobs, there is extreme cynicism about the ability of the European Parliament and the European Community to put into action even further rhetoric about social policies to go hand in hand with the loss of jobs. I believe that if the Commission fails to take action to protect the jobs of workers in the car industry then the trade unions in those countries will take action against imports themselves.

My colleague, Gilles Martinet, referred to the 7 million unemployed in the Community. Almost 3 million of those are in the United Kingdom alone. In my view, and in the view of the unions in the United Kingdom, this damaging flood of imports into the car market has to be stemmed, I believe, and they believe, that short-term collective import controls are needed — certainly as far as the United Kingdom is concerned. They are necessary to create a genuine breathing space during which our industries can re-equip and reorganize. The real intention of that is to strengthen our indigenous motor industry and not to create a feather-bed for any individual company.

Mr President, that is the only way in which we can avoid systematically destroying yet another basic industry and condemning thousands more workers to witness the failure of our so-called social policy.

President. — I call Sir David Nicolson.

Sir David Nicolson. — Mr President, colleagues, you have heard of the problems of the European motor vehicle industry which is a vital industry affecting millions of workers directly and indirectly. You may also have heard how early in December the council of Ministers promised to improve coordination of industrial innovation in the Community, because Europe was falling so badly behind in developing advanced technologies. Was this just talk, or is something going to be done? For a start, when are we going to have an Industry Council in the Council of Ministers? Surely it is an important enough subject. In America the government is giving 800 million dollars to the automobile industry and in Japan the investment aid given is immense. In Japan there are now 6 500 robots in manufacturing compared with 2 000 in the whole of the Community. The productivity ratio in the automobile industry is such that 3 or 4 Europeans are now needed to do the work of one Japanese.

We can't go on like this. That is quite obvious, and we must have a new approach. We certainly need a breathing space, but in the longer term the only way for

industry, particularly the automobile industry, to survive is by being competitive. This means that we must regain the lead in design, which we are quite capable of doing, and match performance in terms of price. In order to catch up now, however, the scale and complexity of the research and development needed is too expensive for individual companies or countries to undertake. We cannot rely on protectionism or asking the Japanese to stop exporting or propping up industries with aid.

What we have got to do is something much more positive, and we have got to do it now. We should let contracts now to individual companies for research and development both in the field of design and in the application of automation systems in production. We should ask the European Investment Bank to help with investment in these areas. When this work has been carried out, we can then licence the results to any company which applies and thus spread the know-how gained throughout the Community. The time has come for action. It cannot be delayed. Let us try to take at least one positive step now.

President. — I call Mr Vernimmen.

Mr Vernimmen. — (NL) Mr President, Mr Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, it is very difficult to say anything more that is worthwhile after so extensive a debate. What I can say is that in the last five years the volume of non-European goods sold in Europe has doubled and the European manufacturers' share of the European car market has fallen from 95 to 90 %.

It is forecast that there will be further erosion of the European position, because the major investments made in the car industry not only in Japan but also in Eastern Europe are aimed principally at the Western market. The forecast is that by about 1985 Japanese manufacturers will increase vehicle production to about 14.5 million units, including 9.3 million passenger cars. Domestic demand in Japan will, it is estimated, account for fewer than 4 million cars, and it can therefore be assumed that 5.5 million will go to export. As a result of the growing protectionism in the Third World and the expected restrictions on Japanese exports to North America, some 1.9 million Japanese cars will be coming to Western Europe, unless restrictions are imposed on imports.

It is also expected that car production in Eastern Europe will expand quickly and reach 3.8 million by about 1985. Once again Western Europe will absorb most of this increase, with the sale of Eastern European cars likely to rise to 800 000 units by the mid-80s.

By 1985 Europe may be importing 3 million passenger cars, 2 million more than in 1979. The European car manufacturers would then be supplying only 8.4 million cars, less than three-quarters of total European demand.

Vernimmen

The prospects as regards profits and employment in the European car industry are indeed gloomy. It is estimated that by about 1985 133 000 existing and potential jobs in the car industry may be lost. A similar number of jobs in ancillary industries would also be lost. This gloomy employment prospect will be further aggravated by shrinking European exports and also by improved productivity.

This means that by 1985 a total of about 500 000 existing and potential jobs in the European car industry may be lost. Approximately half of these will be due to the increase in non-European imports. If the factors likely to affect employment in the car industry itself are shared among the various European countries, it is possible to estimate the gains and losses of potential employment. On this basis it appears that Germany and Belgium will be hardest hit: the prediction is that by 1985 150 000 existing or potential jobs may be lost in the car industry itself in those countries.

The question is, what can we do about this? Can we sit back in Europe and allow a quarter of the workers in our most important industry to lose their jobs? Of course not. I feel the European industry will need some time to face and adjust to this challenge, a period in which we will develop new models and restructure our industry. In the coming five years we must reduce Japanese sales in Europe to the 1979 or 1980 level. Without this reduction the industry will soon be in the same position as the steel or textile industry, and it will then need enormous support from the European Community.

I believe the European Parliament and the Commission can help by asking the Japanese Government voluntarily to impose a limit equivalent to 7 % of the European market. That is the level reached in 1979, before the tremendous increase in the sales in 1980, which are a threat to our future. Parliament and the Commission must be prepared to use statutory means to give strength to such a restriction if the Japanese are unwilling to accept a voluntary arrangement. Excessive naïveté may do irreparable damage to our employment policy, and in my opinion this policy must be given priority.

President. — I call Mr de Courcy Ling.

Mr de Courcy Ling. — Mr President, there are cities all over Europe which have been dependent for most of this century upon the prosperity that the motor-car industry has brought to them. I am thinking of cities such as Milan and also of Coventry as one that interests me, and I must say that the futility of war, of which Coventry is a symbol, and the reconciliation that followed war and the hard memories of the bombardment of 1940 are followed forty years later by the futility of de-industrialization, the near despair which the 12 % unemployment level in this centre of British motor manufacture has brought.

I might say that, to summarize, the Commission thinks, the Council of Ministers acts, but above all the Parliament feels, and the Parliament must feel for the nearly 300 million people in Europe that we represent. Their feeling is one of bewilderment at the interim industrial situation through which we are going in this decade, the system which David Howell, my colleague in the British Government, described the other day not as de-industrialization but trans-industrialization.

The difficulty about the insensitivity of Japanese motor-car manufacturers and exporters is that they are making it extremely difficult for us. They are making it impossible for us to move step by step away from the declining industries of the European Community into the new industries which will provide hope for our economies, hope that we shall be able to maintain our social order and also the international monetary, financial, industrial, and trading systems on which Japan herself depends. GATT, for example, was never meant to lead us to a freedom of trade which meant commercial chaos, chaotic international trading relations; it was meant to create an orderly framework in which trading relations between the industries and governments of the industrialized world would be determined on a common-sense basis.

I know that Mr Davignon will be playing an important part in the negotiations which are about to take place with Japan, and it will not be long before these talks take place — I think, before the end of this month — between the Commission and the Japanese authorities; and I should like to say that we in the Parliament, certainly in my Group, strongly welcome the mandate which the Council of Ministers gave to the Commission to negotiate with Japan in November. This seems to me to be a major step forward. The Council have not acted with great enthusiasm or keenness in this sphere hitherto, and I am afraid the invisible expression on the invisible faces of the Council here this morning in this Parliament are typical of the attitude they have taken to this urgent problem in recent years. Things have moved far too slowly, but I would like to say three things.

First of all, I should like to say to Japan and to the Japanese observers at this debate here today: Watch out, because, as you have heard, 6 million jobs are involved! The Japanese authorities have not really taken account of the dangers to European industry brought by the onslaught on our markets: this onslaught is the consequence of high productivity and competitiveness, which are virtues in themselves but which must be managed sensibly when it comes to world trade. Secondly, I should like to say to the Commission, and to Mr Davignon in particular: When you meet the Japanese, be tough with the Japanese. Make them understand that this is a last chance for them to negotiate on a voluntary quota basis.

Finally, I would say to the Council: For heavens' sake, support the Commission; give the Commission the

De Courcy Ling

authority they need over the coming months; stick together, and we will work together to get the results we need as a Community. We ourselves in this Parliament will certainly give the Commission all the moral support, all the moral authority which comes from our representation of the 6 million people concerned in Europe, many of whom at this moment are close to despair and for whom we speak today.

President. — I call Mr Beazley.

Mr Beazley. — Mr President, we all know that the Japanese motor vehicle industry has conquered such a large percentage of European, US and world markets not by innovation but by reproducing European ideas at lower cost, because they have better industrial relations and greater determination at all levels to be successful. The Japanese are more competitive than our industry in world markets, and we must win back our natural advantages. How? National and European protection would be counter-productive for a Europe which is the world's greatest trading community.

In the long term the continuance of a successful European motor vehicle industry depends on our creating conditions which provide it with higher competitiveness. This means that we must have earlier and more original ideas on what the market needs and how to produce it competitively. We must design cars more suited to modern needs in terms of energy saving, less maintenance, better comfort and greater safety. This may mean radical changes in construction, fuel types and production methods. We must be the first in introducing new concepts, even such novel concepts as the electric car, to give only one example. Our strength and superiority lies in innovation. We must therefore improve investment in this vital industry to ensure that we can provide the best production methods. For these to be effective, we must in turn create the best industrial relations in this industry. Otherwise we will not succeed whatever else we do.

What can we ask from Japan? We must ask it to recognize that the importance of its relationship with the West requires that it does not destroy Europe's vital industries where it may, for a time, have competitive advantages in production and distribution but not in innovation. It must recognize that it is in its own interests to live and let live. Japan must safeguard its own interests by respecting the skills and strengths of European industry and doing more trading with it. This means the Japanese must purchase much more from the European Community, not only in terms of the automobile industry's products and components but also from the aeronautical industry, the defence industry and many more of our high technology industries. Otherwise Japan will inadvertently destroy European industry and there by destroy itself.

President. — I call Mr Michel.

Mr Michel. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should very briefly like to make three comments and three suggestions without quoting the figures that we all know. As I believe we are all aware, ours is a market economy. We must accept that and compete at European level and at world level as well. Secondly, to promote our industry, the car industry as well as the others, we must have imagination, we must be inventive, we must coordinate and restructure. That is the *sine qua non* if we want to remain competitive or become competitive again and accept the challenges we now face and will face in the future. Thirdly, even if we took them today, protectionistic measures would not save our car industries in the medium and long term. If we are to contest the market, we must invest in grey matter again and undoubtedly in coordinated equipment.

Having made these three comments, I should like very briefly to put forward three suggestions. Firstly, the second paragraph of Article 54 of the ECSC Treaty, to which a speaker has already referred, permits the European Coal and Steel Community to agree to loans for investment in industrial sectors whose development will facilitate the marketing of steel products. It is therefore possible to apply Article 54 to the automobile sector, just as was done, I would point out, in 1980 in the case of the shipyards. We should today agree to loans which might stimulate research and investments as part of a coordinated operation at European level to make the European automobile industry competitive again.

My second suggestion is this: I believe that such loans might go chiefly to projects which may result in technical progress likely to put European industry in the lead in the world market.

My third suggestion leaves aside the material problems and directly concerns people. I would first like to remind the Community, represented here by the Commission but not by the Council, that a resolution unanimously adopted by the Consultative Committee of the Coal and Steel Community has unanimously adopted a resolution which refers to the social aspects of the problems connected with employment under the iron and steel policy. It presented the Commission with a whole series of very precise suggestions on this subject, which had been unanimously adopted. These suggestions should now be applied to the automobile sector as well.

To conclude, I should like to remind this Assembly of what we said here yesterday on the question of international standards for working conditions. We have concluded agreements with various countries, not only developing countries, but also industrializing countries such as Brazil. If the social standards relating in particular to the school-leaving age and working hours are not respected in those countries, I do not see how we can be competitive without exploiting labour. This is an opportunity to ask the Council to ensure the appli-

Michel

cation of the standards on working conditions as adopted in the international conventions of the International Labour Organization. Commissioner Cheysson also referred to this subject in this Assembly yesterday. He would be wise to take account of it in the future.

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, the debate on the automobile industry must not be seen in isolation from the debate on the industrial crisis as a whole. Suffice it to say that the lead Japan has in car production, for example, also has to do with electronics and with the energy crisis. A crisis means that sales prospects are diminishing and with them production prospects. The economic, social and human consequences of this frighten us, and there is always a danger that fear will stifle imagination in both the political and the technical spheres. I was therefore pleased to hear Mr Michel making an appeal for the will to be imaginative and innovative.

When I listen to some British Members, I cannot help thinking that they have no right to claim that Japan is entirely or perhaps mainly to blame for the decline of an important sector such as the automobile industry. We must consider carefully how it is that Japan is so far ahead of us, because this is a very complicated question. If we focus our attention on the economic crisis alone we run the risk of losing sight of the overall picture. This explains the heated discussions at the various part-sessions where these questions were discussed as for example the link between automation and the 'robotization' and employment.

The link between automation or mechanization and employment must also be seen in this broader framework.

If European cars are not being sold in sufficient quantities and car production must be maintained to keep people in employment, we must think about and work on a new kind of European car. After all, if we see this crisis in context, we find, firstly, that it is connected with the energy crisis, which in its turn has to do with oil prices and with our dependence on imported oil. Secondly, we find that we are now far more than 20 years behind the times as regards environmental problems and particularly the distressing situation in large cities, where traffic policemen have to wear gas masks and be replaced every hour because of king car.

We must now do our utmost to develop a car that consumes less fuel, causes less pollution and makes the city a less unpleasant place to live in. There are such projects, at various stages of development, but so far they have not received sufficient Government support. One example of this is the project being conducted by the employees of the British firm Lucas Aerospace.

The people who worked on this projects, a vehicle suitable for use on both roads and railways, are now threatened with redundancy. I therefore appeal to the Commission and to the European governments not to fight this serious crisis by simply burying their heads in the sand or applying the protectionist emergency brakes.

Let us use our imagination and above all the imagination of our workers and managers. Let us rescue the car, but not yesterday's car, which is too expensive, causes too much pollution, guzzles too much petrol and takes too high a toll of human lives: in this respect the Bonaccini report is not satisfactory. Let us think instead of tomorrow's car, which uses less fuel, causes less pollution and is less of a nuisance in our cities.

To conclude, I should like to say a few words to the Commission. I feel some clarification is called for. Firstly, there have been many complaints here about Japan's car industry and trade policy, but what is the position as regards agreements between car manufacturers in the European Community and their Japanese counterparts? I should like to know rather more about this music for two voices.

Secondly, I should like to hear the Commission stating its views on the two separate matters being discussed here: a Community policy and national policies. The Belgian Minister for Economic Affairs, for example, has just been negotiating with Japan on his own.

Finally, I would ask the Commission to draw up as a matter of urgency an extensive report on all projects submitted that relate to new types of car, whether they are at an advanced or a less advanced stage, so that we can at least get some idea of the possibilities the future offers, after the European market has been protected for a while.

President. — I call Mr Narjes.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (D) Mr President, I am happy that the start of the new Commission's work allows me this opportunity and the privilege to attend the last part of your debate. Let me say quite impartially that it has been an impressive debate, the significance of which extends far beyond the automobile industry. It seems impressive to me because of the amount and high quality of the work previously done in the three committees involved and at the two public hearings. I also find it impressive because of the vision, objectivity and constructive thinking that have marked all the contributions to today's debate. I join with my colleague Mr Davignon in thanking you very sincerely for the contributions and suggestions made during the debate, which will be of great value to the Commission in its future work. As President Thorn explained yesterday, the closer cooperation among Commission Members will mean that

Narjes

Mr Davignon and I will together be discussing with you the major problems facing the European economy.

The significance of the debate extends beyond the automobile industry because it has made a contribution to the convergence of ideas on economic policy. Without such convergence, there will be no convergence of economic policies either. As I have had the honour of being a Member of the Commission for only a few days, my own contribution must be confined to a number of general and perhaps personal remarks. They concern the extremely important subject of the situation in the European automotive industry and its chances of developing in the face of the Japanese challenge today and perhaps a renewed American challenge tomorrow. I agree with everything that has been said on this subject here. This problem is important not only because of the economic, social even political significance of the automobile industry in the European economic structure, but also because of the basic considerations with which the Japanese challenge must be fought off.

In Japan we face a major challenge, but one that has at last been fully understood, thank God, now that earlier market losses, for example, by the optical industry, the photographic industry, the clock and watch industry, shipbuilding and electronic games have been effaced from the economic policy memory rather than regained. The present difficult situation — and we should not forget this either — goes beyond the challenge represented by the Japanese export offensive. The present situation stems from the coincidence of three developments.

The Japanese challenge, which has been described here, has been joined by this year's world-wide stagflation — or perhaps recession — and by the structural change already necessitated by the need to protect the environment, the oil price explosion, road safety and other factors. The interdependence of all three of these areas should not be overlooked. I agree with everything that Mr Coppieters has just said on this subject.

European interests are principally characterized by the fact as the largest manufacturing area in the world we are absolutely dependent on exports. The alarming increases in current account deficits following the last oil price explosion underline the extent of our dependence on exports all too clearly. In view of this dependence on exports, it seems to me that we should begin by tackling the external economic problems as offensively and dynamically as possible and consequently with the aim of increasing world trade. Anyone who rejects this dynamic course and immediately calls for barriers and castle walls as a permanent solution could, on the whole, well be doing greater damage to the exports of other sectors than the benefit to be derived from any import barrier. Permanent protectionism is something like a political drug. At first every-

thing seems easy, even plausible to the layman. But in the medium and long term protectionism always results in an enormous waste of resources and triggers off structural problems whose dimensions can then only be described as political.

The one who suffers most from such deferred spending on structural change is the worker, who in the medium and long term receives a lower income in real terms than would have been possible had a solution along free-market lines been found.

As regards the Japanese challenge, I should like to point out that the GATT took the company and the merchant as its model. It is not a basis for the world struggle between States and State economies. But in Japan we now see a sectoral policy which is efficiently guided by the External Trade Ministry and which has an effect — I will choose my words carefully — that goes far beyond what individual European companies can achieve with their corporate resources. This upsets competition. Nor should we forget that, unlike the United States and the Member States of the European Community, Japan has an extremely low defence budget — less than 1 % of gross national product — and that the development aid it grants is also below the average for the European Economic Community and its Member States. This gives the Japanese economy, the Japanese State, additional room for manoeuvre, which can be used either to keep taxation down or to absorb social costs, for which budgetary resources are not available at the same level in Europe. This may also result in distortion of competition.

Thirdly, there are import barriers in Japan even if we leave aside the difficulty of overcoming the cultural and language barriers that undoubtedly exist in Japan. The import barriers in Japan have hitherto prevented effective mutual market penetration, and this is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future.

I also share the concern and doubts expressed by those who have pointed out that a number of mysteries in the trend of the yen exchange rate have benefited the Japanese automobile industry in recent years. In view of these four factors I therefore feel that there is every reason to call on Japan to exercise long-term restraint with immediate effect, and in fact this should have been done long ago.

As regards the European Community's own image, there is an obvious lack of unity.

I join with all those who have deplored this situation. And in addition to that, anyone who would like to revive the European national markets to ward off the Japanese offensive should be reminded that the Japanese domestic market is exactly twice as large as the largest European national market. A solution that aimed at the restoration of national markets would automatically contribute to the permanent consolidation of the lead the Japanese have gained and would

Narjes

remove any chance there might be of European development.

As regards the future, I do not intend to state my views on each individual proposal, but merely to pick out three points that seem to me worthy of mention.

We formed the European internal market 23 years and 3 days ago today. It would be a step forward if not only this House but also, and above all, all the Ministers in the Council agreed that the existence of obstacles, however small and negligible they may be, on the path to the European internal market 23 years and 3 days after its establishment is a European disgrace for us all.

The second remark I should like to make is that we must also bear in mind how long structural change in the automobile industry takes. The manufacturers need reliable data today on customer attitudes tomorrow. They have to know what tax the man buying the car and faced with a choice between a diesel and petrol engine will have to pay. They have to know whether or not they should be making engines that run on methanol and ethanol. They have to know how electric vehicles are to be taxed. It therefore seems to me that if there is to be reliable long-term reorientation, there is a particularly urgent need for all these standards in the European Community to be harmonized so that the manufacturer has reliable data on which he can base car production for one and the same market.

The independent companies alone — and this is another point — must take the decisions and bear the responsibility and above all accept liability for wrong decisions. The risks they face, as the Chrysler case has shown, are enormous. No bureaucrat, first-class though he may be, and no structural council can take these risks for them. They need reliable data for their investment decisions. Whatever assistance is offered and however much it can be improved, one thing appears important to me: in the long term restructuring to achieve competitive conditions will succeed only if the European economic policy ensures that interest rates in the Member States fall well below the present level. Anyone who compares the cost of financing a project with borrowed funds in Switzerland, for example, with the cost in most Member States today, will know, if he works it out, what I mean and what proportion of the costs is represented by interest at the present level.

I am convinced, ladies and gentlemen, that a united, consistent and consistently implemented economic policy of the European Community and its Member States is quite capable of creating the conditions a European automobile industry with changed structures needs to become fully competitive again in a few years — even with the Americans in the more distant future.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, I should like to make a few specific remarks on the debate we have had on Mr Bonaccini's report and the various statements that have been made.

Firstly, Parliament's role has not been simply to organize this debate in the excellent fashion to which Mr Narjes has referred, but also to play a part, as Sir Fred Warner has said, through the discussions between Parliament's delegation and the Japanese parliamentary delegation. It is absolutely essential that the opinion of Europe's elected representatives should be heard by our Japanese counterparts not only at political level or administrative level, but also at this level, because there are still misunderstandings — to use a slightly ambiguous term — which should be removed.

Secondly, as my colleague has just said, when we talk about the automobile industry, we must remember that what is at stake extends far beyond a single industry. The place occupied by the car in modern society reveals the impact success or failure will have in this field. And this goes far beyond a single sector: it is something which is essential to our ability to produce, something which is essential to our way of life, and that is why, psychologically and subjectively, as soon as we start talking about the automobile industry, we feel the tension, the concern, which is far greater than when we talk about other spheres of activity, although they may employ more people when ancillary industries are included. But this is a key sector of our activities. It is therefore obvious that the strategy we use can only be an overall strategy, a strategy which takes account of economic conditions, a dynamic strategy, a strategy of action rather than a strategy of withdrawal, of paralysis, of renunciation and even less of resignation. That is why the Commission approves Mr Bonaccini's report and resolution, because this resolution touches on the various constituent parts of a strategy of action rather than a strategy of resignation.

It is unfortunately true that we begin this strategy with various handicaps. I heard Mr de la Malène say just now that a great deal of time has been wasted. Everyone has wasted a great deal of time, and I do not think there is any point in trying to establish who has wasted most. The Community, the Member States or the manufacturers? That is no longer the question. We are not going to have an academic debate on what should have been done ten years ago. Let us try not to make the same mistakes again. Let us try to understand that a global strategy today means — as Mr Martinet said in such excellent fashion — a European strategy. In the past the strategy has always been a national strategy, since certain States felt that it was in their best interests or in the best interests of their companies to solve problems at national rather than at European level. The most obvious example that can be quoted

Davignon

without annoying anyone is that of the Italian Government, which, on acceding to the GATT, called for a quantitative restriction, which was legally quite acceptable, which could be invoked against the Community. The Italian Government acted quite correctly. I will not refer to other restrictions and merely say that this one would mean fewer than 3 000 cars being imported into Italy a year. Is the automobile industry aware of the loss it suffers through there being no genuine Community market and no genuine Community policy? Obviously not. But the losses suffered in other markets are more serious than a certain level of penetration of its own market. That must not be forgotten. That, then, is our problem.

To be brief, I will confine myself to defining what is the Community's strategy. With whom are we going to establish it? Who are the participants in this Community strategy? There are quite a number of them. First of all, there are the companies, which obviously have an essential role to play. It is for them to define their strategy and for us to create the environment in which they can do their best to do what it is their responsibility to do. We shall therefore encourage cooperation and we shall therefore encourage an environment which allows innovation to develop.

In this connection, I feel I must tackle various misconceptions. If we start from the premise that technological change itself endangers the economy and employment, technological change will be the risk. If we accept this argument, who will make the 30 % electrical components our cars will need in three or four or five years' time? Someone else will, because we shall not be able to sell to third markets cars which do not have these features. So there is no choice. We have to do it. As regards automation and the question raised just now of robots in industry, we must ask ourselves who is going to make them. Are we going to make them or is someone else? What will become of the industry if we refuse to have anything that is innovative and creative here? Someone else will make them. We have no choice but to be innovative if our products are to be worth anything in the future. We must at all costs avoid a situation in which we have to buy these new products outside. My colleague Mr Narjes will be taking up this point again when we have other debates on these matters.

In this context, we shall also be having discussions with the trade union organizations, and I find the resolution put forward on this subject by the European federation of car workers' trade unions very interesting. It is a resolution that proposes dynamic action rather than resignation, and that seems important to me. We must continue along these lines and ensure everyone understands what is happening so that there is general acceptance of the idea of restructuring. And I should like to say that we have taken careful note of what Mr Barbagli's opinion says. I will confine myself

to these remarks. *En passant* I would mention, for example, that an amendment tabled by Mr Sarre goes further than what the European federation of trade unions is asking for. I feel we must take care not to create complications in this area.

I should now like to come to the central issue in this debate, the Japanese affair, and to go beyond the excellent remarks made by my colleague, which clearly demonstrated that we cannot dissociate our relations with Japan, taken as a whole, from the more negative effect they may have on a specific sector. The question is whether we are going to erect barriers every time we find our products are less good than those of our competitors, when we know very well that we need third markets for our automobile industry, because in this case the battle will not be won in Europe or Japan but in third markets. They are the markets that need to develop, since ours have virtually reached saturation point. I do not want to start on the whole argument of the principles of the organization of the economy again, but I would point out that, when compared with the other leading members of the liberal economy system, the European Economic Community and the United States, Japan benefits by this system and that its contribution to the GATT in no way compares with those of the other two leading members. In these circumstances, we must ask ourselves if we should be helping to pay Japan's oil bill and for its industrial development. The answer is quite simply no.

While Japan's contribution is less than our own, it will not be able to claim the same rights as those who support the system. There is in fact a lack of balance. And in view of this lack of balance, paragraph 8 of Mr Bonaccini's resolution is in line with what the Council proposed the Commission should do in November and with what the Commission began to do with Japan, in that the Japanese Foreign Minister came to Brussels and we will be having talks on this very subject with Japan in Tokyo in late January. The question we must ask is, 'What is Japan's proposal to us?' What is Japan's proposal in view of the fact that it does not participate in the general system in the same way as we do, and how does it therefore intend to take account of the problems we have raised, the most acute obviously being the exports of cars in excessive numbers. Either Japan gives at the end of January the answer our Member States, Parliament and the Commission want to hear, in which case we shall have made some progress, or at the Council meeting in February, on the basis of a report from the Commission (we shall, of course, as always be in contact with the various parliamentary committees responsible for this aspect), we shall see what we are forced to propose if the dialogue has not produced the results we had hoped for.

Mr President, in view of the late hour and as answers have not been given to various questions, I would propose that a list be made of them and that we give

Davignon

written answers which can then be distributed in the committees so that everyone has a specific answer to the questions on arrangements, penetration, the use of European components in Japanese cars, financing, and so on.

What the Commission wishes to say to your Parliament through Mr Narjes and myself is extremely simple: we have a situation in which a basic industry which is in difficulty but is by no means a lame duck has developed a strategy of recovery. This can succeed only if the Community contributes through its internal market, its arrangements for eliminating obstacles, through the creation of a favourable climate for investments, through a rational policy towards innovation. I will need all that to make a success of this policy of recovery. And our external policy remains what it has always been, a correct policy. We are asking no more than we give. But we are asking as much as we have the right to expect, in line with our contribution to the smooth functioning of the system which is of value to the developed industrial powers. That is our position. I believe it is reasonable. To conclude, Mr President, I will say that having listened to the debate and carefully reread the various reports and Mr Bonaccini's resolution, I feel we have together taken this political option to develop a dynamic, voluntary, courageous strategy, which I am convinced will succeed.

President. — I call Mr Bonaccini.

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to thank all those who have participated in this debate and enriched it with interesting and thought-provoking remarks. We had realized in committee that the examination of the automobile question would not be concluded by this resolution, and we know that we shall be obliged to continue our efforts over a long period of time in order to see our decisions put into effect with the results hoped for by Mr Davignon. I take this opportunity to thank the services of the Commission and of the Parliament, and all those whose assisted me in attaining this objective.

Our work was carried out according to a cultural tradition which I would like to express here on a personal basis. A great Florentine political writer said five centuries ago that, since he intended to write of matters useful to those knowledgeable of them, he chose to write about things as they are rather than as they are imagined to be. Even though five centuries have passed, the same reasons led us to adopt a similar method, directing our attention to concrete realities capable of bringing our project to a successful conclusion. This was the spirit which inspired me and which guided the collective efforts of our committee. This is also the reason I believe it becomes easier at this point to bring the work to a speedy conclusion, especially after what has been said by the two members of the

Commission. I wish to give them my personal thanks for their remarks, with special gratitude — if Mr Narjes will permit me — to Mr Davignon, who has been occupied with this matter for a longer period.

Before I conclude, I would like to underline three aspects which indicate, in my opinion, the importance of the decision we are about to take. Firstly, this decision is important in itself for the employment of workers and technicians, for others directly and indirectly involved in this sector, for technology, both present and future, for industrial location, and for international exchanges. The political importance of the interests involved is considerable, and if we are able to arrive at a positive solution to this problem, we will succeed in giving new vitality to the process of economic development, obtaining the expansion and stimulative effect we have the right to expect of such an important industrial sector. There is no question of retreat, of salvaging the essentials; we are working towards a highly ambitious goal. In presenting this resolution, I mentioned the catalytic effect of the automobile industry on economic life as a whole, and this is something which should always be borne in mind.

The second important aspect of our decision is that it represents a significant step in our battle against inflation. Up to now we have conducted this battle from the point of view of regulating demand, but in general this method has not had impressive results. I believe it is now necessary to substitute a policy based solely on demand with a supply policy, that is, a policy capable of offering more goods at prices more advantageous to the consumer. It is clear that in so doing we would be taking a step forward, and that we would be able to stimulate efforts of innovation — as Mr Narjes has said — and thus ensure a more solid basis for development in production and employment than we could otherwise have obtained.

The question of employment has always been and continues to be the fundamental issue, to which I, and all of us, respond. I would like, therefore, to reassure those members who were anxious or who were suffering from a misunderstanding: we do not forget the fact that an increase in productivity must be part of an overall increase in the productivity of an economic system, for history knows of no economic system capable of advancing while productivity and competitive ability are in decline. This is why numerous proposals for reform and various structural suggestions, along with their related social programmes, are included in the resolution. Finally, but still on the subject of the fight against inflation, this resolution also suggests procedures in industrial relations which can represent a new stage in the life of this sector.

The third and last aspect to be stressed is that this resolution is of significant importance for the attainment of European unity, for the concrete realization of the Community — towards which we are all

Bonaccini

working and which was the subject of such an interesting commitment in yesterday's speech by the new President of the Commission. These objectives cannot be reached without a common industrial policy; we must make an effort to overcome the inconsistencies in the attitudes demonstrated by many governments now and in the past, inconsistencies which are written into the treaties and reflected in practice. This discrepancy creates difficulties later in the institutions, difficulties which arise from the fact that opportunities for economic and social unity and progress are not as plentiful as they should be. Therefore, the third aspect of the resolution which I would like to emphasize is the possibility of going beyond a simple management of the crisis and of giving new vigour to the Community and to its political and economic forces. I am confident that the importance of these three aspects will ensure a positive vote, a vote whose value transcends the role of the speakers and the rapporteur in order to form a solid foundation for the work of the Commission, whose commitment to the Council and to the Member States of the Community we now record.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.10 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

7. *Urgent procedure*

President. — I have received from Mr de la Malène and others a motion for a resolution with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 for the Rules of Procedure, on the crisis in the European automobile industry (Doc. 1-790/80).

The reasons supporting this request are set out in the document itself. The vote on this request will be taken at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

8. *Votes*

President. — The next item is the vote on motions for resolutions on which the debate is closed.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Aigner report (Doc. 1-672/80): Discharge in respect of the 1977 budget.*

The resolution is adopted.

*

* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Battersby report (Doc. 1-671/80): Discharge in respect of the 1978 budget.*

The resolution is adopted.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *Bonaccini report (Doc. 1-673/80): European automobile industry.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraph 1)

After paragraph 1, I have Amendments Nos 7 and 6 by Mr Cousté, seeking to add the following new paragraphs:

- 1a. Regrets that at its meeting of 1 and 2 December 1980 the European Council did not discuss the problem of the automobile industry and did not give the appropriate European institutions detailed instructions to introduce economic, commercial and social measures from the beginning of 1981;
- 1b. Urges the speedy adoption of a Community programme of aid to the automobile industry which would supplement national programmes and be on a large enough scale to enable the industry to adapt to the new conditions of international competition and to win new market;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur — (I) Mr President, I am in favour only of the part of the amendment which ends with the words 'automobile industry'. I oppose the rest of the amendment. I therefore suggest the acceptance of the text of the amendment only for the part I have just indicated.

(Parliament adopted the first part of Amendment No 7 up to the words 'automobile industry' and rejected in

Bonaccini

succession the second part of amendment and Amendment No 6. It then adopted paragraphs 2 to 6)

President. — After paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 16 by Mrs Lizin and Mr Vernimmen, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

- 6a. Asks the Commission and the Council to take all the necessary measures to allow the introduction of a temporary quota for a period of 5 years, on imports of Japanese cars, to be fixed at the level prevailing in December 1979 so as to allow the European automobile industry to organize its reconstruction;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur. — (I) I am against it.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 16 and adopted paragraph 7)

President. — After paragraph 7, I have Amendment No 8, by Mr Cousté and others seeking to insert the following new paragraph after the heading 'External Trade Policy':

- 7a. Requests the Council to take counteraction to protect the European industry before entering into negotiations with Japan on an equal footing, while safeguarding the position of each of the Member States;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur. — (I) I am against it, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 8)

President. — On paragraph 8, I have Amendment No 5 Mr Moreau and others seeking to amend this paragraph to read as follows:

8. Requests the Commission to pay particularly close attention to further developments in the talks between the representatives of the European and Japanese manufacturers. It should see to it that the internal market is afforded adequate protection, in particular through its contacts and negotiations with the third countries concerned. The purpose of this is to ensure improved market access in particular through the removal of spurious obstacles to trade, under conditions of effective equality as well as balanced exchange rates, especially against the yen, and with fewer divergences in matters affecting industrial relations. *The Commission is asked to negotiate an agreement for the voluntary restraint of Japanese exports to the Community. If these contacts and negotiations do not produce the desired results, the Community must then*

rapidly adopt the necessary measures to protect its market;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, I think that this amendment, which only introduces a new sentence where the resolution reads 'The Commission is asked to negotiate an agreement for the voluntary restraint of Japanese exports to the Community . . .' until the end, can be accepted.

(Parliament adopted in succession Amendment No 5 and paragraphs 9 to 14)

President. — On paragraph 15 I have Amendment No 14 by Mr Carossino, seeking to amend this paragraph to read as follows:

15. Calls on the Commission to adopt the measures necessary to obtain the greatest possible transparency as regards final retail prices in the Community, so that it is possible to establish whether excessive profits are being made by virtue of a dominant position on, or control of, the market and so that Community consumers are able to purchase vehicles at reasonable prices;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur. — (I) Mr Carossino has agreed to withdraw this amendment.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 15)

President. — After paragraph 15, I have Amendment No 10 by Mr Pininfarina seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

- 15a. Also calls on the Commission to tap private European sources of financing for the restructuring of the automobile industry by introducing a Community guarantee for loans expressed in ECUs issued by automobile and/or components manufacturers; this instrument would ensure that borrowing on all the European markets was subject to the same interest rate, with the possibility of interest rebates being granted by the Commission subject to the attainment of certain production and job-creation targets in areas that are disadvantaged or severely affected by industrial reorganization;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, although this amendment contains some interesting ideas, I think it would be anachronistic to insert them in the text at this point. The text has already been

Bonaccini

organized according to what is said in point number 6 of the motion for a resolution. This question could be more thoroughly examined in an *ad hoc* committee. At the moment I think the amendment cannot be accepted, unless its author is willing to withdraw it.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 10 and adopted paragraphs 16 and 17)

President. — After paragraph 17, I have Amendment No 1 by Mr Sarre and Mr Oehler seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

- 17a. Industrial agreements should make it possible to facilitate major investments, to develop production and thus guarantee employment.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur — *(I)* Mr President, I think that this material is better organized in point number 23. If we insert it at this stage in the motion for a resolution, we risk damaging the coherence of our argument, and for this reason I am opposed to the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted paragraph 18)

President. — On paragraph 19, I have Amendment No 11/rev. by Mr Pininfarina seeking to amend this paragraph to read as follows:

19. Calls for encouragement and support to be given to the financing of studies and practical programmes designed to improve production and its organization with a view to increasing productivity while respecting the need for a satisfactory working environment; and further requests that the social consequences of these programmes be at the same time examined,

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur. — *(I)* I am in favour, Mr President

President. — I call Mr Pininfarina.

Mr Pininfarina. — *(I)* Mr President, I withdraw the amendment as I feel that the paragraph which follows says almost the same thing thereby making it redundant.

President. — Amendment No 11/rev. is withdrawn.

I call Mr Rogers on a point of order.

Mr Rogers. — Mr President, I have objected to situations like this before where you have amendments withdrawn even after the rapporteur has given an opinion. In this way it is possible to prevent Members putting down similar amendments. We could land up in the situation where, or instance, a Member puts down an amendment and then no one else needs to do it. If the matter is withdrawn beforehand, that is fine, but after the rapporteur has given an opinion . . . ?

Sir James Scott-Hopkins says you should put down your own amendment. If he wants to flood the Parliament with material then he can bring his monetarist policies here.

(Protests from the European Democratic Group)

You cannot complain about waste of money and then start it. How many amendments do you want on a specific issue? It really is bad procedure, Mr President. If you have asked the rapporteur for an opinion and he has expressed an opinion, then I do not think it is proper to ask whether the matter is to be withdrawn. If the person wants to withdraw it he should withdraw it before the rapporteur gives an opinion.

(Applause from certain members of the European Democratic Group)

President. — Mr Rogers, I think you have a point there. On the other hand, if an amendment is withdrawn ten seconds before the rapporteur gives an opinion, it cannot be retabled either, so the problem is still with us and I do not see any easy solution. So we shall carry on as before.

President. — I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — Mr President, surely when an amendment has been tabled anybody in Parliament has the right to adopt that amendment in his own name. So if anybody wishes to take on an amendment that has been withdrawn, as this one was, then that amendment should be voted on.

President. — I call Mr Pininfarina.

Mr Pininfarina. — *(I)* Mr President, I asked to speak before the rapporteur but the Chair did not notice my request.

President. — Mr Pininfarina, I think you are right as the President is usually looking at the rapporteur.

I call Mr von der Vring.

Mr von der Vring. — (D) I wish to uphold the amendment that has just been withdrawn and ask that it be put to the vote, because, once it has been tabled, it is a matter for the House and can no longer be withdrawn by an individual, Member.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 11/rev. and paragraph 20)

President. — On paragraph 21, I have Amendment No 2 by Mr Sarre and Mr Oehler seeking to add the following sentence to the end of this paragraph:

it should not have any damaging effects on employment.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur — (I) Mr President, the motion for a resolution is committed to dealing with the problem of employment. Frankly, however, if such an amendment is inserted at this point in the text I think it would lay a difficult burden upon us. For this reason I am against its adoption.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 2 and adopted in succession paragraphs 21 and 22)

President. — After paragraph 22, I have Amendment No 3 by Mr Sarre and Mr Oehler seeking to add the following new paragraph:

22a. These programmes and studies should be carried out under the control of the workers concerned to ensure that they do not lead to a general reduction in the level of skills and in the number of jobs; the automatization of tedious work should be used to improve working conditions;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, as this is already dealt with in paragraph 30 of the motion for a resolution, I feel that it is inappropriate to raise it again here.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 3 and adopted paragraphs 23 to 25)

President. — On paragraph 26, I have Amendment No 13 by Mr Carossino seeking to delete this paragraph.

This amendment has been withdrawn.

(Parliament adopted paragraphs 26 to 28)

On paragraphs 29 and 30, I have the following amendments: Amendment No 4 by Mr Sarre and Mr Oehler seeking to replace these paragraphs by the following new text:

29. Believes that these industrial and commercial measures, based in particular on winning back the Community market, will lead to a restructuring of the automobile industry in the Community and permit it to cope with the current crisis,

30. Affirms that bold social measures should accompany these provisions. The first object of these measures should be a reduction in working hours. Similarly, the restructuring of production should be placed under the control of the workers concerned and of their representatives (control of investments, technology and the organization of work and vocational training). In particular, the need to improve the competitive position of the European automobile industry should not lead to any degradation in working conditions for the workers such as speeding up production or increasing shift work;

Amendment No 9 by Mr Verhaegen and Mr Henckens, seeking to insert the following text at the end of paragraph 30:

this means that workers' representatives and their trade union organizations in particular should have the right to information to monitor the investment programmes, and also the right to be consulted on the expected effects of this programme on the level of employment, qualifications required, vocational training working conditions, the organization of work and the location of jobs;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, this matter is already dealt with in paragraphs 29 to 32 of the motion for a resolution and it seems to me that regrouping the arguments in this manner does not make the text any clearer. For this reason I am opposed to both amendments.

President. — I call Mr von Bismarck.

Mr von Bismarck. — (D) I should like to point out that the German and French translations of Amendment No 9 have a meaning that is quite different from the Dutch text. The Dutch text refers to information, the French version to 'control', the German text having the equivalent term. I should simply like to make it clear that, when an amendment is tabled in Dutch, the Dutch text is the authoritative version, which means that faulty translations can be corrected later. We are therefore in fact voting on the Dutch text, otherwise we shall have two completely different results, if we adopt the amendment.

(The President read out the Dutch version of Amendment No 9. Parliament rejected Amendment No 4. The results of the votes on Amendment No 9 both by show of hands and by standing and sitting were inconclusive)

President. — I call Mr Galland.

Mr Galland. — Mr President, I am very sorry, but despite the explanation given just now, the situation is still not clear to some Members. We would like to know, in French, if this amendment concerns information or controls. I apologize, but it seems that what the Dutch Member was saying just now was 'information' while the French translation we have refers to 'contrôle'. Can we have an explanation before we proceed to the vote?

President. — Mr Galland, the amendment refers to 'the right to information' and 'to monitor the investment programmes'; the word 'control' is nowhere mentioned.

I call Mr Herman.

Mr Herman. — (F) Mr President, the word 'volgen' has been translated as 'contrôle'. In German the equivalent to 'contrôle' has also been used. So we have an incorrect translation in two versions. If it is clear to everyone that the text refers to information and not to controls, I believe we can come to some kind of agreement in the Assembly. But if we keep the word 'contrôle' and do not make the correction straightaway, there will undoubtedly continue to be disagreement.

President. — I call Mr Bonaccini.

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur — (I) Mr President, after a more careful reading, and bearing in mind that this amendment completes points 31 and 32 of the motion for a resolution, I think that this amendment can be accepted.

President. — In view of the linguistic difficulties in which we find ourselves, I accept your change of position.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 9 by electronic vote and paragraph 30 as amended)

After paragraph 30, I have Amendment No 15 by Mr Sarre and Mr Oehler, seeking to add the following new paragraph:

- 30a. Draws the attention of the Commission and of the Council to the fact that these measures are urgently needed to enable the Community to act in time and to halt the crisis in the European automobile industry;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur — (I) Mr President, since I am basically in favour of the amendment to where it reads 'in time', I think that in order to avoid voting on

the separate parts we can accept the amendment as a whole.

(Parliament adopted in succession Amendment No 15 and paragraphs 31 to 32 (a))

President. — On paragraph 32 (b), I have Amendment No 12 by Mr Pininfarina seeking to amend this clause to read as follows:

- (b) Continuing its work on the formulation of proposals for the adjustment of working hours;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Bonaccini, rapporteur — (I) Mr President, I am against this amendment because the general question of work schedules will be the object of a specific study. I think that it would be better not to go into the matter here, but rather to examine it in a more general context, so that an eventual decision, which cannot be adopted now, *ipso facto*, by a simple vote of this Assembly, will not be jeopardized later.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 12 and adopted in succession paragraph 32 (b), (c) and (d) and paragraphs 33 and 34)

President. — I shall now call explanations of vote.

I call Mr de la Malène.

Mr de la Malène. — (F) Mr President, I should like to say very briefly why my Group will be abstaining in the vote on this resolution. We do not think it is bad in itself. It is a rag-bag resolution full of fine sentiments and so, at first glance, there is no compelling reason to vote against it. But we feel it does not get to the root of the problem, that it is not sufficiently forceful in view of the difficulties our various industries will be facing. We particularly regret that our amendment No 8, which called for a counter-attack, was not adopted. My Group will therefore be abstaining not because it wishes to criticize the resolution, but because it wants to stress where it finds the resolution is not forceful enough in view of the problems facing the European automobile industry.

President. — I call Mrs Lizin.

Mrs Lizin. — (F) Mr President, I shall similarly abstain during the vote on Mr Bonaccini's report because I feel it is too weak and fairly indicative of the type of debate we have sometimes had in this Assembly. What we need is a firm approach. If this firm approach does not exist at European level, we shall have to go back to the Member States, and specifically Belgium, which will be obliged to take firm

Lizin

action and will move towards the renationalization of this policy, which is not what we want. As I do not want this and as I am sorry the amendment I tabled with Mr Vernimmen was not adopted, I shall abstain from the vote on Mr Bonaccini's resolution to show that I am not basically opposed to it, but that I find it really too weak.

President. — I call Mr Sarre.

Mr Sarre. — (*F*) I too shall not be voting in favour of the Document before us. It seems to me that, while the heart of our industrial system is under attack, the European Parliament does not in this text react to the basic question; that it does not get to grips with what is at stake. It is impossible to vote against something which could lead to a policy which effectively allows us to get to the root of the matter. Following the rejection of various amendments which would hardly have improved the text, I therefore feel obliged to abstain in the vote.

President. — I call Mr de Courcy Ling.

Mr de Courcy Ling. — Mr President, I have noted that the report has united the different Groups, the different parties of Europe and the different nations in a very remarkable way. We have identified a problem. I think it is important that Parliament should vote for the report, because this will give increased authority to the Commission in the vital negotiations with Japan which are about to take place, and I repeat what I said this morning, that I hope our vote will be construed by the Japanese as a last warning and by the Council as a reminder of the need to support the Commission in the way that Parliament intends to over the coming months.

(Parliament adopted the resolution as a whole)

9. Directive on aid to shipbuilding

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Delorozoy (Doc. 1-638/80), on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-332/80) for a Directive on aid to shipbuilding.

I call Mr Delorozoy.

Mr Delorozoy, rapporteur. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, what we have here is a fifth Directive concerning the aids granted by the Member States which may be regarded as compatible with the

rules laid down by the Treaty of the European Economic Community.

Some discipline must be exercised and observed to prevent the distortion of competition which might otherwise occur. This fifth Directive follows on from the fourth, which expired on 31 December 1980, a few days ago, and is designed, at a time when the world market is in a critical situation, to encourage the structural changes that are essential if the shipbuilding industry is to survive in a Community and world market characterized by fierce competition, stagnation of demand and even recession in terms of the tonnage it is hoped will be built in the near future. I should point out that shipbuilding is a sector which is really open to the world market. Japan, yet again, Kuwait, Poland, Romania and other countries are the direct competitors of the Community countries. And I should like to answer in advance a question on the changes this sector may undergo as a result of the entry of Greece into the European Economic Community. The answer is clear and simple: Greek production amounts to 40 000 tonnes compared with 3 000 000 tonnes in the other countries of the European Economic Community, or less than 1 %. So the figures in this file do not need to be changed in any way.

In the last months of 1980 the Commission presented a report on aids granted to shipbuilding in the Community and, early in 1980, a report on the situation in this sector, two excellent documents which your Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has studied, and undoubtedly other Members have done the same. They pinpoint perfectly and objectively all the facts of the matter. I shall not go into them in detail. I will confine myself to referring to a number of essential points. Firstly, there is an urgent need for the Council to adopt the Commission's proposal for this fifth Directive without delay. What we have today is in fact a vacuum, which might have serious consequences in the near future. I stress this point because we do not want a period of procrastination, which is likely to aggravate the situation in various countries where aids are granted at an exceptionally high level, thus helping to perpetuate and develop inadmissible competition situations. Our report points out that the shipbuilding industry throughout the Community will continue to need aids. The level of the aids required will not necessarily be the same, because of work that has already been done, but in the present circumstances, the Commission must certainly continue to ensure internal discipline where aids are concerned. This discipline must be maintained to ensure that the Member States bear the weight of the crisis and the difficulties to which it gives rise as equitably as possible. Above all, the arrangements made by the Member States must not help artificially to prolong certain situations through their not taking the action that is needed, particularly to reduce production capacities.

Delorozoy

This proposal for a fifth Directive was drawn up following extensive discussions between Commission representatives and the experts at multilateral meetings. It very largely follows the line of the fourth Directive, but it improves the arrangement by including amongst the various aids some which were not previously covered. In addition, this fifth Directive is of relatively short duration, being limited to two years. As such it will enable a more rapid examination to be made of the measures which should subsequently be contemplated, notwithstanding the annual report by the Commission on annual trends, and new decisions can therefore be taken as the situation requires.

The ultimate objective is to enable the Community's shipyards to adjust their facilities and production capacities as part of a modernization programme, so that they can eventually quote prices that compare favourably with those of their competitors in third countries. The Directive also seeks to prevent excessive movements in the market as a result of orders which passed from one Community shipyard to another or even from one State to another. The directive will similarly ensure that aids granted to shipowners rather than the shipbuilding industry do not indirectly result in a different form of support, which would in fact cause a new distortion of competition. One of the articles of the Directive will allow the Commission to check that this is in fact the case. Past experience has shown that, thanks to this supplementary support in the form of aid to shipowners, some Member States have succeeded in ensuring that almost all orders go to national shipyards. These aids consequently have a similar effect to aids to the shipbuilding industry proper, and it is therefore fair that this type of aid should in future be subject to the discipline imposed on the other aids. This new Directive thus continues along the same basic lines, its aim being a reorganized and more competitive shipbuilding industry. Not inconsiderable progress has already been made, extensive restructuring having been achieved in many Member States. The continued effort now requires an adjustment to the different rhythm depending on the results achieved. We cannot have uniform measures throughout the European Economic Community, and it is important that the idea of restructuring should be interpreted in a more flexible way, but with firmness, with the accent placed on every aspect of modernization and rationalization, rather than our confining ourselves to straightforward checks or consideration of the reduction in production capacity, which cannot be regarded as an end in itself.

To conclude, I wish to refer to another aspect summed up in Article 5 of this new Directive, which provides for aids to be granted to offset the social and regional consequences of restructuring. It is unfortunately true that shipyards are usually situated in the old industrial areas, which are themselves in grave danger and face serious social problems. To offset these consequences, the fifth Directive provides for the allocation of some of the Regional Fund appropriations to help solve this

problem. This emphasizes the serious concern felt by the Community about the problems raised by the crisis in the shipbuilding industry and demonstrates the principle that the objective of industrial policy cannot be seen in isolation from the people to whom it applies. Restructuring sectors in difficulty, supplementing national efforts with Community efforts, stabilizing the conditions in which people work must not allow us to forget that Europe needs a cohesive and global industrial policy and that we must call for genuine industrial cooperation so that our countries can make optimum use of their technological potential and know-how and take coordinated action. We feel that this fifth Directive is the most appropriate means in the present circumstances of pursuing a realistic policy in the shipbuilding sector, one which safeguards the future as far as possible while meeting present requirements.

A very large majority of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs hopes that you will vote in favour of the report before you and so allow the early adoption of the directive.

President. — I call Mr Caborn to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Caborn. — Mr President, as the rapporteur has explained, at the end of 1980, when the Council of Ministers met to discuss the whole question of the fifth Directive on shipbuilding, no agreement was reached. Further, while some anticipated that the fourth Directive would be extended into 1981, that was no to be, because one of the Member States did not allow that to happen. So we are left with no Directives in operation for the moment. It is because of that situation that one of the amendments put down in my name — and let me say at this stage that I do not think the amendments have been distributed, and that is very unfortunate — recommends that the whole question of the fifth Directive be looked at, particularly because Greece has now entered and because of the declining situation in the Community yards. We believe that a much more dynamic policy ought to be followed and that the opportunity ought to be taken, while still recognizing that we are operating under Articles 92 and 93 of the Treaty.

One must also bear in mind the situation of 1969, when the first Directive was adopted. This was clearly designed to give protection to the shipbuilding industry at that time, particularly from the competition — and some would say the unfair competition — of the Japanese. Since then we have had the second, third and fourth Directives, designed to make the shipbuilding industry more competitive. We have also tried to harmonize aids.

It is in the absence of an industrial policy for this sector, however, that I think that many of the prob-

Caborn

lems we are now confronted with have become evident. If we look at the position of the shipbuilding industry from 1978 to the first half of 1980, we see that the Japanese share of world trade went up from 49 % to slightly over 65 %, whilst that of the EEC yards dropped from 27 % to around 19 %, and the loss of employment has been quite considerable as well.

Even more important now, however, is the question now being raised, both by employers and by employees, as to whether we are going to continue having a shipbuilding industry in the Community. If we continue to allow the industry to decline at the rate that has been experienced over the last few years, we may find ourselves in a very serious position for many reasons, and therefore the principle of the free-market economy which seems to have been applied to the shipbuilding industry will, I believe, have to be considered very seriously. When others, and particularly the Japanese once again, are not only practising unfair competition within the industry but are managing their economies, and particularly their currencies, to take advantage of the European yards and capture the orders of the world, I think we must look to the fifth Directive for at least some protection and possibly even a return to the position that we had in 1969.

I now turn, Mr President, to a very important amendment put down by the Socialist Group, and that is the one relating to paragraph 4. Because of the disquiet and uncertainty of the workers as well as many of the employers, we call on the Commission not to proceed any further with the reduction of manpower until adequate provisions are available to deal with the regional and social consequences. Coupled with this, the call to the Commission for an industrial policy for this sector is, I think, extremely important. We have just had the debate on the automobile industry; we have the manifest crisis in steel; we have a tremendous crisis in the shipbuilding industry; and until we put a stop to the importation of Japanese products and particularly to the unfair advantage they are taking on the world markets, a very serious situation may arise for the Community yards, such that we shall be questioning their viability very seriously.

So I believe that the fifth Directive has got to be seriously considered in the light of the amendments that have been put down by the Socialist Group to provoke a more dynamic policy capable of offering at least some protection to the workers in the Community yards.

President. — I call Sir David Nicolson to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Sir David Nicolson. — Mr President, colleagues, as an ex-shipbuilder I am, of course, deeply pained by the crisis that some sectors of industry are in, particularly

at a time when shipping is also in trouble and ship-ownership seems to be moving to low labour-cost countries of the Far East, which does not help the position of the shipbuilding industry. However, I think we have got to look very squarely at our own past failings and accept that part of the difficulty is due to the change which has taken place in the world. This is another example of change. Just as the motor vehicle industry has been affected, so this change has affected shipbuilding, and once again it is related to manning levels, costs and innovation. We must accept that productivity and structure have got to be changed in this industry if it is to survive in the long-term.

Now change is not going to stop. What we have to do is to learn in respond to it. In the past 10 years we have seen the number of people throughout the world employed in building computers rise from 100 000 to 600 000. This increase is just as great as the decrease in jobs which has taken place in older industries like shipbuilding or steel. The trouble is that we have not won our share of the employment, work and development in the new industries. Shipbuilding has been affected by this more than most, and I fear this will continue to be the case. Business logic in this industry has often lagged and innovation has been slow. All the new prefabrication methods in shipbuilding originally came from America and it was America that showed us during the last war that shipbuilding was merely part of engineering and capable of rapid expansion or concentration to suit market demand, that it should not be inbred in talents or in the products it made.

Well now, Japan is showing us how to build in new ways and how to build new products in shipyards; even complete industrial plants built on pontoons, chemical plants and the like, and towed away from the dry docks, away to South America. The skills in shipyards are suitable for a variety of different industrial work including the building chemical plants. There are immense opportunities in building environmental equipment, in coalhandling and other energy equipment, including oil rigs. These are areas in which we are in crisis and where we need output. But I fear that in the past there has been too little diversification, too little innovation and too little cross-fertilization of talent and staff between this and other industries, and it is notable that really only one yard has made a success of building standard ships.

The concept of specializing in building ships alone is wrong. This is a declining *métier*, not general engineering of which shipbuilding is part. I am against support for declining industries going on and on. It is worth noting that in Japan and in Germany shipyards are part of larger industrial groups. This is a case where nationalization and specialization are not the long-term answers to this problem.

Now because of these difficulties my Group supports this resolution and in particular paragraph 10 calling for proposals for creating a dynamic framework for

Nicolson

this industry and to make it competitive in the long term without resorting to permanent subsidization. If we do not support that view we shall be following our noses without tackling the root causes.

President. — I call Mr Herman to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

Mr Herman. — (*F*) Ladies and gentlemen, I should first like to thank Mr Delorozoy and congratulate him on the diligence he has shown in drawing up this report and on the way in which he has taken account of the various aspirations and recommendations of our committee.

Of course, the harmonization of aids, the reduction of capacities and rationalization of shipbuilding industries are laudable objectives, but it seems to me that, at this stage, they are not enough. And the two solutions offered in rather conflicting fashion by the last two speakers leads me to believe that there is a middle path between the two. It is clear that we cannot be happy with protectionistic measures and that we cannot continue to subsidize the shipbuilding industry for ever. Consequently, any solution based on this thinking is doomed to failure. In addition, although we strongly support the suggestion that there is a need for dynamic management in the shipbuilding industry to make it competitive again, we must also admit that, if we make a comparison with Japan, this objective cannot be achieved in the present circumstances. It cannot be achieved for the same reasons that it cannot be achieved in the automobile and many other sectors. It cannot be achieved until Japan takes on a larger share of what I would call the general running expenses of the world market economy. It will not be achieved unless Japan agrees to increase its share of the efforts now being made by the other pillars of the world economy, the United States and Europe, efforts in respect of monetary stability, aid to the Third World, the protection of the environment, military defence and so on. Until Japan agrees to participate in the effort being made by the United States and Europe, it is obvious that we shall never succeed in restoring conditions of equal competition with them and so making our industry competitive with the Japanese industry again.

That is why the conclusion drawn in this debate should be the same as that which we have just drawn with regard to the automobile industry: we must have talks with Japan and not content ourselves with harmonizing our aids by saying to the Member States: 'Don't do this and don't do that.' We must go further. We must open the dialogue with the Japanese to make them understand that they must share as we have done, and to the same extent as we do, in the efforts and responsibilities incumbent upon them as a new economic power.

We must make them understand that they are deriving tremendous benefits from international expansion and the efforts being made to sustain this world economy. By agreeing to make this effort, they will therefore be putting themselves at a level of competitiveness that approaches our own and enabling us to accept the challenge we are asking the Commission to take up.

I should now like to make an additional comment on the subject of problems connected with technology. I believe there is still considerable progress to be made in shipbuilding. Not only in the harmonization of costs, not only in increasing productivity in the industry, but also in the very concept of shipping. The Japanese have just shown us that in this age of energy shortages there are ways of taking advantage of the possibilities offered by sailing ships. They have built a ship — it has just been launched — which, with the aid of very sophisticated electronic apparatus, is powered by engines using conventional fuels and by the wind, which is always very strong at sea, using modern methods to harvest this wind power. This is one of the examples of a field in which the European shipbuilding industry should also be involved, and although at the outset in might appear that the effort involved is too risky and too limited for one or other shipyard, here again there is perhaps an opportunity for those who are concerned with technological innovation at European level to gain general acceptance for this new type of ship or to promote it. Those, then, were the two additional comments I wanted to make. My group would like to see them incorporated in Mr Delorozoy's otherwise excellent report, whose conclusions we endorse.

President. — I call Mrs Le Roux of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Le Roux. — (*F*) Mr President, Mr Delorozoy's report and the Commission's Directive itself take the decline of the shipbuilding sector as an established fact. Referring to the Community's shipbuilding industry, the Commission states that between 1975 and the end of 1979 35 % of the jobs in this industry were lost and capacities were reduced by almost 40 %. That is a real massacre and not something we should feel very happy about. But I find Mr Delorozoy calling in his report for the restructuring plans to be speeded up, particularly in Member States which, in his opinion, have not participated sufficiently in the restructuring programme. I think he is referring to France, where the struggle has prevented the employers and Giscard's Government from going as far as he would like in closing down plants and making workers redundant . . .

Mr Delorozoy. — (*F*) You are wrong: I was not referring to France.

Mrs Le Roux. — (*F*) ... The workers in the shipbuilding industry, helped by the Communists, were successful in their struggle to maintain jobs and industrial potential that is essential to the French economy. And we are pleased with this fighting spirit. At the same time, we condemn the use in France by Giscard's Government, of which Mr Delorozoy is a representative, of a plan to restructure the shipbuilding industry which has resulted in more than 5 000 redundancies in four years. Mr Delorozoy also calls for the implementation of the 'scrapping-building' plan which my friend Danielle De March rightly denounced at the December part-session, because this plan for brutal cut-backs would mean the scrapping of two ships for the building of one.

Once again we confirm our total rejection of plans for industrial restructuring established by the Commission in Brussels, and we also reject the idea of the Commission strengthening its supranational controls over the national aids granted by France to the shipbuilding industry, whatever assessment might otherwise be given to the content and the actual destination of these aids. It is for France to maintain its sovereign right to decide the fate of its industry and the aid it gives that industry. We feel for our part that investments which create jobs and are likely to increase production must be facilitated.

But we find that the Directive which Mr Delorozoy approves in his report, goes against what the shipbuilding industry needs, since it provides, on the one hand, for these aids to be subject to constant checks — supranational checks, of course — and on the other hand, for them to be linked to the achievement of restructuring objectives. The Directive also states in Article 3 that a Member State may not grant aids likely to increase its shipbuilding capacity. Such objectives are completely unacceptable to the Communist and Allies Group. The sole aim is to increase the profits of a few major shipbuilders by encouraging concentration and closures. This is one reason why we remain opposed to the enlargement of the Community to include Greece. For this reason we shall also join with the Greek workers in their struggle as in any other struggle. For that is where hope lies.

President. — I call Mr Calvez to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Calvez. — (*F*) Mr President, once again the debate concerns the persistence of the crisis in the shipbuilding sector: the order books are far from full, because 80 % of world orders have gone to Japan.

The shipbuilding industry is suffering a battering from Japan, Korea and Brazil and, to be frank, from closer at hand, Poland and Romania. In this situation we find everyone looking after his own interests. European owners are ordering ships in Japan, where prices are

so low that it is very difficult not to have ships built there. The shipyards are trying to obtain as much aid as possible. But we find that the workforce has been reduced by 80 000 in five years. Although the situation varies from one Community country to another, it is no longer acceptable today. Is it acceptable for members of the European Club not to obey the rules of the game? Is it acceptable that Member States should not make their contribution to the reorganization of the shipbuilding industry? I believe we have here a shameful example of division and indifference.

To conclude, I should like to see Parliament calling on all the Member States and the Community to take dynamic action to put the shipbuilding industry on a sound footing and to make it competitive again through reorganization, painful though it may be.

The French tax-payer for his part will be paying 1 500 m in 1981 to support the major shipyards. This is a great deal when compared with total public aids to the 22 180 fishermen and shellfish farmers, but it is hardly enough if we are to avoid having a new Longwy in St. Nazaire and La Ciotat. In short, Community aid is essential and we hope to find in the Commission's programme of work a chapter devoted to the structural activities it envisages proposing to allay the concern felt by those who depend on the shipbuilding industry directly or indirectly for their livelihood.

President. — I call Mr Remilly to speak on behalf of the Group of the European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Remilly. — (*F*) Mr President, since the crisis began in the sea transport sector in 1975, demand for new ships has been much reduced, resulting in a decline in world capacity, which was estimated in 1980 at 18 million tonnes or almost 20 % down on maximum capacity.

In this depressed market, where the Japanese yards have the reputation of offering the lowest prices in the world, countries such as South Korea in Asia and Poland in Eastern Europe, as Mr Calvez has just said, offered even lower prices, and these came to be regarded by the owners as international reference prices. Consequently, sales prices fell so low that the recovery, which began in early 1978, does not always allow the shipyards to strike a balance between the sales price and the cost price. As a result, in the first three quarters of the year the Japanese, who as usual won all their national orders, exported over 75 % of orders, or about 50 % of world orders. The self-accelerating effect can only lead to the continued strengthening of this dominant position unless an external brake is applied. Let us not forget that Japan's success in shipbuilding was a powerful pace-setter for the whole of Japanese industry.

Thus, although we approve the Commission's objective of ensuring the competitiveness of the Commu-

Remilly

nity's shipbuilding industry at world level, we maintain that this objective cannot be achieved as long as the industry faces artificial competition from third countries, as Mr Delorozoy has said in his excellent report. The European Parliament has agreed in the past that EEC action should take the form of a genuine industrial policy, but the proposals that were put forward were not successful, the opposition of our partners preventing the adoption of provisions which seemed positive, particularly the proposal for a premium for the scrapping and building of ships.

The EEC might adopt measures designed to encourage Member States' shipowners to place their orders with Community shipyards. This question is particularly important at the time when Greece has just joined the Common Market. On the other hand, the Commission should take action to ensure the earliest possible implementation of the IMCO measures aimed at getting rid of or adapting ships which do not meet the standards that have been laid down. If the Commission proves incapable of taking action to ensure the continued existence in the Common Market area of a shipbuilding industry that is viable and commensurate with the role played by Europe in the world's maritime economy, it will be depriving itself of essential weapons for use in the discussions it must have with third countries, and particularly Japan, with a view to obtaining their agreement to limit their exports of ships and to charge sales prices that cover cost prices.

President. — I call Mr Almirante (non-attached).

Mr Almirante. — (*I*) Mr President, speaking for the members of the Italian right, I express a firm negative judgement on Mr Delorozoy's report, for five reasons which I will list very briefly.

First of all, and this is the most important reason, the shipyard crisis is an employment crisis, and a fearful one, if it is true as the report itself asserts, that in recent years 35 % of workers employed in this sector have been laid off. Our Parliament expressed its position on employment in the clearest possible terms when, a few sessions ago, it approved Mr von Bismarck's excellent report calling for fighting unemployment through incentives, through participation and development, through regional policy, and certainly not through demobilization and dismantling. This report, in substance, is a demobilization and dismantling report.

Secondly, in the same report and in the documents pertaining to it, it is correctly noted that Japanese competition with regard to prices is and will continue to be extremely damaging. This is contained in the report itself. As far as I am aware, such competition, which constitutes veritable dumping and a protectionism injurious to the European industry, should be

opposed not by demobilizing and dismantling the other industries, but by adopting defensive — I do not wish to say protective — measures.

Thirdly, this report reflects an uncompromising approach detrimental to Italy and Great Britain, and not to France, as one speaker incorrectly asserted a moment ago, and we find this unacceptable. If this resolution were approved, though we hope it will not be, one of its results would be serious damage to the shipbuilding industry of the Italian Mezzogiorno. As Italian representative of the Mezzogiorno, I cannot be unmindful of the unemployed workers of the shipyards of Castellamare di Stabia, near Naples, for example — an area also struck by the earthquake —, and of the shipyards of Taranto and Palermo. For this reason I protest vigorously against this dangerous attitude.

But there is worse: contextually we have available an excellent report by the Committee on Social Affairs, drawn up by Mr Van der Gun, where the Council is criticized for having failed to adopt a coherent general policy of industrial restructurization including social provisions for the purpose of maintaining the income of shipyard workers. Thus, on the one hand additional unemployment is advocated, and on the other no corresponding supportive measures are taken for the benefit of the unemployed workers.

President. — I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, Northern Ireland has one shipyard, Harland and Wolff. Unfortunately it is excluded from the ranks of British shipbuilders, but it has cooperated fully with the EEC in reducing capacity. For example, in 1979 its steel throughput was less than a quarter of its throughput in 1976. Its labour force has been reduced from 22 000 in the 1960s to its present level of 7 000. It has sought to diversify, in accordance with EEC requirements, into related operations. For instance, Harland and Wolff is currently tendering for the steelwork of the new EEC-aided Foyle Bridge in the city of Londonderry.

The costs involved in this struggle for survival through diversification are excessive, and it is in this regard that this Community can help us. With its massive slimline operation the Belfast shipyard now finds itself with the same overheads as before, but spread over only one-quarter of the work turnover. Insofar as this new fifth directive permits the continuance of financial aid, I welcome and support it. However, in the Belfast shipyard there are unique costs associated with production, which are not borne by our counterparts in the rest of this Community. It is these that put us at great disadvantage. These costs flow mainly from the high cost of energy and the high cost of securing our supplies, arising from the fact that Northern Ireland is on the periphery of the Community and suffers a great

Paisley

degree of isolation. Not having any steel industry, all our raw materials for shipbuilding have to be imported at great cost.

Special note therefore needs to be taken of these facts by this Community in fixing the guidelines for permissible aid, and I trust that they will always be kept in mind when directives of this nature are being drafted and adopted.

President. — I was approached by some representatives of the Greek Members who asked me to postpone the debate, but as our procedure does not permit the tabling of new amendments when we have just postponed the vote, which is the only thing that could be postponed at this point, the Greek Members have finally agreed not to introduce any proposal. I want to thank them for their cooperation, because I understand that the subject we are now dealing with is of particular importance to their country.

I have great pleasure in calling Mr Andriessen who is speaking for the first time in the European Parliament. I know Mr Andriessen well from the Netherlands and I recall that in debates of this kind in the Lower House there were even fewer Members present than during this debate, so it seems that the Dutch tradition is being continued.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, thank you very much for your friendly welcome. If we could reduce this Chamber in size somewhat, I think we would find there were far more Members taking part in this debate than what we are accustomed to in the Dutch Parliament.

I should like to begin by thanking the House on behalf of the Commission for the particular and careful attention it is paying to our proposal for a fifth directive. I join in the words of praise that have been directed at the rapporteur, Mr Delorozoy, who has made an excellent analysis of the problems in this area. Practically every speaker has expressed grave concern at the situation in the shipbuilding industry, and rightly so. The situation in the shipbuilding industry is serious and has been so for a very long time, and it does not look as if there can be any substantial improvement in the short term. Mr Delorozoy's report explains the situation very clearly. It is therefore understandable that many speakers should feel a very great effort is needed in the Community to maintain or to some extent restore our competitiveness at international level. But this can be done only if help is provided in the form of aid for a limited period, and I hope it will be as limited as possible.

However, and I say this to those who have made very far-reaching recommendations regarding the maintenance of employment, the Commission feels that we cannot allow a kind of 'subsidy mentality' to develop

in the shipbuilding industry, with the result that it is never again able to stand on its own feet without massive government aid. That would be degrading for this sector and it could not be kept up for long. The Commission has therefore submitted this proposal for a fifth directive as part of its decision-making to the Council with the aim of achieving an organized adjustment of the shipbuilding sector to the market situation in the longer term in a way that is also socially acceptable.

This new directive, as has already been said, is wider in scope than the one which applied until the end of last year, particularly where it concerns the addition to the present forms of aid of aid granted to shipowners that has an effect on shipbuilding, and all other forms of financial support the shipbuilding industry receives from governments.

It should perhaps be pointed out — in connection with what various speakers have said during this debate — that the Commission feels that, where Member State governments allocate further aid in the future, the accent should be placed on crisis measures, which should also be accompanied by restructuring.

Various references have been made this afternoon to restructuring, improving competitiveness, attempts to reduce costs and so on, and it is the intention of this directive that in the period before us the emphasis in restructuring should be placed on these aspects rather than on the reduction of production capacities, of which — as has rightly been said — there has been a great deal in the past. The Commission also regrets that the debates on this fifth directive last year did not result in actual decisions being taken. In this respect, we are in something of a vacuum, it has been said, and that is true, but that was almost bound to be the case once the Council asked Parliament for its opinion on this directive and decided to include that opinion in its deliberations.

But I must also point out that, apart from this aspect, some of our proposals for directives raise problems which make further discussion in the Council inevitable. To keep the vacuum as small as possible, the Commission proposed to the Council in the middle of December of last year that the existing arrangement under the fourth directive should be extended for three months. But unfortunately a decision has not been taken on that either. But I am quite hopeful that this extension will be made in the next few days, just as I hope — and the Commission derives strength from what has been said in Parliament — that the final discussion of this directive will produce a positive decision.

I should now like to make a few comments on various questions put to the Commission. Firstly, a considerable amount has been said, by Mr Herman among others, about the problems raised by Japan and the competition we face from Japan. I would point out

Andriessen

that this directive provides an opportunity to use aid, as I have already briefly indicated, to respond to those elements of this competition which we consider unacceptable. I would also point out that these matters are regularly discussed within the OECD — with Japan and other countries — and that this directive can also be taken as a basis for such discussions. In reply to the urgent appeal for a cohesive policy, of which this policy should form part, all I can say is that a lack of Commission initiative can certainly not be blamed for the absence of a policy of this kind. Proposals have been made on several occasions in the past, but unfortunately the decisions then taken did not produce the desired result. I can assure the Assembly that the Commission will be diligent in this respect in future. I cannot, of course, anticipate the contents of our programme of work, but I will certainly take note of the recommendations that have been made this afternoon in this Assembly.

Then Mr Paisley asked us to take account of a number of specific factors which he feels have an effect on the problems faced by the shipbuilding industry in Northern Ireland. If you look at the text of the proposed directive, you will see that, when assessing the level of aid, the Commission takes account of the actual circumstances in which that aid is allocated and that these specific factors are considered during the Commission's appraisal and decision-making under the directive. To conclude, I should like to say that I shall naturally inform this Assembly immediately if changes should be made during the procedure relating both to the decision on the extension and the decision on the directive itself, and I hope that the debate in this Assembly and the results which will emerge will help to ensure a positive decision is taken in this important area shortly.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

10. *Prevention of pollution of the sea*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on

- the report by Mr Carossino, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-332/80) for a directive concerning the enforcement, in respect of shipping using Community ports, of international standards for shipping safety and pollution prevention (Doc. 1-708/80),
- the report by Mrs Maij-Weggen, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-333/80) for a decision establishing a Community information

system for preventing and combating hydrocarbon pollution of the sea (Doc. 1-709/80);

- the report by Mrs Maij-Weggen, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the prevention of disasters during the extraction of oil and gas in the north-west European waters (Doc. 1-473/80);
- the report by Mrs Spaak, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on combating the effects of disasters where oil is released into the sea and reaches the shore (Doc. 1-467/80)

I call Mr Carossino.

Mr Carossino, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this proposal by the Commission tends to respond to demands repeatedly expressed by the Parliament. Considerable progress will be made in the fight against the use of substandard vessels by modifying the rights now acknowledged by international law to all countries permitting the inspection and eventual temporary immobilization of ships whose technical specifications, crew complements, or equipment do not meet the applicable obligatory standards.

This procedure will only produce positive results, however, if the proposed directive, once approved, is rigorously applied in all Community ports.

Otherwise the increase in traffic directed towards the more lenient ports would cause serious disruption. For this reason the Council's approval of the proposals should be considered only as a first step.

In the report, I made an effort to illustrate that the utility of international treaties depends upon at least four conditions: their ratification, their effective application, checks on the implementation of the measures involved, and, finally, the suppression of eventual infractions.

If one of these conditions is not met, the effectiveness of the provisions can be seriously weakened. If, therefore, the ratification of the international treaties serves as a point of departure, it must be followed by other provisions to ensure that the commitments are faithfully and rigorously observed.

I will not describe the contents of this proposed directive, for they are clearly set forth in the report. The aim of the directive itself is to bring about the effective application of some of the basic international maritime safety standards in all Member States of the Community.

On more than one occasion, the Commission has insisted that it is not so much new and stricter standards which are needed as simply the observation of those already in existence. This certainly true, for the application of international agreements on the part of

Carossino

all Member States would clearly improve the situation to a significant degree. The problem of safety and its dramatic consequences is serious enough to require the adoption of supplementary measures of which, moreover, Parliament has frequently expressed its approval. I refer to the creation of a system of controls for maritime traffic in heavily-travelled Community waterways, to the use of escorts for supertankers carrying dangerous substances, to a Community service specializing in salvage operations and to a balanced policy for navigational training. Further measures would include the issuing and mutual recognition of documents certifying the qualifications of captains, deck and engine-room personnel, stricter measures against illegal employment and failure to observe the prevailing social regulations, standards designed to ensure an adequate crew for ships of all categories, and improvements in the construction and manning of vessels. Finally, there are additional proposals regarding the promotion of scientific research for the mechanical recovery of oil lost in spills and for the development of acceptable standards of bio-degradation, the creation of so-called 'ports of refuge', and improvements in the existing systems of insurance and liability afloat for pilots in busy sea-lanes.

It is obvious, ladies and gentlemen, that everything cannot be done at once. Nevertheless it is permissible to insist that the Commission draw up and submit to the Council, on the basis of these suggestions, a programme of priority items aimed at increasing security in maritime traffic and protecting the Community's maritime environment.

I must now dwell for a moment on the reasons why the presentation of such a rational and useful proposal was so long delayed. At present it is impossible even to be sure of the Council's approval, despite the fact that, in recent years the situation has been steadily worsening. In 1979 there were no fewer than 279 maritime accidents in which more than 177 people lost their lives. These delays in the matter of greater international cooperation for maritime transport are due, in my opinion, to the fact that up to now the identification of rule violations has been left to the nations under whose flag the ships have sailed; to the fear that unilateral application of controls and sanctions on the part of a single nation might provoke measures of reprisal from the countries whose vessels were involved; to anxiety lest the exercise of excessive power by the Community or the separate countries raise obstacles to freedom of navigation; and finally to the fear expressed in some quarters that the approval of regulations concerning social and technical security might result in higher prices for freight and oil.

These reasons are valid; they involve large interest groups and call for a gradual process of modification brought about through the participation of many countries working in effective international cooperation. It is at this point that political difficulties arise. The Member States tend to resist yielding authority to

the Community in maritime matters, and some have even requested that the proposed directive be turned into a simple recommendation or an agreement among national governments.

In discussing costs and benefits it is indeed necessary to bear in mind the price of freight, but it should also be stressed that the adoption of this directive would be a concrete contribution to solving the crisis in European shipyards which we discussed a few moments ago by stimulating a new demand for ships built to international standards. Other interests are also to be considered: tourism, ecology, and fishing, all of which are ever more seriously affected by growing pollution of the seas. I personally share the opinion of those who believe that the problem of pollution has become so serious that it must be faced without any further delay. The measures must be implemented gradually and each single action and decision must be consistent with a Community maritime policy.

At the same time, it is impossible to ignore the primary responsibilities to be borne by the Community because of the extent of its trade, the size of its fleet, and the length of its coastline. For these reasons, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Committee on Transport which adopted it unanimously, I invite you to support this proposed directive, which can be considered as the first concrete step forward towards a more coherent Community initiative aimed at solving the problems of security at sea and of marine pollution due to hydrocarbons.

President. — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen.

Mrs Maij-Weggen. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the European Parliament has urged the Commission on several occasions in the past to adopt a better and joint approach to oil pollution in European maritime areas. In written questions put by Mrs Ewing and Mr Klinkenborg among others, in resolutions tabled by Mr Cottrell, for example, and not least at the hearing held in Paris in 1978 after the *Amoco Cadiz* disaster on the initiative of Parliament's Committee on Regional Policy, the Commission's attention has repeatedly been drawn to the gravity of these problems.

That this concern is justified has again been made clear by the recent pollution of the Swedish, Norwegian and Danish coasts, which in recent weeks have cost over 150 000 sea-birds their lives and the cause and extent of which are still not known, even though it is at least three to four weeks since the pollution was first noticed. We therefore welcome the fact that the Commission has now taken the first step towards answering Parliament's urgent appeals. The proposals now before us may be just the beginning but if they are followed by further legislation — and Mr Carossino has made various suggestions — they may repre-

Maij-Weggen

sent the satisfactory start of a balanced system of prevention, control and containment of oil pollution at sea.

The Commission's document, which includes the first steps towards a plan of this kind and which was referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for its opinion, contains two proposals. The first concerns the establishment of a Community information system in which all data on ships and particularly on tankers sailing in European waters and calling at European ports will be recorded. These data will include the identity of tankers, features, age, the identity of the owner, the nature of the oil being carried, the position of ships as regards international agreements — a point I shall be returning to in a moment — and incidents and accidents in which these ships have been involved. The information system will also include a permanent record of all national and regional disaster plans the various Member States have for their coastlines. It will also include a permanent record of all the equipment the Member States have available for these disaster plans.

The second of the Commission's proposals is that an advisory committee of oil control specialists, three from each Member State, should be set up. The intention is that this committee should be principally concerned with working out the details of the proposed cooperation.

The Committee on the Environment approves both the Commission's proposals, although we do have some criticism to make, as you will see in the resolution.

The Commission proposes, for example, that the information system should include data on the position of tankers at sea and entering port under international treaties. That is very laudable, but we must remember that many of the international and regional agreements which are named in the Commission's documents and concern the safety of shipping, have not yet been ratified by certain Member States of the Community. This is not conducive to the credibility and effectiveness of a proposal of this kind. We therefore urge the Commission to call on Member States which have not yet ratified these agreements to do so as quickly as possible. After all, we can hardly expect Liberian and Panamanian tankers to meet requirements which Member States themselves are not meeting.

The Committee on the Environment is also critical of the sphere of application of the information system. It seems very important to us that the sphere of application should not be limited to the Member States of the Community and that negotiations should begin with third countries, particularly in the North Sea and Mediterranean areas, as soon as possible. It is particularly important for these countries to participate in the information system. We are thinking here, for example, of Norway and Sweden as regards the North Sea area and of Portugal and Spain and possibly

Yugoslavia in the south. Cooperation is important not only with regard to environmental protection but also for competition reasons. It is quite conceivable that tankers will change their routes to ports and countries which take checks and records less seriously, and then we shall soon have not only the phenomenon of cheap flags, but also the phenomenon of cheap ports. Mr Carossino has also emphasized this point in his report.

The Committee on the Environment also appreciates the second of the Commission's proposals that an advisory committee of oil control specialists should be set up. This proposal prompts an important comment, which is largely connected with what I have just said. It seems to us extremely important that here again relevant third countries, particularly in the North Sea and Mediterranean areas, should be involved in this advisory committee. When we consider the most recent case of oil pollution, we find that the pollution extended principally along the Norwegian, Swedish and Danish coasts and also left traces on the German and Dutch coasts, and that surely proves that a committee of this kind cannot work effectively unless means are found of involving certain third countries in the discussion. Oil pollution unfortunately does not stop at the Community's frontiers, and we must bear that in mind. To put it very mildly, it is remarkable that none of the Commission's proposals refers to the off-shore oil production industry as a possible source of oil pollution at sea. We even have the impression that the Commission has been careful to ignore the off-shore industry in the documents that have been submitted to us. It is therefore a good thing that the Committee on the Environment will be submitting an own-initiative proposal to Parliament and to the Commission on this subject.

This second report, for which I am the rapporteur, has been prompted by a resolution tabled by Mr Muntigh on the involvement of the off-shore industry in such oil pollution, in the specific context of an accident in the Gulf of Mexico. In this accident, which occurred in July 1979, a drilling ship parted company with a well on the seabed. The work involved in plugging the well was so complicated that it took months. The enormous pressure in the oil reservoir had made the seabed around the well completely porous, so that once one had been plugged, another sprang open. During this period over 400 000 tonnes of oil were released into the Gulf of Mexico. That is as much again as found its way on to the coast of Brittany after the *Amoco Cadiz* disaster. It is not yet known how much damage was done throughout the sea area and to the coast, but experts are already saying that it may be fifteen years before the flora and fauna on the coast and in this sea area have recovered from the catastrophe to some extent.

What happens a long way from home can also happen on our own doorsteps. An extensive off-shore industry has developed in the North Sea in recent years, an industry which we must treat with a special care for

Maij-Weggen

economic and political reasons. But the fact remains that the risks inherent in this off-shore industry must not be underestimated. The economic and political vulnerability of this industry compels us to be particularly wary of the risks. In 1977 we were shaken by an accident in the North Sea, in the Norwegian Ekofisk field to be specific. Here again there was a blow-out, but in this case the well-head was on the drilling platform and not on the seabed, which meant that it could be plugged within about a week, which is relatively quick for an off-shore accident. As a result, only about 20 000 tonnes were released into the sea, and that is really comparatively little for an off-shore accident. The question is how great is the risk of a disaster in the North Sea. Experts estimate the risk as being greater than the present statistics indicate. There are a number of reasons for this. The oil- and gas-bearing strata are situated at a considerable depth under the sea. The pressure in these underground strata is very high, even higher than in the Gulf of Mexico. The structure of the seabed is also particularly complicated and in some places rather porous and soft. The weather conditions in the areas concerned are very unstable. All these factors have resulted in the regular introduction in the North Sea of new and advanced methods with which little experience has been gained elsewhere. This all makes the off-shore industry a vulnerable industry involving major risks for the environment. We need only think of the shallows that stretch for a distance of 300 km along the Dutch, German and Danish coasts and also of the risks involved for certain economic sectors such as the fishing and tourist industries. Several million European workers and employees earn their daily bread in this way. If an accident like that in the Gulf of Mexico occurred in the North Sea, it would be not only a terrible catastrophe for the environment but also an economic disaster. We must not therefore close our eyes to the risks inherent in these activities.

The Committee on the Environment therefore calls on the Commission to submit a report shortly — that is to say, within a year — on this industrial sector and in particular on the risks this industry creates. We also call for this off-shore industry to be included in the proposed record and information system as soon and as completely as possible.

Why should we record tankers carrying hundreds of thousands of tonnes of oil and ignore wells through which hundreds of thousands of tonnes of oil are produced? Both involve risks, both must be recorded.

To conclude, I should just like to say a few words about the sea-birds which have been washed up on to the beach in the thousands every day in recent weeks. I do not want to evoke cheap emotions, but what I have seen in recent weeks on the beach near my own home in Noorwijk-aan-Zee has filled me with a profound feeling of shame. Many sea creatures flee to the coast when they are in need, perhaps with the intention of confronting human beings with the results

of their activities. The sea is not a cheap waste-tip. The sea is of vital importance to animals and human beings. If we destroy life in the sea, we are also threatening life on land. Any action designed to reverse this process is worthy of our support. The proposals now before us have the unanimous support of the Committee on the Environment, and I call on Parliament similarly to give unanimous support to these proposals.

President. — I call Mrs Spaak.

Mrs Spaak, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, the motion for a resolution contained in this report was prompted by a question by Mr Muntingh. It is deliberately confined to calling for support for mechanical means of fighting accidental pollution to the sea or the coast caused by hydrocarbons.

Many studies have been made of all these problems since 1978, the year of the *Amoco Cadiz* accident. For the sake of efficiency, action should be taken to deal with specific aspects. Tanker accidents are responsible for 11 % of marine pollution caused by hydrocarbons. Prevention is, of course, still the best means. But the risk of an accident inevitably remains. Since the *Tanio* accident, it is obvious that vigorous and concerted action is needed to cope with the human, ecological and socio-economic consequences of these accidents.

Everyone would agree that preference should be given to the removal of the hydrocarbons by mechanical means rather than chemical means, since there is then no risk of secondary, toxic effects on the marine flora and fauna. But the mechanical means at present available are effective only in a limited number of cases. The first difficulty involved in using them is due to the specific nature of each case of hydrocarbon pollution, owing to the type of product to be recovered, the physical environment of the slick and atmospheric conditions. The requirements relating to the use of mechanical means raise a second difficulty: the need for favourable atmospheric conditions, high costs, the need for a large work-force. The layer of oil to be recovered must be thick and not yet dispersed, which, owing to the ageing of oil in sea water, means that action has to be taken quickly, and this is not always possible because of atmospheric conditions. Pumping off dispersed oil means pumping off 80 % water. Storing and possibly processing the hydrocarbons recovered form a third obstacle. This explains why most Member States tend to use chemical means to combat such pollution. The Netherlands and Scandinavian countries alone have developed and experimented with various mechanical means.

The performance of the mechanical means must be improved. The cost of the research and the evident interest of the Member States in having standardized equipment should encourage the Commission to take coordinating and financing action in this field.

Spaak

To be more precise, it should coordinate and promote the use of mechanical means wherever possible. At local level there is a work-force which is directly concerned: the inhabitants of the coastal regions and more specifically fishermen. This work-force should be made aware of a problem which directly concerns them. Mechanical means could be fitted to fishing boats, for example. The oil companies are spending large sums on research into chemical means. They should also be spending similar amounts of money on mechanical means and their use. There are a number of research centres in the Member States that specialize in the fight against pollution. The oil companies should help to finance studies by these centres to establish which mechanical, chemical or biological — the use of bacteria — means are the most effective and the least harmful in given circumstances.

We await with interest the proposals the Commission must put forward as part of the programme of action to control and reduce pollution caused by the discharge of hydrocarbons into the sea, particularly as regards the possible involvement of the Commission in the design and building of pollution-fighting ships and the drawing up of a proposal for a programme of research into means of fighting pollution caused by hydrocarbons and the effect they have on marine flora and fauna. We call on the Commission to include the suggestions I have made, which had the unanimous support of our Committee on the Environment, and we call on Parliament to adopt this resolution.

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Klinkenborg to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Klinkenborg. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by saying that the Socialist Group will be voting in favour of the report.

As a member of the Committee on Transport, however, I do have a number of criticisms to make to the Commission. The Committee on Transport does not dispute that the prevention of environmental problems caused by sea transport are a transport problem. This is also true of pipelines, because pipelines are also a transport system. The Commission should realize that this question ought not to be taken away from the Commissioner responsible for transport to be given to a new Commissioner, because then a new authority has to spend some time looking into a problem on which we already have all the information.

The Commission too should realize that, if maritime accidents are to be prevented, two major areas must be examined: on the one hand, the purely nautical area and on the other, if I may put it as briefly as this, the area of technology and material — or simply the age of ships.

We do not need any new statistics on this, because we have enough at national level to provide us with all the information we need to discuss these problems. We know, for example, that many shipping accidents are due not to technical but to human failings, and human failings stretch from poor manning of the bridge through the absence of maps to the purchase of a master's certificate without any nautical experience to back it up. We know all about this. We also know that some ships raise very serious technical problems, ships which ports accept only at arm's length, as it were, ships that are unloaded as quickly as possible and then sent on their way again, so that the next port can try to sort out the problems they may create.

As we see it, then, there is no need for new statistics. What the Commission must do is exert pressure on the national parliaments to ratify at long last everything that has long since been agreed, in the IMCO Code, for example.

I can only warn against bypassing the IMCO Code and introducing a European system. It would have very many deficiencies. One such deficiency would be that it would be helping to create a distortion of competition if the standards applicable to the European shipping nations, that is the European owners, were different from those that are internationally accepted. Shipping is world-wide and international, and the rules governing it must therefore be international too.

Now in particular, with the accession of Greece, the European Community must play a greater part in this area. With the tonnage Greece has introduced into the Community, Europe now carries more weight, and it will now be easier to achieve the quorum needed to make the IMCO Code binding world-wide. So there is now absolutely no reason for further delay, because we can no longer say, 'We do not have a sufficient majority anyway.'

A second problem — and I feel it is here that the Commission's responsibility really begins — is the question of checks in the national ports. As you know, ports on the whole still form a kind of large mercantile set-up. Each port claims a certain share of the world freight volume as its own. This automatically means that the ports compete with one another. This may result — and, I believe, has resulted in the past — in not too much fuss being made about whether this or that ship actually meets the conditions negotiated. The general practice has in fact been to accept and unload any additional ships calling at a port. If the volume handled can be increased slightly, less thought has

Klinkenborg

been given to proper consideration for the environment.

As I have already said in connection with a report on the Law of the Sea Conference, what we need is the European mandate. The European Community, the European Parliament must accede to these agreements. The national parliaments must accept that, if there are national agreements and the European Parliament has approved them, they are binding. Otherwise we can go on talking about environmental protection for 20 years without any changes being made, because no-one at national level is prepared to make them.

President. — I call Mr Janssen van Raay to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group).

Mr Janssen van Raay. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as a member of the Committee on Transport I shall confine myself to the Carossino Report, although I have read the reports by Mrs Maij-Weggen and Mrs Spaak with very great interest.

I once asked three inhabitants of Rotterdam picked at random what they understood by substandard ships, and all three answered that they thought it meant small ships. My own practical proposal as regards this report, at least the Dutch version of it, is that we should drop all this official jargon. This report is extremely important for our constituents, the citizens of Europe, so let us talk about ships that are not safe, because that is what it is about, and whether or not a standard is good, is another matter.

Lack of safety — as the previous speaker has already said — may be due to the ship itself or to the crew. The case of the ship that broke in the middle in the port of Rotterdam was clearly due to the ignorance of the crew, in this case during the loading and unloading of oil. The emphasis must be placed equally on these two aspects. If we think of the crew, I would remind the House — I do not know whether this story is known outside the Netherlands — that a Dutch journalist was able to buy a master's certificate at the Panamanian Consulate for a few hundred guilders.

The man had no expert knowledge at all, at least not of shipping. He is undoubtedly an inventive and expert journalist, but for a few hundred guilders he bought a certificate enabling him to work as a mate on an oil tanker. If this sort of thing goes on — and it is, of course, almost too funny to be true — we shall have to carry out thorough checks in this area too.

I am not speaking as a theorist, ladies and gentlemen, but as a lawyer with 25 years of experience of looking after shipping interests, and I can assure you that those directly involved will never solve these problems them-

selves. Shippers are interested in only one thing, low freight rates, and whether they are due to the ship or its crew being unsafe, has nothing to do with it as far as they are concerned. Safety in shipping is therefore a matter for the authorities, but as we have seen — the previous speakers and Mr Carossino have already referred to this — the individual countries are not prepared or not able to take the necessary measures themselves to ensure safety in shipping and to prevent the pollution of the seas. I therefore completely agree that we should do this at Community level, and I can assure the House that the Carossino Report and thus the Commission's directive has the full support of my group. We are against recommendations in this area. If there is no compulsion, nothing will be done at all.

I can give you a very good example of this. The Committee on Transport recently visited the port of Rotterdam, and one of the experts there told us that he was in the Hook of Holland on the Meuse plain when the *Energy Concentration*, that ill-fated ship that broke its back, left the North Sea and sailed up the Meuse. He assured us that he said at the time that he doubted whether the ship would even reach its berth. And what happened then? Nothing. That is the wretched part of it, as Mr Carossino has said. How many more disasters must there be, before we at last reach the stage of taking the necessary action? I hope it will not be necessary in this case. Unfortunately, although it is possible to predict disasters, Cassandra never makes the front pages of the newspapers. This ship should really have exploded in Rotterdam, causing the thousands of deaths that are needed before the necessary action is taken.

I think that is one of the most important statements Mr Carossino makes in his report: I hope that disasters of this kind will not be necessary. With the *Energy Concentration* it was a very close shave. Very many catastrophes could have been prevented if there had been proper checks. The suggestion that there should be a sea traffic control system is a very good one in my opinion. It is, of course, completely illogical that we should have air traffic control, even though aeroplanes have an extra dimension — they move in a three-dimensional space, ships in a two-dimensional space — but not sea traffic control. There should certainly be a standard sea traffic control system, an integrated sea traffic control system for the North Sea and the Channel and, I feel, for the busy routes in the Mediterranean, performing the same service as has been done so successfully in air transport. I intend to give my full support to this recommendation.

I would also draw your attention to two other interesting remarks that have been made. The rapporteur rightly says that the question of unsafe ships should not be confused with the problem of ships sailing under cheap flags. He points out that the percentage of unsafe ships among cheap-flag ships is larger, but it is not the same problem. The Committee on Transport

Janssen van Raay

will be drawing up a separate report on this, and it would be a good thing to keep these two issues apart. There are cheap-flag ships which satisfy the safety standards and there are ships sailing under expensive flags which do not satisfy the safety standards. We are concerned solely with the safety aspect.

What is particularly important, of course — as both the rapporteur and Mrs Maij-Weggen have said — is that we must prevent the emergence of cheap ports, because if we have one port taking these measures and another one not taking them, with the result that ships call at a more favourable port — for the reasons I have just outlined — we shall not have achieved anything. We must have a uniform Community-wide system of enforcement and inspection.

To conclude, I would refer you — and particularly Mr Percheron and Mr Josselin; I hope they are here — to the Dutch amendments, which I do not yet have. I have the English version of Amendment No 1, which does not make sense. It says, 'urgently requests the Member States to consider their ways of taking action within maritime conferences in which' — it is all right up to there, but then it continues, 'European armaments play a dominant role.' Now I have checked this to be absolutely certain and 'armaments' obviously have no place in this text. The German version rightly refers to 'the European shipowners', and that is what is meant, but to prevent any misunderstandings and British Members from voting against it, as they certainly would have done, this must be corrected. Those were just a few of the items I wanted to single out for particular emphasis. There is little point in discussing each item of a report on which we agree. I will leave it at that and assure the rapporteur of our wholehearted support for his report.

President. — I call Mr Johnson to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Johnson. — Mr President, I welcome the four reports we are discussing today. I represent a constituency, which is the Isle of Wight and East Hampshire, where the problems of marine pollution caused by oil take on each year an increasing importance. Even as I am speaking, the casualties of the latest incident are being totted up. Sea-birds are being brought in with their feathers covered in oil. The beaches of the south coast are menaced. The pollution may not be on the same scale as that caused by the *Torrey Canyon* or the *Amoco Cadiz*, but it is important, nevertheless, and the threat grows each year as the traffic in the English Channel itself increases.

The reports we are discussing call, amongst other things, for stricter enforcement by flag States and coastal States of the rules against marine pollution. So many incidents result, not from accidents, but from deliberate acts of tank washing, ballast discharge and so on, which are in fact in contravention of interna-

tional law. The law must be strengthened and it must be enforced and there is a key role here for the European Community as such. If we act on the principle of solidarity between the ten member nations of the Community — and with the accession of Greece, we are much more oriented to the sea than we were before — we can put into effect this principle of solidarity. We can, I think, wage a much more effective war against the fly-by-night operators and against the incompetent captains.

Mrs Maij-Weggen spoke of the need for exchange of information about ships and operators. That is, of course, crucially important, but just as important, I believe, is the idea that the Community as such should ratify the international conventions and that there should be intra-EEC agreements about the enforcement of these conventions. If a ship, for example, having fouled French waters, puts into a British port, the British authorities should pursue that ship relentlessly and with effect, just as though the infraction had been committed against the British themselves.

I also very much approve the emphasis placed in Mrs Maij-Weggen's report and in Mrs Spaak's report on the problems of pollution caused by oil exploration. We may not at the moment know what precisely is happening to Norwegian ecology, but I am quite sure the argument for greater control is clear.

Mr President, you will recall that the European Democratic Group, with the support of other groups, put forward some time ago in this Parliament a proposal for a European environment fund. In the intricate manoeuvres which we witnessed at the end of last year over the budget, that proposal itself was the victim of a nasty accident. It slipped through the crack, if you like, between the slimmed-down 1981 budget and the 1980 supplementary budget. But we have the new Commissioner for the environment with us today and I do appeal to him to repropose that fund — he will have the support of the Parliament — as soon as he can, because one key dimension of the proposal was for help to be given to States and to local authorities to deal with the problems caused by marine pollution.

I am asked, Mr President, by the colleague who sits on my right, to make a brief announcement, that a film by Anglia Television on oil pollution in the North Sea will be shown at 5.45 in the cinema below this Chamber.

President. — I call Mr Veronesi to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Veronesi. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the reasons advanced by Mr Carossino in support of the resolution on security in maritime transport and the prevention of pollution are wholly

Veronesi

valid. Both texts, the resolution and the explanatory statement were unanimously adopted by the Committee on Transport. This bears witness to the fine work done by the rapporteur, who has presented the problem cogently.

With this in mind, the Italian Communist and Allies Group could simply limit itself to stating that it will vote for the proposal under consideration. In this debate, however, we are also obliged to consider other questions which, though closely connected to the problems dealt with by Mr Carossino, enlarge their scope to an appreciable degree. I am referring to the reports by Mrs Maij-Weggen and by Mrs Spaak. In this case as well we are faced with resolutions and supporting documents which were unanimously adopted by the members of the Committee on the Environment.

I have called your attention to this circumstance in order to show that the overall problems of maritime traffic are now considered from a single viewpoint, whether by political groups or by national public opinion. Safety of transport in general and of the transport of hydrocarbons in particular, measures for the prevention of pollution, the establishing of means for rapid intervention in case of disaster, and international legal dispositions to be acknowledged and applied by all countries have become an absolute necessity, and are in principle recognized as such throughout the world. For that matter, the many agreements and conventions, and the innumerable directives now in existence are confirmation of this recognition. What is disconcerting and at times outrageous is the dilatory and ineffective manner in which the measures and regulations agreed upon are finally applied.

The political problem to be solved lies in the sharp contrast between good intentions and their practical application. In many cases, unfortunately, we are still at the level of proclamations and preachings and far from an effective commitment. I was chosen by the Committee on the Environment to be the draftsman of an opinion on the *Amoco Cadiz* accident. I had the opportunity to participate in the important international hearing in Paris which dealt with this appalling event, whose consequences are still visible today. At that time how many declarations were made and commitments assumed, and yet still nothing has been done. Today we are discussing the same problems once again, which is an obvious indication that nothing has changed. We realize that the issue is not a simple one: long-established patterns of behaviour need to be changed; real economic interests and bureaucratic inefficiencies must be confronted; it is necessary to disturb long-standing habits and practices, but all this cannot be allowed to halt vital action such as that called for in our resolutions. It must be made clear that no country can consider itself safe from the dangers and the consequences of the failure to respect the standards in question if they continue to

be administered on a national basis. In every case the cost of an accident and the damage inflicted upon the environment are greatly in excess of the costs of an adequate policy of prevention. It is no use improving technology for environmental improvement if we have not first done everything possible to foresee and minimize the risks of disaster.

For these reasons, which I have briefly reviewed and which have been stressed many times by our group on previous occasions, we will approve the resolution before us.

President. — I call Mr Haagerup to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Haagerup. — (DK) Mr President, the documents we have before us in the form of the four reports show the size of the problem which oil pollution represents for our ports and coasts and the need for more effective action. I believe that our Community can make a decisive contribution to solving these problems and that it can show others the way, although it is not a specifically national or Community problem, for this scourge knows no limits either on land or at sea.

We hear all too often of oil slicks which have caused serious damage to men, animals and our environment. The economic costs are very high, but the effect on our environment is even more serious. Speaking as a Dane I should like to refer to the point made by Mrs Maij-Weggen, that is, that the oil escaping from an unknown source which has quite recently killed some 200 000 sea-birds along the coasts of Denmark, Norway and Sweden and elsewhere has had a very serious impact. I know that we have experienced much worse disasters, as Mr Johnson said, especially from the economic point of view; but the sort of effect I am talking of in this instance cannot be calculated in monetary terms. The only positive thing that can come out of this sort of disaster is that it may and, I hope, will force our governments and public authorities to recognize the need for coordinated action, both by the Community and by our governments-action in line with that recommended in the four reports we are discussing today and which my group supports.

President. — I call Mr de Lipowski to speak on behalf of the Group of the European Progressive Democrats.

Mr de Lipowski. — (F) Mr President, if there is one area in which our Assembly must bring pressure to bear on the governments — and it is doing so — to get them to take action, then it is pollution.

When we read the excellent reports that have been drawn up by Mr Carossino, Mrs Spaak and Mrs

de Lipowski

Maij-Weggen, we are struck by two things. The first is that the danger is constant. Despite the *Amoco Cadiz*, which woke us up, there have been, according to Mr Carossino, 279 accidents. And these accidents can occur again at any time, because Mr Carossino tells us our coasts are constantly being passed by an impressive number of what can only be described as floating coffins. That is absolutely unacceptable, particularly when we consider the inaction of the governments.

Faced with a situation that is and remains as dangerous as this, the governments always have numerous good reasons for refusing to ratify the conventions they have signed. They put forward legal arguments, while the real reason is money. After all, they say, it would cost a great deal to get ships into the ports for proper checks. So if there is one area in which savings are expensive, it is this one. Because it must be realized that it would be completely wrong to cheat a little here. Cheating will cost far more than the saving it produces, because closing our eyes to substandard ships will be extremely expensive when the catastrophe happens. If there is one area in which action at European level is essential, it is the fight against pollution. In short, not taking action at European level will cost far more than doing so.

I therefore propose, on behalf of my group, four measures which I shall be putting forward in a motion for a resolution submitted to the appropriate committee.

Firstly, the conventions must be ratified by the parliaments of the countries which have signed them but not yet ratified them. The Commission must bring pressure to bear, as one speaker said just now. We Members of the European Parliament must also bring pressure to bear on our national parliaments. What good is the dual mandate if pressure cannot be exerted on our governments to ratify these conventions.

Secondly, as Mr Carossino's report very rightly says, there must be very strict checks on the quality of ships carrying hydrocarbons to see whether they comply with the safety standards. These checks must be made not only when the ships are in port, but also when they are sailing along our coasts. The sea must also be patrolled, either from the air or from the sea.

Someone is going to say, 'You want a Community patrol system.' We already have them for fishing and customs. These are national patrols, commissioned by the Community, which account to the Community for the inspections they make, whether in port or at sea.

Once the damage has been done, there must also be some kind of Community solidarity to provide material and financial assistance and send a Community emergency team to the areas affected, such as the Brittany coast in the case of the *Amoco Cadiz* or the British coast, as my British colleague has said, to repair the damage and to provide slightly more financial aid

than was given to the Bretons after the *Amoco Cadiz* accident.

I now come to my last proposal. We must not only try to prevent accidents: we must also punish the polluters severely by substantially increasing, tenfold for example, the fine the polluter must pay. And the proceeds of these fines should go into a common fund to be used either to repair the damage done or to make good the loss of earnings of ports taking in ships in distress or any costs they may incur.

At all events, I join with all the rapporteurs in hoping that the governments will wake up. It is a scandal to think that we have had to wait until the *Amoco Cadiz* disaster before taking action. I am perhaps speaking in a rather emotional way, but that is because I represent a coastal constituency and my coast is under the constant threat of an oil port, the port of Verdion.

How many more cases like the *Torrey Canyon*, the *Tanio* and the *Amoco Cadiz* must we have before the Commission and governments decide to establish a genuine Community policy on maritime safety? Parliament is now doing its duty, through its rapporteurs. It is playing its full role. We call on the governments and the Commission not to wait for several more years, for so many more accidents, fatalities and cases of damage before implementing this Community policy. The governments and the Commission must wake up unless they want to feel the full force of the justified anger of the people directly affected.

President. — I have great pleasure in calling the first speaker from the Greek delegation, Mr Pesmazoglou.

(Applause)

Mr Pesmazoglou. — (EL) Thank you very much, Madam President, for the introduction you gave me. I am fully aware that the subject under discussion this evening is of great importance for all our countries and I should like to emphasize how important it is for us Greeks as we are, to a large extent, an insular country. We are not just a seafaring nation of sailors with a large merchant fleet, but also an insular country. For this reason we take a particularly keen interest in controlling pollution on our beaches and I should like to say how much importance we attach to the conclusions and decisions which will be taken after this evening's discussion.

I should also like to say that we agree with all the proposals made in the interesting reports presented to the European Parliament. In my opinion these proposals are fairly similar and the conclusions to be drawn from them, which I am sure that Greece supports, are of major importance to us all. I also want to add that the statement made earlier by the representative of the European Progressive Democrats

Pesmazoglou

regarding arrangements for a film which is to be shown gives me the opportunity and the right to say that, unlike the well-founded, responsible and serious reports we heard this evening, there are certain notices and films — and I want to point out just how dangerous this is — which draw conclusions that lead to a confused and false picture of the facts.

I would like to finish by saying that as proof of the importance which we all — i.e. the State, the political parties, the Greek shipowners and all the employees in the shipping business in Greece — attach to this matter, the representatives of the Greek shipping world have submitted a definite proposal to the IMCO which, as everybody knows, is the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization. This proposal refers to a positive measure which, as far as the Greek shipping world is concerned, is the solution to the problem of beach pollution. The positive measure referred to is the commitment to provide what is commonly called in English separate ballast tanks. This means that the ballast tanks and tanks containing liquid cargoes, including petrol products, will be separate from each other. The separation of the tanks will make it almost impossible for ships transporting hydrocarbons to cause sea pollution and, in the opinion of the Greek shipping world, if this proposal is accepted it will go a long way to solving the problem under discussion this evening. I should like to point out how much importance we attach to the Commission's work and the measures it has taken to persuade governments to get their parliaments to accept and approve measures which will effectively control pollution of the sea. The positive measure proposed by the Greek shipping world, Greek shipowners and Greeks employed in the shipping business, is, in our opinion, a crucial factor in controlling the pollution of our beaches, a problem to which the Greek people as a whole gives particular importance.

President. — I call Mr Dalakouras.

Mr Dalakouras. — (*EL*) Madam President, being a country with a large fleet, Greece is always concerned about the safety of Greek sailors and since it is also a country with a considerable tourist trade it is interested in keeping its beaches clean. Consequently, it has always been particularly energetic in adopting, approving and implementing all the international shipping agreements dealing with safety measures for vessels and anti-pollution measures. Thus, without the slightest hesitation, we give our full support and approval to Mr Carossino's proposal. Furthermore, I should tell you that Greece is a member of all the international organizations and although some of these do not include the members of the Community amongst their membership, their aims are exactly the same.

In addition to what Mr Pesmazoglou said a few minutes ago, I should like to say that the positive

proposal for establishing separate tanks for water and petrol was unfortunately rejected by just two votes. If it had been accepted — as it is several years since it was proposed — we would certainly have avoided a number of ecological disasters which no amount of money can ever put right. As a representative of a country with a substantial fleet, I should like to say, without going into details, that we are pleased that the part played by the Greek fleet in these major disasters has thankfully been very small and in recent years we have seen, to our immense satisfaction, that, in spite of the fact that the total damage caused by the world fleet has almost doubled, the percentage of damage attributable to the Greeks fortunately seems to be decreasing at a steady rate. I should also like to inform Parliament that Greece is the only Member of the Community which has set an age-limit for ships (17 years) above which they are not allowed to fly the Greek flag. This is a measure which I hope the other Members of the Community will adopt.

I would have been happy, Madam President, to finish my short speech at this point had I not been surprised by my English colleague's reference to a film which is to be shown in a few minutes. This is a film by a private TV company and unfortunately one of the topics it deals with — I don't know whether or not it does so on purpose — is the Greek fleet. However, the facts it presents are far from the truth. I imagine that the President of Lloyds has already sent off a letter and rushed off himself to Greece to visit the Ministry of Shipping and the Greek Shipowners Association to excuse himself — this may be a strong word to use, but it is accurate — for a bad translation, a bad rendering of statements made by Lloyds' office in Piraeus. In other words, what I am saying is that the European Parliament ought not to have accepted a film of this kind which is not based on official sources and which contains incorrect information, before its accuracy was completely checked by official sources.

President. — I call Mr Josselin.

Mr Josselin. — (*F*) Mr President, being the representative of a region, Brittany, whose coastline has been polluted with oil six times and which finds the products of oil tankers' cleaning operations washed up on its shores every week, I think you will agree that five minutes is a little short for me to give expression to the resentment and concern the people feel, to accuse the Member States and also to remind the oil companies of their responsibilities. No-one can deny that marine pollution is a European problem, and I am happy to see that the Community authorities have taken up this subject. Common policies must be implemented at international level, and at European level to begin with, to prevent efforts on one side from being negated by a *laissez-faire* attitude on the other. In this respect, I fully welcome the Commission's proposals both for the introduction of a data bank to record and

Josselin

coordinate the means of fighting pollution and for the application of minimum safety standards in sea transport.

Having had the misfortune to see that the only satisfactory method of fighting pollution is to prevent it, I should like to ask the Commission:

Has agreement really been reached on the definition of the term 'minimum safety standards'?

Who will be ensuring the uniform application of this definition in all the Member States?

We all have some reservations about certain inspection-rates. Who is going to ensure they comply?

The same question applies to crew training standards. What do you think of the idea of an international certificate in view of the considerable differences in training periods from one Member State to another? And here again, I believe we must start by looking closely at the idea of a Community surveillance and intervention force.

The introduction of a data bank that enables ships to be identified is a good thing, but it will come up against various difficulties. Again I would ask the Commission: are the insurance companies prepared to open their files so that we can establish proper health records of ships, taking in all the incidents in which they have been involved, all the damage they have suffered, all the offences they have committed, even if they have changed their names? After all a ship changes its name each time it changes its owner. The multitude of questions clearly illustrates the complexity of the problem, but this complexity can in no way relieve the Member States of their guilt or allow us to forget their *laissez-faire* attitude. Without disputing the importance of the work done by the Commission in Brussels, without disputing the importance of the considerable work done by our Assembly's rapporteurs reference must nevertheless be made to numerous factors which are already known and have already been included in the conventions and protocols and discussed at numerous conferences: the conference on the North Sea in Gothenburg in 1969, the conference on the North-East Atlantic held in Oslo in 1972, the conference on the Mediterranean held in Barcelona in 1975, the Solas Convention, which was proposed in 1975 but did not enter into force until 1980, and the Marpol Convention, which has so far been signed by only one Member State of this Community, the United Kingdom. In short — and I believe this is the essential point — we have known for a long time in fact what should be done. So why not do it? Reference will be made to legal questions. It is true that the law of the sea is still in its infancy, that it is not easy to move from a state of force to a state of law and that too often the rights of the maritime powers have been favoured because that served our best interests, while we overlooked the fact that we

were also coastal powers and that the rights of the State in which a port is situated must be strengthened. But in fact these are political obstacles, the *laissez-faire* attitude of the States which have not considered it worthwhile — as a speaker before me said — to devote sufficient financial resources to equip itself with an inspection and surveillance apparatus or with the means of taking action and the required human resources and equipment: I am referring to ways of enabling ships to clean their tanks in port so that they do not have a good excuse for doing it at sea. Instead we have a *laissez-faire* attitude towards the shipping companies, the oil companies and, more generally, ships sailing under flags of convenience.

You will appreciate, and I say this without wishing to resort to polemics, that the arrival of the Greek Members prompts me to ask them if they are willing to take action to ensure that their fleet, the third largest in the world, meets the safety standards and also the minimum social standards and to put an end to a situation which in many respects is unacceptable to the French, British and German merchant navies. We are told that progress has been made. I hope that progress will continue to be made.

But let us not forget, ladies and gentlemen, that every year several ships from our own national fleets, including our national shipping companies, are transferred to flags of convenience with the blessing of our governments, principally to the benefit of the seller and the buyer, who can then employ cheaper cosmopolitan crews whose qualifications are often extremely questionable. Let us not forget, either, that this fleet sailing under flags of convenience is used to supply Europe.

Reference should also be made to the weakness of sanctions and the infrequency with which fines are imposed, which in the long run ensures that the polluter gets away almost scot-free. The adoption of these reports must not be allowed to let us forget that primary responsibility is borne by the companies, who are constantly increasing the size of ships, thus making them more difficult to control, sailing them closer to the coast to reduce costs and also reducing the size of crews to keep the wage bill down. On this subject, I should like to ask the Commission what practical action it contemplates taking to overhaul insurance terms along with the standards. The limit on the shipowner's liability laid down in the Brussels Convention does not correspond to the extent of the damage done, especially when this damage has to be assessed in terms not only of repairs but also of the ecological, economic and, I would almost say, cultural damage that is done when a giant oil tanker is wrecked.

And as I have referred to the question of the repair of damage, I urge — as everyone will understand — that a centre be set up in Brittany to conduct research into marine pollution and to take action against it and also

Josselin

that the data banks being discussed here be set up at places directly concerned — again in Brittany perhaps. We have unfortunately had personal experience of these disasters, and we have research workers and universities who have also benefited by this experience. It seems to me that would be a good way for the Community to give concrete shape to its solidarity with a region that has paid a high price for the supply of oil to northern Europe.

Mr President, I shall vote for the reports before us, especially if they are modified to incorporate certain amendments, specifically those tabled by our Communist comrades, in the hope that they will help the fight against pollution. But let us make no mistake: the people and their elected representatives, in Europe and elsewhere, must remain alert and keep up the fight for a long time, because there is considerable resistance from those whose sole objective is to make a profit.

President. — I call Mr d'Ormesson.

Mr d'Ormesson. — (*F*) Mr President, according to Mr Carossini's report, marine pollution can be prevented only if the existing international conventions are strictly observed and rigorously applied. This is made all the more uncertain and difficult by the fact that the debate preceding their ratification is very long, too long. In addition, ships sailing under flags of convenience, that is to say the flag of a State which allows the inclusion of foreign ships in its shipping register, are involved in accidents four times more often, as the last speaker said, than ships sailing under their national flags.

This situation makes me feel that, while I agree there is a need for the coordination of the surveillance missions carried out by the Community countries which have navies to ensure the protection of the seaways essential to the supply of goods to the EEC, I believe that the protection of EEC waters should be ensured by coordinating air and sea missions to inspect movements of merchant shipping. Is that not the best way of applying the necessary sanctions? I would add that the excellent reports by Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mrs Spaak and Mr Carossino should definitely be adopted by this Parliament. I hope that in future the EEC will speak with one voice at international conferences on the protection of the seas. It has done so successfully at the major conferences on tariffs. Why should it not be able to do so to protect the waters that wash the banks of the Community? I would also suggest that there should be a Community representative at each major port in the EEC to ensure liaison and to convey to the States and the data bank information on nuisances caused by a company or by the owner of a merchant vessel.

President. — I call Mr Moorhouse.

Mr Moorhouse. — Mr President, first of all, if it is still in order, we should like to congratulate the new Commissioner for Transport on his appointment and wish him every success. As members of the Committee on Transport, we are very much looking forward to working closely with him.

Mr President, as my colleague Mr Johnson has already said, we very much welcome the Commission's proposal for a Council directive concerning the enforcement, in respect of all shipping using Community ports, of international standards for shipping safety and pollution prevention. I think we would all agree that it is a problem we should actively try and solve as quickly as possible. The application of the conventions concluded within the framework of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, known as IMCO, would be an enormous step forward. But I do feel we have a dilemma here. We all believe that the Community countries should act together to overcome certain problems for the good of the entire Community, and at first glance this area does seem to be an ideal one for such concerted action. However, the purpose of speaking with one Community voice is surely to strengthen our influence, and the Member States already have enormous weight within IMCO and well-established procedures for informal consultation. The fear has been expressed to me that the formal and complete transfer to the Community of competences for the enforcement of standards may jeopardize the collective authority of Member States within IMCO to the detriment of the objectives we are all pursuing and may also, by politicizing IMCO meetings, reduce the chances of achieving common agreement on the key issues. Accordingly, I hope that the Commissioner can reassure us on this point. He will appreciate that in this very sensitive and highly-technical field IMCO has a solid record of achievement which it would be madness to put at risk, and so, with the exception of this one reservation, my group wholeheartedly welcomes Mr Carossino's report.

President. — I call Mrs Le Roux.

Mrs Le Roux. — (*F*) Mr President, today's debate is the outcome of the emotion aroused by the catastrophes that have affected the Channel coast and particularly the coast of my region, Brittany.

The decision taken quite recently by the thirteen States attending the Maritime Safety Conference to set up procedures for the ratification of certain international conventions was similarly prompted by this emotion. Nevertheless, we cannot say we feel reassured about the fate of the people and activities in coastal areas. Since the last disasters little has been done in the way of prevention and research into the fight against pollution. Since that time there have been many accidents involving hydrocarbons. This evening

Le Roux

or tomorrow another disaster may occur. Further confirmation is provided by the budget of the French merchant navy, which in 1981 has been reduced by 23 % in appropriations and by 37 % for programmes. However, important and justified requests have been made by the national representatives after considering the resources needed for a real fight against pollution. My Communist colleagues in the National Assembly have rejected this budget. The presence of Greece in the Community does not reassure us as to the safety of our coasts, and I also dispute what has been said on this subject, because Greece causes more accidents at sea than any other country apart from the United States in terms of tanker operations.

The motion for a resolution before us does not have our approval as it stands, there being a number of reasons for this. Firstly, it advocates action coordinated at European level as the only effective means. Once again, we do not contest the need for, the coordination of surveillance and cleaning-up operations, particularly as regards the use of such major means as satellites and so on, but we feel that countries such as my own have an independent role to play in the fight against pollution. The primary need is for the political will to be translated into action and into resources. The second reason why we are not satisfied with the motion is that, by not naming those truly responsible for pollution, the authors of the resolution do not propose that these people should be asked to foot the bill.

The responsibility of the shipowners and the oil companies is no longer questioned by anyone. So when is this acceptance going to be followed by retaliatory measures? The adoption of our amendment recommending the governments of the Member States to tax the companies as a means of combating the risks of pollution would demonstrate a genuine desire on the part of the Members of this Assembly to take action against those who cause the maritime disasters. The resolution also proposes that new research should be financed, with a share of the costs borne by the oil companies. You cannot be the accused and the prosecutor at one and the same time. And we personally have no confidence in the oil companies' will to carry out research to combat the pollution they themselves cause. Each of our countries — at least this is true of mine — has university institutions, public scientific bodies which are quite competent to carry out this research. There is one in my own town of Brest, for example.

That is why we propose that the Member States should be recommended to step up the research being done by the public bodies. Fine words must be followed by action. For our part, we shall keep a close watch on what happens to these fine words in the future and we shall join with the people directly concerned in the fight to ensure that these words are matched by practical action.

President. — I call Mr Voyiatzis.

Mr Voyiatzis. — (*EL*) Dear Madam President, at a time when Greek MPs have just become Members of this honourable Parliament, I am very happy and proud that the first speech I am going to make is on the subject of the merchant fleet, safety measures and protection of beaches from petrol spillages. The merchant fleet has historical and economic links with the Greek people and the Greek economy. The significance and size of its contribution to the economy is huge. Dear colleagues, as the President said yesterday in her important speech when she welcomed the Greek MPs to your Parliament, Greece's accession to the European Communities will mean, apart from other mutual benefits, that the Community's strength will be increased by the addition of Greece's vast merchant fleet of 40 million tonnes which will make the Common Market the owner of the world's largest merchant fleet. With the Greek fleet the Community will be in the position to have much more effective control of merchant marine affairs. For these reasons, in my joint capacity as a Greek MP and MEP, I should like to congratulate the Commission for taking such a close interest in the question of safeguards for vessels and the pollution of the coast by petrol. I should also like to congratulate my colleagues, Mr Carossino, Mrs Maij-Weggen and Mrs Spaak for their well-prepared and helpful reports which will provide a sound basis for discussion on the regulations which need to be drawn up and voted on by Parliament. The Greek Ministry of Merchant Shipping, the Association of Greek Shipowners and Greek shipping organizations have always given a lead to others in taking all the required safeguards for vessels and sailors and in implementing all the safety measures aimed at avoiding sea and coastal pollution by hydrocarbons. As my dear friend and colleague, Mr Pasmazoglou, said earlier, it was Greek shipowners who made the proposal about the use of separate ballast tanks which the world organizations unfortunately rejected by two votes. Had this proposal been adopted, a great many of the accidents involving pollution which have happened up to now would have been avoided. In all the international assemblies and committees, stricter measures are being called for by Greek shipowners and the Greek merchant navy to ensure the success of these safety measures. These problems are very serious and, with the least possible delay, the Commission and we in Parliament should take all necessary measures to avoid pollution and ensure the safety of sailors. I should also like to draw special attention to the fact that there is a possibility that technological progress will be made in recovering hydrocarbons which have spilled onto the sea's surface, and we in Parliament should make recommendations about what direction these technical innovations should take. Any regulations which Parliament draws up aimed at saving life or avoiding pollution will be implemented immediately by the Greek navy.

Voyiatzis

Dear colleagues, I was also astonished by my English colleague's proposal that we should see a film which is not based on any official source and in which - I have actually seen it - there are some damaging criticisms of the Greek merchant fleet. Lloyd's representative in Piraeus appears in the film and makes certain statements which were proved subsequently to be entirely false. I will go further than my friend, Mr Dalakouras, to say that in my opinion there was some behind-the-scenes interference in this film. This view is supported by the fact that as soon as Lloyd's president go to know about the film he published a letter in *Lloyd's List*, an internationally respected journal, in which he denies all of the slanderous statements against Greece which the film makes. Madam President, I would like your permission, although I am not sure of the procedure, to submit to the Bureau Lloyd's letter and another letter which Mr Atkinson, the president of the Lloyd's Register of Shipping, sent the Greek Minister of Merchant Shipping. I believe that the Bureau ought not and must not allow this film to be shown within the confines of this distinguished building.

However, Madam President, if permission is given to show the film you must allow us, using these official documents, the chance to reply to those accusations which directly involve the Greek merchant fleet, and explain that they are slanderous.

(Applause)

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, something has just arisen to which we have not given sufficient attention. A particular group and a particular company is showing a film in the building. We are not familiar with the film, but you have been informed of it through the interpreters. A number of our Greek friends have, as they are entitled to do, taken the view that they should protest against it in advance. A protest has therefore been lodged. I can give the assurance that this question has been referred to the Bureau for closer consideration. On Thursday the Bureau will consider the question submitted by the Honourable Member and decide whether in future films should be shown which might give offence to one or other delegation. I hope that you will regard the matter as closed for the moment. I shall contact the Honourable Member with a view to a discussion of the matter in the Bureau.

I call Mr Moreland on a point of order.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, I entirely endorse what you have said. For the sake of clarity I should insist that we were not making this point as a recommendation. Neither affirmation nor approval was implied. We are very much aware of its limitations, that there are grave dangers of libel and that the chairman of Lloyd's Register of Shipping has criticized

it. We would not in any way wish to give the impression that we approve of it.

President. — Your statement has been noted.

I call Mr van Minnen on a point of order.

Mr van Minnen. — (*NL*) Mr President, I agree with you entirely, but I hope your announcement of what the Bureau intends to discuss does not mean that information which the Members of this House are able to discuss and assess for themselves will henceforth be withheld from them. I think it is an excellent idea for films to be shown here, by whomsoever, as a source of information.

President. — I note what you have said and I can assure you that you misconstrued what I was trying to say.

I call Mr Doublet.

Mr Doublet. — (*F*) Mr President, I should like to express my support, of which there is a little need, for the statement made by Mr de Lipowski and also to welcome on behalf of my group and in my capacity as rapporteur on the transport budget our new transport Commissioner from Greece, Mr Contogeorgis.

I should simply like to stress that we are talking about a particularly important area of safety at sea, European or even international cooperation. But action must be taken in good time. We always take action late in the day. Must we always, as Mr de la Malène said yesterday, sacrifice the medium and long term for the short term? Can Europe only grow out of disasters? Think how many disasters would have been avoided, how much time and money would have been saved if action had been taken at the proper time. Referring to Mrs Maij-Weggen's report, I would recall that, when I was chairman of the Committee for the protection of the Mediterranean in the framework of the United Towns Federation, I worked out various measures to combat marine pollution caused not by shipping but by the discharge of waste water. This too is an area which should be dealt with at European level, because if the public knew how bad things really are, they would certainly be alarmed, and rightly so. To conclude, I would say that we cannot want everything and its opposite: we cannot want to use resources and indulge in a dispute such that the absolutely essential safeguards cannot be obtained in good time. Above all, we must not raise the standard of revolt against the exploitation of resources themselves. Be that as it may, the report by my colleague on the Committee on Transport, Mr Carossino, has chosen a happy medium. It is a good choice. the Group of European Progressive Democrats can but approve it.

President. — I call Mrs Weber.

Mrs Weber. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, what we are faced with in sea transport as in the other sectors of the economy is the fact that everyone is trying to work as economically and efficiently as possible. The problem is that it is the operator, of course, who derives the benefits from this economy, not society as a whole. The benefits to the operator rather than to society as a whole are therefore measured. In other words, the cost of adverse consequences are borne by society. We find that the cost of fines is far lower than the cost of proper facilities. In the few ports that have destruction facilities, the cost of using them is far higher than the fine likely to be imposed. Although I cannot captain a tanker, I do have a master's certificate for Lake Constance, and so I am a kind of captain and I know how high the costs on Lake Constance are when a captain discharges bilge water into the lake rather than waiting until he reaches port — or, as a car driver, I know how high the costs are if used oil is drained into the street rather than being destroyed in the proper manner.

In the last few days we have all been shocked by the news from Scandinavia and down as far as Central Europe. We were all disgusted by the consequences of such atrocities for us all. We must also remember that it is not only oil that pollutes the seas. We had a long debate yesterday on titanium dioxide waste. And there are other types of waste which are discharged into the sea in incredible quantities every day. Commissioner Narjes gave us some extremely shocking figures yesterday.

In these circumstances, it is hardly conceivable what functions the seas in fact perform. They are the breeding grounds for minute creatures, in other words not only for creatures that can be seen, the birds that die because of the oil and are then washed ashore. We do not see what happens to those minute creatures, and it comes as an even greater shock to realize that they form the basis of all our lives.

The American President was recently presented with a report on the environmental situation. It also takes account of the European seas, and it becomes depressingly clear how polluted these seas already are. But it is not, of course, only these minute creatures, it is also the food chain that directly concerns us, and it is also the situation as regards foodstuffs for human consumption. During our debates on hunger in the world we heard that there are no guarantees for the supply of the protein mankind needs. Our research institutes are working on plans to use the sea as a new source of foodstuffs. When these aspects are considered, it becomes abundantly clear that environmental offences are criminal offences and that anyone who infringes the agreements we are adopting here is a criminal on whom more than just small fines should be

imposed, because what he destroys can hardly be replaced.

We cannot afford to leave the seas as rubbish-tips and graveyards to future generations. The regeneration capacity of the seas is not as extensive as we had always hoped. It has reached its limits, as has become particularly clear in the last two weeks.

President. — I call Mr Turner.

Mr Turner. — Mr President, I support the Carossino Report and the Maij-Weggen Report and their firm language. When there is a grave oil spillage disaster in the North Sea — as there will be — then Parliament will be vindicated, but the Council of Ministers will be condemned for inactivity. I would like to know the reason for their inactivity. I believe myself the reason is that the unnamed advisers behind the ministers who sit in the Council of Ministers think first of their own petty national bureaucratic empires and not of the needs of those who live on the coast of the North Sea, or anywhere else in the EEC for that matter.

The Commission is attempting to remedy this state of affairs, but I do not think they go far enough. I agree with Mr Carossino's resolution, paragraphs 15 and 16, and Mrs Maij-Weggen's paragraph 8, where they demand further moves beyond what the Commission is proposing. Notably they demand compulsory pilotage of all oil tankers in congested waters of the EEC. The European Parliament has twice voted this demand in the last year, and I hope it will do so again tomorrow.

Finally, I would say that we need integrated aerial surveillance of deliberate oil spillage. At the present time, of course, there is surveillance by individual countries and different authorities but it must be integrated by the EEC so that it is done efficiently and thoroughly.

President. — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (*I*) Mr President, I think that the number of Members who have spoken and who wish to speak on this issue is proof that maritime pollution and safety deeply concern our constituents. This leads me to make two observations.

The first concerns the belated decision of the Council of Ministers to intervene in this sector. I am sorry that the present Council which is presided over by someone who belongs to a country particularly affected by hydrocarbon pollution and especially sensitive to navigational problems, is not present, but I hope that the officials here today will bear witness to the enthusiasm and the emotions aroused in this debate.

Squarcialupi.

The second point concerns the Commission. I would like to ask the Commission how it intends to proceed in this matter, for since other accidents are bound to occur, the only question remaining is when they will happen, since the preventative measures adopted are certainly inadequate to deal with disasters. The countries have no coordinated plan of intervention and no suitable means to carry out such a plan. Therefore, the repairing of damage caused by large accidents is left solely to the local organizations concerned. I would like to offer another suggestion to the Commission. The Commission in its documents has considered chemical and mechanical means of reducing pollution. We know that chemical means merely shift pollution from one place to another and that mechanical means are efficient but not totally effective. The Commission has always been silent regarding biological methods. These means are certainly new, and still at the experimental stage: the oleodestructive bactericides upon which the Commission should concentrate its attention. The European Community must encourage these studies, this search for new methods of countering the effects of pollution. It must open up new avenues in this field as well.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I tabled only one amendment — which, unfortunately, has undergone a series of changes since it passed from my hands into those responsible for its presentation, and for this reason it will be presented here tomorrow in a revised form — intended to extend the information on the legislative provisions to the other Member States of the EEC as well. We are aware that with the accession of Greece to our Community the number of seas which are the torture and delight of tourists and fishermen has been increased. The amendment, therefore, which will be presented tomorrow in its correct original form, concerns Mrs Majj-Weggen's resolution. I hope that it will be accepted, considering the fact that in affairs of the environment there can be no frontiers and that equal attention should be paid to all seas. It is not through the number of documents that we can make ourselves heard as a Parliament, but rather through the effectiveness of the documents themselves.

President. — I call Mr Markozanis.

Mr Markozanis. — (*EL*) Madam President, dear colleagues, as this is the second time I have spoken in this chamber but only the first speech I have made in the European Parliament, I should like to express my profound belief in the European Community and assure you that I shall do all that is expected of me to promote and consolidate European unity.

The President of the European Parliament, Mrs Veil, yesterday made special reference in her speech to the fact that, as a result of Greece's accession and the addition of the Greek merchant fleet, the European Community will become a major sea-trading power.

With the resources of the Greek fleet the Community will control over 30 % of the world's fleet and will be in a much better position to compete against other fleets, and in particular against Eastern fleets.

The majority of merchant vessels controlled by Greek ship-owners are relatively new and their safety standards are high as the technical inspection of almost the whole of the Greek merchant fleet is carried out by the largest European and American shipping registers such as Lloyds, the Bureau Veritas, the German Shipping Register and the American Shipping Register. Greek operators always take all the appropriate measures to combat the problem of sea pollution and they have suggested to international organizations practical solutions to avoid sea pollution in the case of accidents involving petrol tankers.

Furthermore, colleagues, the educational standards of Greek officers and sailors are very high and the Greek government and Ministry of Merchant Shipping, which is responsible for naval training, are constantly implementing any measures which are necessary to keep naval education firmly in touch with the demands of modern technology. I should like to take the opportunity offered by today's discussion on the vast subject of sea pollution to point out how important it is to find solutions, as soon as possible, which will rid the sea of pollution once and for all. This is something, Madam President, that we have to achieve as almost all the countries represented in the European Parliament are seafaring nations.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Muntingh.

Mr Muntingh. — (*NL*) Mr President, it is very easy to table a resolution in Parliament, but it is very difficult to draw up a report on it and reintroduce it into Parliament. On the two resolutions I have tabled Mrs Majj-Weggen and Mrs Spaak have drawn up excellent reports. I thank them very much for the work they have done, by which I am deeply impressed, and I must say that I am glad that they were appointed rapporteurs.

In December of last year there was a conference of ministers in Paris at which oil pollution at sea was discussed and the decision was taken that every effort should be made in the short term to implement the four conventions that have been awaiting ratification for so long: the Marpol, Solas, STCW and ILO Conventions. The ministers said that these conventions must be discussed by the various Parliaments of the Community by 1 July 1981 — this year, in other words — and the Dutch Presidency has undertaken to convene a conference before that date at which the 14 countries together with the EEC, the ILO and IMCO will discuss the matter. With these four

Muntingh

conventions they want to set up a comprehensive European port control system. My group will be reminding the various countries and the Dutch Presidency of what they have said. If this can be achieved in the Council and if these conventions are ratified next year, then we can say, from a legal point of view at least, that we have a comprehensive system for combating oil pollution caused by ships and for taking the necessary action. But pollution is not only caused by ships, although they do cause oil pollution at sea: pollution also comes from the air, from natural sources, ashore and at sea, from rivers and canals, and the most important sources of oil pollution at sea are drilling platforms, and I should like to look at this aspect more closely.

I am very happy with Mrs Maij-Weggen's report, which emphasizes the need for a study to be made on this subject soon, because I feel that, once we have shipping under some kind of control, we may face major problems over pollution caused by drilling platforms, particularly in the North Sea, one of the most dangerous and roughest seas in the world, as we saw with the *Bravo*. Inconceivable disasters may occur if nothing is done about this, and I therefore believe that Mrs Maij-Weggen's request that the Commission should produce a study on this aspect within the next 12 months must be taken very seriously and that a great deal of work needs to be done. I also attach considerable importance to Mrs Maij-Weggen's suggestion that a coordinating body for environmental problems and also for other problems occurring in the North Sea should be set up. I have already tabled a resolution, and I hope that this will shortly result in a report that is as exemplary as those produced by Mrs Maij-Weggen and Mrs Spaak.

I must say that as things are now developing in the North Sea, the incredible pollution now taking place, resulting in the death of many birds — more than 200 000 — of many species such as razor-bills, guillemots, kittiwakes, puffins, and petrels, some of which the biologists fear are doomed to extinction. This is not the first time that this has happened. In 1844 the last two giant auks were killed by seamen on an island off the coast of Iceland. Since then these creatures have never been seen again. Seamen are now guilty of the crime of discharging oil into the sea. There is a considerable chance that a number of sea-birds will die out. Quite a few of us will say, oh well, what difference does it make, we have never seen them. But anyone who has ever seen a puffin and the beautiful colours of its beak, the guillemot, the razor-bill in its dinner-jacket and morning-coat, anyone who has ever seen a kittiwake swooping over the sea with wing tips as if dipped in ink, will know what we will be missing if these creatures die out. It is a crime, not only from an aesthetic or ethical point of view, but also as a sign: if these birds die out — as Mrs Weber has already said — other links in the food-chain will also die out, and man will suffer too.

What is happening as a result of oil pollution, the tens of thousands of unfortunate birds washed ashore, should fill us with a deep sense of shame and should prompt the Community and the Commissioner to take action very quickly. Parliament has spoken, it has produced four excellent reports which say what has to be done. We have known for a long time — as Mr Josselin has said — what must be done, but Parliament is saying so once again. Parliament has spoken, it is now up to the Commission, and I expect it to produce the report requested by Mrs Maij-Weggen, and I expect the Council to take the action before 1 July 1981 that it said in December it was in favour of taking. Otherwise I can assure you more and more species of birds will become extinct. Is there anyone here who wants that on his conscience, to go down in history as someone who allowed these species of birds to die out by sitting idly by and doing nothing about oil pollution? Our generation must realize that this is one of the most disgraceful things that is happening in the world at this time. There is no need for it: with a little more good will, with a little more money and a little more willingness on the part of the Council, which — as Mr Johnson has said — refuses, for example, to set aside money for a European environmental fund, with a little more of this kind of good will, dreadful things like this would not happen. Parliament has spoken, it is now up to the Commission and the Council.

President. — I call Mr Percheron.

Mr Percheron. — (*F*) Mr President, at the end of this long debate it is obvious that the objective of a true maritime safety policy can be achieved only if the Member States show real willingness to implement the Commission's recommendations and also those contained in the reports we are discussing. This means that the Member States, all the Member States must harmonize their policies, firstly by ratifying all the conventions of the IMCO and ILO type and then by jointly setting up a procedure for checking ships in all Community ports.

I should like to discuss this last point briefly. I absolutely share the rapporteur's concern about the dangers of the proposed procedure not being strictly applied in all ports. If that happens, traffic will inevitably be rerouted and ports of convenience are bound to emerge. In view of the rules governing the world maritime market at present, it seems that there can be no guarantee that these procedures would in fact be applied in Community ports. Why not? For three reasons. Firstly, because the legal system differs from one European port to another. Thus, along the coast between Hamburg and Le Havre, we have large French ports like Dunkirk which are subject to the rules of the autonomous port authorities, while the major Belgian and Dutch ports have a legal structure which allows some of their infrastructure to be

Percheron

privately owned, which makes State control more difficult. Then, because the port authorities, by no means the only people involved in maritime transport, are rarely the true decision-makers. Finally, because the shipowners are increasingly involved in the development of ports and their cooperation will therefore be required if the inspection measures are to be generally applied with the required effect.

To conclude, if the maritime safety objectives are to be achieved, it seems essential for the Commission to look more closely at the legal systems governing ports from the angle of harmonizing competition and for it to pave the way for the effective participation of all European shipowners in the general application of the safety standards. The first step might consist in a dialogue with the maritime conferences, in which the Europeans exercise considerable, even dominant influence. If the safety standards were automatically incorporated in the rules of the maritime conferences, the merchant fleets of the third countries would gradually be induced to accept our maritime safety requirements.

President. — I call Mr Franghos.

Mr Franghos. — (EL) Madam President, dear colleagues, you should know that no matter how much interest we Greeks show in our large merchant fleet we are just as interested in safeguarding the sea from pollution, since Greece is, more so than most countries, a coastal, seafaring and insular country which relies on tourism. The responsibility for the pollution of the Mediterranean surrounding Greece, which is one of the most polluted seas, does not lie exclusively with Greece but with other more developed industrialized countries. It is on this particular subject that I intend to speak in a speech which I shall keep very brief.

First, I should like to congratulate the distinguished rapporteurs for their excellent reports. Second, I should like to emphasize how important it is for the national parliaments, in cooperation with international organizations such as the Council of Europe, the UN, and the European Parliament, to give their express approval to international treaties which have already been drawn up and adopted. Third, I refer to the Greek shipowners' proposal for separate ballast tanks. Fourth, I propose that intentional, i.e. dishonest, pollution of beaches be made into a special crime and the person responsible should be tried by the country in which he is apprehended and be given extremely harsh penalties — in other words *Ubi te repereo ibi te judico*. I should point out here that in Greece the fines which are imposed in these situations are crippling. Fifth, so that this proposal of mine — which Parliament found so shocking — can be properly tested, tankers ought to sail around the British Isles and not in the middle of the Channel. This will also serve some practical purpose because, in view of the harshness of

the climate, it is clear that workmen will not agree to cooperate in cleaning up the oil spillages. Sixth, we should not allow this informative discussion to be disrupted by fraudulent and defamatory statements like those made in the uncorroborated film which we have already mentioned. We don't know who is behind the film and as it does not present any reply to the allegations made in it, it can hardly be considered an objective presentation of the facts — in my view the motto *Auditur et altera pars* should always be adhered to — and it is therefore distracting us from the point of our discussion.

Seventh, in reply to my colleague in the Communist Group and to Mr Segre, I have statistics here from the International Tanker Owners Pollution Federation Limited which show quite clearly that the Greek fleet comes about sixth, so to speak, in terms of the number of incidents causing pollution in which it was involved in 1979. With 36 incidents, Greece comes behind the USA (115), Liberia (157), Great Britain (66) and so on. These 39 incidents are relatively small in number when compared to these other large numbers of incidents. I have the statistics here for anyone who wants to see them. Finally, I should like to point out that the Greek fleet is no longer simply the concern of Greece, but something in which the whole Community has an interest.

President. — I call Mr Dalakouras.

Mr Dalakouras. — (EL) My colleague has said what I intended to say myself. The facts which my French colleague gave about the damage caused by the Greek fleet were inaccurate. Besides the ITOPFC, which for the last four years has placed Greece in either fifth or sixth position, I just want to quote two more sources. The most authoritative English and, in my opinion, international merchant shipping journal, *Lloyd's List*, says quite clearly in its issue of 5 January that the Greek fleet's losses have decreased from 2.3 % to 1.37 % and last, but not least, the Greek Ministry of Shipping provides figures which show roughly a one-third reduction in damages and losses in 1980 compared to 1978. Perhaps, colleagues, we may differ, and indeed we do differ in our estimates, but it is impossible for an open and frank discussion to take place when we disagree about the basic facts.

President. — I call Mr Peponis.

Mr Peponis. — (EL) Madam President, colleagues, Greek Members of the Socialist Group, we are particularly sensitive to the dangers of sea pollution. Our concern in this matter is not for the problems facing Greek shipowners, but for the dangers facing our sea and its shores which are the essential ingredients of Greece's landscape. This is our main concern and I ought to say, at this point, that Greece is not full of

Peponis

people like those presented in the film referred to earlier, who can think of nothing else apart from accusing shipowners. The Greeks are more concerned with keeping their sea safe and unpolluted. The Mediterranean is not being polluted by the ships of any particular nation or, if you like, by the ships belonging to operators of any particular nation. The open navigation areas of the sea are at risk from ships which belong to various operators and which sail under all kinds of flags. Consequently, the problem is literally international and not simply a matter of what measures should be taken against ships which sail under the flags of Member States. Since there has been a lot of discussion about flags of convenience, I would like to say that we are against their use. We believe that the Genuine Link principle should be implemented but, at this point, it is worth noting that those ships which fly flags of convenience because they provide certain financial benefits for their owners are in fact under the control of the USA. In my opinion, the European Parliament ought to face up to the fact that if an international agreement is to have any meaning at all then there must be some assurance that it will be implemented on a wide scale. Provisions already exist for dealing with this matter, but the question has not been asked why these provisions are not observed. With the exception perhaps of my colleague, Mr Josselin, nobody has made any reference to the fact that what we are clearly dealing with here is the financial interests of shipowners who, for the sake of profit, are poisoning the seas and ultimately poisoning themselves and the rest of us in the process. For, if the seas are poisoned by pollution, men will be the victims in the long run. International agreements are useful, but perhaps we ought to consider whether a more effective way of confronting the question might be for coastal States to extend their area of jurisdiction. In other words, perhaps if territorial waters and sea zones of vital interest were extended, countries would have greater jurisdiction and power to intervene in order to protect the sea. I think that this is an aspect which ought to be explored. Madam President, I shall not take up much more of the time of my colleagues who have listened to me so far. However, I should like once again to repeat that the problem, as we see it, is not mainly a technical one, it is not a question of whether services do or do not carry out their duties in placing proper controls on vessels when they enter harbour, cross territorial waters or sail in the open sea. The problem is essentially one of opposing interests, and one of the ways to deal with it is to inform and mobilize the masses against those interests which give priority to profit to the detriment of the health and survival of mankind.

President. — I call Mr Contogeorgis.

Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission. — (EL) Madam President, fellow MPs, I shall confine my speech to the subject of navigational safety and

connected matters to do with sea and coastal pollution. In other words, mainly matters which are dealt with in Mr Carossino's report. My colleague, Mr Narges, will deal with the broader aspects of the pollution question.

The Commission offers its thanks to Mr Carossino and the European Parliament's Committee on Transport for the explicit report which it prepared and for its draft opinion on the Commission's proposal for a Council directive on the stricter application by Member States which offer port facilities of international specifications on navigational safety and on pollution to all vessels which use Community ports regardless of which flag they sail under. It is quite clear, as Mr Klinkenborg said, that one of the best measures which the Community could take in this important area of navigational security and pollution is to ensure that the world's fleet implements and adheres to the regulations drawn up by organizations like IMCO dealing with the construction and fitting out of vessels and measures for reducing the sea pollution caused by tankers and other vessels. The Community can play an important role in this area in three ways in particular: in the implementation of international treaties on these matters by ensuring that Member States adopt them quickly. The Council has already made several recommendations to this effect, and I am sure that these recommendations are one of the reasons why the Member States generally make a great effort to ratify the more important treaties. As a result of this, one important agreement came into operation in 1980 and two others will be implemented this year.

At this point, I should like to address myself above all to the Greek MPs who spoke on the subject of a commitment to separate ballast tanks. This plan was dealt with in the 1978 Protocol of the Marpol Treaty. So far, two member countries of the Community have ratified the treaty and it is hoped that in the near future the other members will follow the recommendations of the Commission and Council of Ministers, and ratify it. The Community can also assist in bringing these agreements into force and the Member States can assist in ensuring that the regulations and specifications contained in the agreements are effectively implemented by vessels.

Each Member State is responsible for ensuring that all ships which sail under its flag implement these regulations. But, in addition, countries which offer port facilities can ensure that all ships which use their harbours, regardless of what flag they are sailing under, adhere to these specifications. The Commission's proposal refers to this area of action which Member States can take. Madam President, the proposed directive requires that Member States impound any ship using their ports which do not adhere to the specifications and ensure that they are brought up to the required standards. To this end the Commission's proposal lays down procedures to be

Contogeorgis

followed by Member States. The Commission believes that the implementation of its proposed directive will lead to firmer, fuller and more even exercise of authority by countries in the Community which offer port facilities. This was one of the aims put forward in Paris last month when the shipping ministers of the seafaring countries of Europe met to discuss navigational safety and anti-pollution measures. The unofficial talks on the Commission's proposal which have taken place so far in the Council of Ministers indicate that all the Member States are strongly in favour of harmonizing and increasing the importance and effectiveness of the controls accorded to countries offering port facilities. Furthermore, it should not be very difficult to reach agreement on the appropriate procedures needed in this area. However, there is one difficulty to which I particularly want to call Parliament's attention. This is that certain Member States, although fully in support of the idea to increase and harmonize the power of countries which offer port facilities, have still not been persuaded that, if this plan is to be successful, the Council must officially draft Community legislation. Their main concern is that this could produce problems in the future as regards the respective roles to be played by the Member States and the Community within IMCO. However, the Commission, for its part, feels that it is unlikely that problems of this kind will develop, and I want to assure Mr Moorhouse in the European Progressive Democratic Group that the Commission is fully aware of the important and useful role which IMCO plays. The proposed measures referring to the implementation of agreements do not interfere with IMCO's regulatory procedures and responsibilities, as IMCO's main task is to draw up, rather than implement, standards. Madam President, the Commission's special proposal on the commitment to implement international safety standards covers most aspects of navigational safety. Many speakers have talked about other aspects of the problem. On behalf of the Commission, I should like to assure all the speakers that I have listened carefully to their proposals and I shall bear them in mind when, along with my responsible colleagues, we come to deal with the proposals on this subject in greater depth. The Commission thinks that the time has arrived for the Council to issue a directive. The Commission's efforts to get this directive issued will be rendered a good deal more effective if its proposal has the support of all the political groups in the European Parliament.

11. Memorial service for Mr Gundelach

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, a memorial service will be held for our late Commissioner and friend, Mr Gundelach, tomorrow at 12 noon in the Lutheran Church of St Pierre-le-Jeune, rue de la Nuée-Bleue. The Bureau wishes to announce it at this time but further details will be posted on the notice board.

12. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received the following motions for resolutions with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- by Mr Glinne (S), Mr Klepsch (EPP-CD), Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED), Mr Fanti (COM), Mr Bange-mann (L) and Mr de la Malène (EPD), on membership of committees (Doc. 1-788/80)
- by Mr Ferri and others on the arbitrary alterations of the school week at the European School in Luxembourg (Doc. 1-794/80)
- by Mrs van den Heuvel and others on the conscientious objector Christos Nounis (Doc. 1-796/80).

The reasons supporting these requests for urgency are contained in the documents themselves.

These requests for urgency will be put to the vote at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

13. Agenda

President. — The Committee on Agriculture met yesterday evening and the day before to consider the Council's request, made at the December part-session, for urgent procedure which may be dealt with as Items 315, 280, 261, 316 and 317 on Thursday's agenda. The Committee on Agriculture, however, could only approve the Delatte Report on isoglucose so that the Gautier, Nielsen and Bocklet Reports will have to be deleted from the agenda and held over until a later date. The other items which could not be dealt with today will be placed on Thursday's agenda.

14. Agenda for next sitting

President. — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Wednesday, 14 January 1981 with the following agenda:

9 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. to 7 p.m.:

- Decision on urgency of various motions for resolutions
- Council statement on the programme of the Dutch presidency
- Spinelli Report on the Community's own resources
- Balfour Report on budgetary questions
- Van den Heuvel Report on human rights in Uruguay

5.30 p.m. to 7 p.m.: Question Time

Question to the Council and the Foreign Ministers

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 7.15 p.m.)

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 14 JANUARY 1981

Contents

1. Approval of minutes	105	<i>Mr Van der Mei (Council); Mr Paisley; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Maffre-Baugé; Mr Van der Mei</i>	155
2. Documents received	105	<i>Question No 54, by Mr Remilly: Aid to the wood processing and construction industries:</i>	
3. Decision on urgency:		<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Remilly; Mr Van der Mei; Mrs Ewing; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Hutton; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Adam; Mr Van der Mei</i>	156
<i>Ms Clwyd; Mr Bangemann; Mr Spencer; Mr Peters; Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti; Mr Ferri; Mr Hahn; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mrs Van den Hewel</i>	105	<i>Question No 57, by Mr Howell: Community cooperation in pollution control of the North Sea:</i>	
4. Council statement on the programme of the Dutch presidency:		<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Howell; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Seeler; Mr Van der Mei; Mr De Goede; Mr Van der Mei</i>	157
<i>Mr Van der Klaauw (Council)</i>	108	<i>Question No 58, by Mr Clément: Outline programme for the improvement of agricultural structures:</i>	
<i>Point of order: Mrs Kellett-Bowman</i>	113	<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Clément; Mr Van der Mei; Mrs Ewing; Mr Van der Mei</i>	158
<i>Mr Van der Klaauw; Mrs Van den Hewel (S); Mr Penders (EPP); Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED); Mr Galluzzi; Mr Berkhouwer (L); Mr Israël (EPD); Mr Bøgh; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mr Jaquet; Mr Travaglini; Mr Martin; Mrs Castellina; Mr Romualdi; Mrs Walz; Mr Paisley; Mr De Goede; Mr Van der Klaauw</i>	114	<i>Question No 59, by Mrs Fourcade: Terms of oil agreements concluded between individual governments:</i>	
5. Urgent debate	134	<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mrs Fourcade; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Galland; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Seligman; Mr Van der Mei</i>	158
6. Council statement on the programme of the Dutch presidency (continuation):		<i>Point of order: Mr Galland</i>	159
<i>Mr Nyborg</i>	135	<i>Question No 60, by Mr Vié: Negotiations with the Comecon countries:</i>	
7. Community's own resources — Report by Mr Spinelli (Committee on Budgets) — (Doc. 1-772/80):		<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Vié; Mr Van der Mei</i>	159
<i>Mr Spinelli, rapporteur</i>	135	<i>Question No 61, by Mr de Lipkowski: Timetable for increases in agricultural prices:</i>	
<i>Mr Arndt (S); Mr Barbi (EPP); Mr J. M. Taylor (ED); Mr Baillot; Mr Nord (L); Mr Vié (EPD); Mr Bonde; Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr Notenboom; Mr R. Jackson; Mr Leonardi; Mr Visentini; Mr Tuckmann; Mrs Boserup; Mr Møller; Mr Spinelli</i>	136	<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Fanton; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Howell; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Martin; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Delatte; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Vié; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Cousté</i>	159
<i>Point of order: Mr Balfour</i>	155	<i>Question No 62, by Mr Cousté: Urgent need for measures in the field of temporary employment abroad:</i>	
8. Question Time (Doc. 1-778/80) — (continuation)		<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Cousté; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Schmid; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Doublet; Mr Van der Mei</i>	161
• Questions to the Council of the European Communities:			
<i>Question No 53, by Mr Davern: Beef market:</i>			

<i>Question No 63, by Mrs Ewing: The return of the Elgin Marbles to Greece:</i>	
<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mrs Ewing; Mr Van der Mei; Miss Roberts; Mr Van der Mei</i>	161
<i>Question No 64, by Mr Seal: Textile labelling:</i>	
<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Seal; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Paisley; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Fanton; Mr Van der Mei</i>	162
<i>Question No 65, by Mr Hutton: Monthly Council report to Parliament:</i>	
<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Hutton; Mr Van der Mei; Lord Harmar-Nicholls; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Hord; Mr Van der Mei</i>	163
• <i>Questions to the Foreign Ministers:</i>	
<i>Question No 78, by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli: The EEC and Turkey:</i>	
<i>Mr Van der Klaauw (Foreign Ministers); Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli; Mr Van der Klaauw;</i>	
<i>Mr Israël; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Schinzel; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Schmid; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Papaefstration; Mr Van der Klaauw</i>	164
<i>Question No 79, by Mrs Lizin: Thorn initiative on the Middle East and Question No 86, by Mr Israël: The value of pursuing Community initiatives on the Middle East:</i>	
<i>Mr Van der Klaauw; Mrs Lizin; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Galland; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Provan; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Purvis; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Israël; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Moreland; Mr Van der Klaauw</i>	166
9. <i>Urgent debate</i>	168
10. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i>	168
<i>Annex</i>	169

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

(The sitting was opened at 9.00 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Since there are no comments, the minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Documents received*

President. — I have received a number of documents, details of which will be found in the minutes of proceedings of today's sitting.

3. *Decision on urgency*

President. — The next item is the decision on the urgency of a number of motions for resolutions.

We shall begin with the *motion for a resolution by Ms Clwyd and others (Doc. 1-771/80): Steel industry.*

I call Ms Clwyd.

Ms Clwyd. — Madam President, I make no apology for returning to this subject again while there continue to be 7 million people unemployed in the Community, and it is right that unemployment should be on every agenda of this Parliament. Of those 7 million unemployed, almost 3 million are in the United Kingdom.

We have over the last year talked again and again in this Parliament about social policy. In December, the Council quite callously turned down the proposals of this Parliament and the Commission for social measures to alleviate the problem of unemployment in the steel industry; so it is particularly pertinent that we should discuss this problem in this Parliament this month.

As everybody in this Parliament and the Commission agrees, one of the worst-hit regions in the whole of the European Community as far as job-losses in the steel industry are concerned is Wales, where the percentage of unemployed is now 12.5% — next to Northern Ireland, the highest unemployment figure in the United Kingdom. Politicians of all parties are now agreed that unless something is done quickly in Wales, then social unrest is going to develop there.

We have talked again and again about social policy. Social policy does not exist so far as keeping men in jobs is concerned: it only exists when jobs are lost. If the citizens of this Community are to believe that what

Clwyd

this Parliament says is more than rhetoric, that it is serious when it says that social policy must go hand in hand with economic policy and when we talk about restructuring our older industries, then the Members of this Parliament must today support the urgency of this resolution, since a further 5 000 jobs are to be lost in Wales before the end of this month.

President. — I call Mr Bangemann to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Madam President, my group knows full well why Ms Clwyd is again trying so hard to get urgent procedure for this motion. With your permission, Madam President, may I draw the lady's attention to the fact that in recent months we have had — if my calculations are correct — three large-scale debates on the situation in the steel industry. In my view, those concerned would be better served if we now implemented the decisions we took on those occasions instead of using urgent procedure to raise yet again a problem which we have already debated thoroughly enough. We have done our duty. Perhaps it would be a good thing if those concerned, particularly the British trade unions, were to spend as much time as you have just wasted here thinking about the real reasons for the unemployment in the Welsh steel industry.

If they did, they would realize that the country's trade union policy is responsible for a great deal of what has gone wrong there. Perhaps you should think about that for a few moments instead of keeping on wasting Parliament's time.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Spencer to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Spencer. — I have not much to add to what the previous speaker said. I wish to address myself to urgency and not dwell on the phrase 'social unrest' which Ann Clwyd mentioned and which I think is becoming one of the most irresponsible political phrases that we have encountered in Europe for some time.

(Hear, hear!)

We are being asked today to vote urgency for a motion which is dated 19 December which deals not just with one country but with one region of one country, which addresses itself not to another institution of the Community but to a single corporation in a single country — a motion on Wales and its steel industry. No-one can say in this Parliament that we do not have Wales or its steel industry at the front of our minds. The leader of the Liberal and Democratic

Group mentioned the number of times we have debated steel in the last six months. We have also debated an urgency motion on Wales and steel which was incorporated in Mr Peters' report. We had a hearing on the UK steel industry. We have put on record time and time again our pressure on the Council. What we can do we have done and we will go on doing it. You cannot argue that Wales is ignored in this Chamber when you have four able and vocal Members, a doubly vocal Vice-President of this Parliament, and now to cap it all a Welsh Social Affairs Commissioner. Neither Wales nor steel is forgotten.

But now you ask us yet again to have another urgency debate. Will it produce one iota of new information? Will it save one job in Wales? The answer has to be no. If you can put down an urgency motion that suggests new ways of bringing jobs to the steel workers who are being displaced in South Wales I will support you. If you can put down an urgency motion that will point one way of prodding the Council towards pushing forward the social measures, I will support you. But I for one, and my Group, cannot support urgency on this motion which is provocative, unwise and above all rather cheap. I beg the House to oppose urgency.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Peters to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Peters. — (D) Madam President, so far Mr Bangemann has not spoken even for one minute in this House about closures and the radical elimination of jobs in the Welsh steel industry, and he was even applauded for it.

I second this request for urgent procedure. Admittedly, this House has thoroughly debated the overall situation in the steel industry and has stated what needs to be done in the European steel industry in the immediate term, e.g. it must be modernized and restructured to make it competitive, but not in the way it is being done in England and particularly in Wales, where in some towns steelworks are being shut down completely. The purpose of this motion for a resolution is to protest against this kind of restructuring through closure, which is being carried out at the expense of the employees alone. This is the central point, and it does not conflict with what we have said in earlier debates.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti. — (I) Madam President, I have carefully read the resolution, in which it is stated that there will be redundancies by the end of January. I think it is important for this matter to be dealt with in more detail in committee before the end of the month — there will be two committee meetings, one next week and the other in a fortnight. I have asked Ms Clwyd to agree to this, since urgent debates held on Fridays are never very exhaustive. If there is anything that needs to be gone into in greater detail, it should be referred to the committee responsible. I shall therefore vote against the request for urgent procedure.

(Parliament rejected urgent procedure)

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by the six political groups (Doc. 1-788/80): Membership of committees.*

(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)

This item will be placed at the beginning of tomorrow's agenda.

I propose that Parliament set the time limit for submitting candidatures at noon on Thursday, 15 January 1981.

President. — Mr de la Malène has informed me of the withdrawal of the *motion for a resolution tabled on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats on the crisis in the motor vehicle industry (Doc. 1-790/80).*

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Ferri and others (Doc. 1-794/80): Alteration of the school week at the European School in Luxembourg.*

I call Mr Ferri.

Mr Ferri. — (I) Madam President, I should like very briefly to outline the reasons supporting urgent procedure, which are also clearly set out in the motion for a resolution.

The Members of this House are aware of the origin and nature of the European Schools as an institution. In view of an arbitrary decision by the Board of Governors, ignoring the opinion expressed by the majority of the parents and the pupils themselves, to alter the length and organization of the school timetable, Parliament should without delay check on the way in which this institution, 70 % of the cost of which is borne by the Community budget, is being run.

So that this check may be carried out in time to enable the necessary measures to be taken before the new school year, we are asking for this motion for a resolution to be dealt with by urgent procedure. I therefore trust that Parliament will agree to this request.

President. — I call Mr Hahn.

Mr Hahn. — (D) I should like to oppose the request for urgent procedure, although I understand and even approve the point of view of the parents and pupils. But the new school year does not start until September, and it is completely impossible for this House to deal with a dispute between a single school's parents and pupils on the one hand and the teachers on the other. It could not possibly acquaint itself sufficiently with the facts of the case, which ought to be dealt with in committee. Since we are due to meet in Luxembourg next month, the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport will certainly be able to visit the school in question and try to solve the problem. I do not feel that it is Parliament's job to deal with questions of this kind.

(Applause)

(Parliament rejected urgent procedure)

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mrs Van den Heuvel and others (Doc. 1-796/80): Conscientious objector Christos Nounis.*

I call Sir James Scott-Hopkins on a point of order.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, would it be possible to postpone the vote on the next request for urgency from Mrs van den Heuvel until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock? I only got it this morning, and quite frankly I have not had time to discuss it or to find out anything about this particular motion. I am not saying anything about whether it is right or wrong, I simply have not had time to examine it, and neither has my group. I should like therefore to ask for a postponement until voting time at ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

President. — I call Mrs Van den Heuvel.

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — (NL) Madam President, Mr Scott-Hopkins' request seems reasonable to me, and I think it is a good idea for us to deal with these important matters tomorrow without rushing.

President. — We shall therefore vote on the urgency of this motion for a resolution at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

4. Council statement on the programme of the Dutch presidency

President. — The next item is the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council on the programme of the Dutch presidency.

I call Mr Van der Klaauw, President-in-Office of the Council, whom I am pleased to welcome to the House.

Mr Van der Klaauw, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) Madam President, my first appearance in this Parliament is overshadowed by the mourning for the death of Finn Olav Gundelach. When he heard the sad news yesterday morning, we could hardly believe that a man of 55, in the prime of life, should be fated to leave us so suddenly. Officials, colleagues and friends, and particularly his family, must have been shocked at the news, and on behalf of the Council I should like to offer the feelings of sympathy which are only too appropriate at this sad bereavement. When I spoke of our 'mourning' I had in mind the fact that the European Communities had suffered a major and disrupting loss with the sudden death of this Member of the Commission. All genuine Europeans had placed their justified hopes and trust in Mr Gundelach's ability and experience for the difficult tasks which will soon be facing the Community. Although still relatively young, our colleague had already had a varied career with heavy responsibilities at national and international level, and the Community can count itself lucky that it was able to benefit from this experience for so many years — although, tragically, not for long enough. He had been entrusted with the sphere of responsibility which constitutes the cornerstone of the Community, and had only recently been called upon to continue this task at a time when the Community will be facing critical moments. Only a man with his integrity, experience and ability could be entrusted with such a heavy responsibility, and it is sad to think that the energy and perseverance which were so much his characteristics were not sufficient to bear the burden of his workload. In these solemn precincts I should like to pay tribute to this son of Denmark who highlighted with such dignity the important role his country and the Commission as an institution had to play in the construction of Europe.

As a result of the rota system peculiar to the Institution which I represent, I am appearing before you for the first time in my capacity as President of the Council. In doing so I am taking over the duties which my immediate predecessor, Miss Flesch, and before her, Mr Thorn, performed in such an excellent and exemplary fashion. Their activities, their drive and their

grasp of affairs will be an example and source of inspiration for me in the performance of these duties.

The Council of Ministers, which is to meet for the first time under the Dutch presidency next week differs in one fundamental aspect from previous Council meetings; the tenth member of the European Communities, Greece, will henceforth be represented as a fully-fledged partner in the construction of a strong and united Europe. I would like here to welcome this new Member State with which the Community has for a long time maintained special links but which will now be fully sharing the rights and obligations of Community membership. These words of welcome are also intended for the Greek members of Parliament who are taking part in your proceedings for the first time. Greece, with its precious traditions, its great present-day achievements and its rich promise for the future will be an asset to the Community, and it is a pleasure for me that the accession of this country is taking place under the auspices of the Dutch presidency.

There is still another aspect in which the Community has undergone a change — I am of course referring to the European Commission now appearing in its new composition. Suffice it to say that it is my wish that the Council will cooperate as closely and constructively as possible with this new Commission where, with many known faces, there are also a number of newcomers. I for one do not doubt that this is also the feeling of the Commission, and I will make every effort to make such close and fruitful collaboration possible.

The Community is entering the decade of the eighties in renewed form. The burden of the problems it brings with it is, however, identical in many aspects to that we have borne in the recent past. Many of these problems are structural or such that only slow and progressive solutions to them may be expected. I am only too aware of the fact that against this background a presidency of a mere six months can only be of relative significance and that much, if not everything, depends on the continual efforts undertaken by successive presidencies if progress is to be achieved in resolving existing problems and if the Community is to make headway. I would therefore ask you to see the Dutch presidency in this context of continuity, although this should not dilute the responsibility which I feel for specific acts of management and direction which my country's presidency will be called upon to perform in the next few months.

Undoubtedly, the present general political and economic climate is relatively unfavourable and in some respects downright bad. On the international political scene, we witness the existence of armed conflicts or serious tension in areas which are of the greatest importance for Europe. There are developments close to our borders which we are following with bated breath, glad at the hope they offer and worried at the serious risks they present. The promise of the milder climate of *détente* has only partially been

Van der Klaauw

fulfilled and has been crushed to some extent by the Soviet Union's behaviour, particularly in Afghanistan.

The sources of instability in the world seem to be multiplying at a rate which stretches to breaking point the capacities of the international community for collective control. The European Community is feeling the direct or indirect repercussions of a number of these developments and there is no reason to assume that this situation will change or become less serious in the near future. The Ten's political cooperation is thus faced in the most direct manner with this state of affairs.

The economic climate is, if anything, even less favourable. Prospects of economic growth, world trade, employment and price stability can plainly be termed bad. We would be well-advised to prepare ourselves for a period — whose duration must remain indefinite for the time being — of bleak economic prospects and a low level of expectations. The process of adjustment of the Member States' economic structures will remain difficult and slow. Absorbing the sharp rises in energy prices will continue to demand great sacrifices. The employment situation will, I fear, be affected even more than is already the case. The need to combat inflation and to control the volume of governmental deficits will require difficult adjustments, although this may apply more to one Member State than to another. The Communities will, beyond any question, also feel the repercussions of these developments.

I am not describing this picture in such sombre tones to discourage either you or myself. The conclusion I would draw from it is that it is all the more necessary that the European Communities should be kept intact and where possible developed and that it is essential for all of us that the potential which exists within the Communities for establishing common policies and coordinated action should be employed to the fullest. Both from the point of view of international stability and to bring about the recovery of the world economy, it is absolutely essential that the European Community should act energetically, effectively and responsibly; that it should maintain its past achievements particularly its free market and the common agricultural policy; that it should resolve its internal problems as quickly as possible in full observance of established commitments; and that it should continue to honour the international responsibilities it has assumed and draw on its not inconsiderable resources to contribute towards solving world problems.

The first field is that of adjustments to the common agricultural policy and the promotion of a better balance in Community expenditure, a complex dossier, also known as restructuring. The second field is the fight against the economic crisis, the search for a coordinated economic policy, and contributions to the fight against inflation and job preservation.

The third field covers international economic relations in both a bilateral and multilateral context, including the general question of North-South relations.

The fourth field covers the institutions. Allow me to clarify our position on each of these chapters.

The main internal dossier which will occupy the Community in 1981 and possibly also thereafter is that of the review of, and adjustments to, the Common Agricultural Policy. Connected to this are the complex questions of a better distribution of the Community's expenditure over various activities, the balance of advantages and disadvantages between the Member States and the limitation of own resources. I do not think I am exaggerating when I state that the continuation of the Community as an effective and successful organization depends on the success of this undertaking.

During the Dutch presidency, a start will have to be made on the examination of this dossier and on working out ideas. There will be ample occasions to do so, such as the fixing of agricultural prices for the next marketing year, the preparation of the 1982 draft budget and the annual priorities debate. In my capacity as President, I shall make every effort to lead the beginning of this idea-forming process along adequate and constructive paths so that on this basis decisions can be taken as quickly as possible.

In tackling this dossier, the Council will base its deliberations on its Decision of 30 May from which I would like in particular to draw your attention to the statement that neither the basic principles of the Common Agricultural Policy nor the common financial responsibility should be called into question. In my view, this basic point is essential, because it is not a matter of dismantling what has been achieved but of adapting to new circumstances and of making room for a new dynamism in the Community.

Given the major interests which are at stake, the leeway allowed for decision-making will be narrow, and more than in any other field the Council will have to derive wisdom and inspiration from the proposals which the European Commission will be submitting before the end of June. If a total deadlock in the agricultural policy is to be avoided, which would result in the suffocation of the other Community policies, we are condemned to succeed, and I do not doubt that we shall find the necessary solutions.

Your institution will also be called upon to play an important role in the formulation of ideas which, as I have said before, is soon to be given a start if this is not already the case, in particular as regards the fixing of agricultural prices. Your Opinions will be of more than usual importance as I am aware of the great faith you place in the agricultural policy as a pillar of the Community and of your sincere belief in the attainment of a better balance between agricultural expenses

Van der Klaauw

and other expenses. I can assure you that the Council will give proper consideration to the Opinion of the European Parliament as regards these crucial problems. Clear statements from the European Parliament would be of extremely great help in the search for solutions.

The second field which will undoubtedly require extra attention is the alarming economic and social situation in the Community. In view of the Member States' 8 million unemployed, stagnating economies and excessively high inflation rates — partially inherited from our dependence on energy — it would be inconceivable if the European Community did not make every possible effort to turn the tide. Possible forms of action cover a wide field ranging from coordinated economic policies to monetary stabilization, regional development and measures in the social sector.

I consider it a priority task for the Netherlands presidency that it should stimulate and coordinate Community activities in these fields as much as possible in order to derive optimal results from the powers which the Community possesses. As is known, these powers are limited. But all possibilities must be exploited within these limits.

It is also in this light that I want to see the European Council's decision to pay special attention, within the context of a coordinated economic policy, to social problems and in particular to unemployment. In this connection, it has been decided to convene a special Council meeting at which ministers for the economy, for finance and for social affairs will jointly examine these thorny problems. It is clear that the composition of this Council is not the most important aspect, but rather the preparations made for it and the decisions which may result. Excessive expectations in this connection are obviously out of place; but this also applies to the feelings of despondency and a lack of initiative. The European Council has meanwhile been instructed to carry out the preparatory work. As soon as this work has been completed the Council will meet in the broad composition I have referred to. In this connection, I would like to express the hope that the European Parliament will also pay the necessary attention to the socio-economic situation in the Community. Your reports and resolutions can play an important and catalysing role in this entire decision-making process.

The symptoms of economic decline are of course felt not only in the Community but also outside, and indeed are intimately bound up with worldwide phenomena and changes. This brings me to the third priority area, i.e. international economic relations.

Here I would first draw to your attention the need for the Community to hold close and constructive discussions with the other great industrial powers in the world, namely the United States and Japan. Coordinated action, in the OECD *inter alia*, is of the utmost

importance in this context, as is a positive solution to trade policy questions. I say 'positive' because a return to protectionist practices must be avoided at all costs. The Community's dialogue with Japan — with which an unacceptably large trade deficit has gradually developed — is likely to be an important theme of Council discussions, and it is important that the Community position be characterized by tact, perseverance and clarity. Close cooperation between the Council and the Commission is indispensable. The Community's relations with the United States, and the trade policy aspects thereof, must in my opinion be seen against the background of the Atlantic alliance: I shall have more to say about this when I come to the subject of political cooperation between the ten Member States. The developing countries are particularly hard hit by the economic decline combined with increased energy prices. The weaker of them are at the edge of the abyss. In this area the Community must bear its share of responsibility and is already doing so — witness the renewed Lomé Convention, the generalized preferences scheme, our links with ASEAN and the, as yet modest, financial aid to non-associated countries.

But more must be done, and by virtue of its economic importance, its central position in world trade and its level of prosperity the Community will repeatedly be called upon to play an important and sometimes even decisive role. Here I am referring also to the broader framework of the North-South Dialogue and the global negotiations which we hope and trust will shortly commence in New York. I consider it one of the main tasks of the Presidency to see to it that the Community is ready in good time with its positions and that it can act in a flexible, resourceful and conciliatory manner, in a spirit of frankness and full awareness of its responsibilities.

This brings me to the fourth area which I consider a priority for the Netherlands presidency — one which is, or ought to be, a priority for every Presidency and every institution — namely concern for the right institutional relations within the Community and more specifically for proper and constructive cooperation between the Council and the other institutions. Here I have in mind cooperation with the European Parliament in particular.

Relations between Council and Parliament are most fully developed in the field of establishment of the budget. I consider the division of powers which has come about in this field as an important Community achievement which must be scrupulously respected and implemented with mutual understanding. Although the bulk of the budget procedure will take place *after* the Netherlands presidency, the Council will have to give close attention to budget problems during that period, and will have to do so under difficult financial circumstances. The necessity which each Member State experiences of making the most efficient and economical use of the limited funds available

Van der Klaauw

must also influence the Council — and hence, I believe, the entire budget authority.

Madam President, as far as the dispute which has just arisen over the supplementary budget for 1980 is concerned, I can only say at this stage that I hope it can be resolved as soon as possible. As things stand at present, I do not think there is much the President of the Council can do, but as soon as it appears that the presidency can contribute towards finding a solution, I can assure you that I shall do my utmost to achieve this.

Let me return now to relations between the institutions. Less developed, but no less important, is the conciliation procedure on legislation. This is an essential instrument which I, as President of the Council hope to put to the best possible use. It is, however, also an instrument which has not fully lived up to expectations. For that reason the European Council, on the basis of the report by the Three Wise Men, asked the presidency to come to a clearer understanding with the European Parliament on the implementation of the conciliation procedure. I shall shortly be meeting you, Madam President, to discuss how we can succeed in doing this as rapidly as possible.

Next there is the question of the attention paid by the Council to the Opinions delivered by the European Parliament. I can assure you that the Netherlands presidency will do all in its power to arrange the proceedings of the Council and its subsidiary bodies in such a way that Parliament's Opinions are given all due consideration in the decision-making process. I intend regularly to see to it personally that the most important of your opinions are brought to the Council's attention. Allow me, however, to point out that if the Council's various subsidiary bodies and the Council itself are to be able to give your Opinions adequate study it is essential that they are submitted promptly. Only then can they exert their full weight.

I should not like to end these institutional remarks without mentioning the question of the seat of the Community institutions. As you are aware this question, which 15 years ago was settled on a provisional basis, was recently raised again by one of the Member States. In a Resolution of 20 November you expressed your concern on this subject and asked the Governments to take a decision by 15 June 1981. It is quite honestly impossible, for me to tell you whether this is feasible. Suffice it to say that I am fully aware of the vital importance of this matter for Parliament and for its ability to function in a strong and efficient manner.

(Applause)

Madam President, my speech is a long one, and I do not wish to try the patience of the honourable Members. I assume that the text has been distributed and that the following comments which I wanted to make on other internal tasks have already been read

and can therefore safely be left out. Madam President, I should like to turn to the Communities' external objectives. In describing the internal tasks in store for the Communities in 1981, the additional responsibilities arising from their external relations also become evident. In my introduction, I stressed that international relations should be characterized by openness and awareness of responsibility. I should now like to add a few comments concerning certain relations in particular.

The Community is preparing to welcome Spain and Portugal as Member States in a few years' time. The phasing and organization of the accession negotiations demand wisdom and care on both sides. Where the presidency can consider expediting matters, it will do so. I am thinking here of chapters such as the customs union, freedom of movement, the ECSC, Euratom, external relations and fiscal questions. The actual negotiating phase can be begun with these aspects.

At the same time, and also in connection with the coming accessions, relations with the countries of the Mediterranean basin require special attention. Commercial policy matters and the financial paragraphs under the existing agreements will be the subject of intensive talks in 1981, during which the presidency will endeavour to achieve balance and harmony among all the interests involved.

I consider myself fortunate to have been able to assume my functions as President of the Council on the day on which the Second Lomé Convention entered into force. It is of great significance for Euro-African cooperation and solidarity, and particularly for stability in Southern Africa, that Zimbabwe has now been included in our circle of associates. In March of this year, I shall have the honour of participating in the Association Council as Co-President on the Community side. On this occasion also, it is my firm intent to make a contribution to the progressive development of our oldest association. Our partners' interest in an extension of the Sugar Protocol will play a prominent role on this occasion.

The development of relations with certain regions of the world and the gradual enlargement of the content of the relevant treaties and agreements cannot, however, detract from the overall worldwide responsibility borne by the Community in the North-South Dialogue, and particularly in the framework of the United Nations. Here I am referring in particular to the successful start and progress of what is known as the New Round of Global Negotiations. The current discussions in New York offer, I hope, the prospect of agreement on a balanced agenda and a rational distribution of responsibilities among the various bodies involved in the negotiations. The Presidency will do everything in its power to ensure that the Community plays a role marked by a reasonable approach which will guarantee that the negotiations are conducted and concluded in as balanced a manner and as successfully as possible.

Van der Klaauw

Madam President, I should again like to shorten my speech somewhat, this time on the political aspects, i.e. on the political cooperation between the Ten, since I assume that you and the honourable Members will already have read the text.

In particular, I should like to draw your attention to a number of points. As you know, the Netherlands presidency attaches great importance to good relations with your Parliament, and this is also true in the case of matters which do not, strictly speaking, come within the field of action of the European Communities. The nature of political cooperation, which is carried on on an intergovernmental basis, imposes inevitable restraints on this presidency, like all others, in its relations with your Parliament. But I can assure you that existing opportunities for a dialogue with the Parliament will be used to the full. I am convinced that a fruitful dialogue requires mutual understanding both of each other's wishes and each other's limitations. Only with patience and the necessary understanding will it be possible to strengthen existing bonds.

Madam President, the text of my speech talks at great length about political cooperation, so I shall keep it short and concentrate on the main points.

In the first place, there is the question of human rights. I have noted that Parliament devotes considerable attention to these, and I can assure you that the Netherlands presidency will do likewise. In my view, our countries bear a special responsibility in this respect since we are a community of democratic countries. For that very reason, the values which we ourselves profess to hold oblige us to make our stand for an ideal of human freedom in all parts of the world.

Another aspect of political cooperation which will deserve our full attention in the coming months is naturally the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. I think that the Nine — as we still were then — put the six weeks allotted to this discussion before Christmas to good use. In continuous close contact with each other and in a broader Western context, they brought up the many shortcomings in the implementation of all sections of the Final Act during that time. The efforts of the Member States of the Community were directed towards accomplishing this task as objectively as possible while avoiding unnecessary polemics. The session beginning on 27 January will be devoted to the section of the agenda relating to the extension and strengthening of security and cooperation in Europe. A number of substantive proposals have been introduced in this connection. The lessons drawn from the state of implementation of the provisions of the Final Act have played an important part in the drafting of these proposals, during which the Member States have endeavoured to adopt a balanced approach to the Final Act so as to avoid favouring one section at the expense of another.

When speaking of East-West relations it is, of course, not possible to ignore the situation in and around Poland, which so preoccupies us all.

In accordance with codes of conduct and principles such as those laid down and reaffirmed in the United Nations Charter and in the Helsinki Final Act, the signatories of these documents recognize the right of every country and every people to choose and develop its own political, social, economic and cultural system in complete freedom and without any outside interference. The governments of the Member States of the Community have very recently found it necessary to express their views on this matter in connection with Poland in a declaration published after the meeting of the European Council on 1 and 2 December 1980 in Luxembourg. On that occasion a decision in principle was taken, in response to a request to that effect from the Polish Government, that the Community as such should give Poland the opportunity to buy agricultural products in Community countries at favourable prices. It goes without saying that the governments of the Ten will follow further developments in Poland with undiminished attention.

Another subject which will continue to be discussed in political cooperation is, I am afraid, the situation in Afghanistan. The Soviet intervention there is a continuing source of concern.

I turn now to the Middle East. Under the Netherlands presidency the situation there will continue to receive the great attention which the importance of this question commands. When they met in Venice in June last year, the European Heads of State or Government, summarizing past positions, agreed that the time had come to promote the recognition and implementation of two principles universally accepted by the international community, namely the right to existence and security of all the States in the region, including Israel, and justice for all the peoples, which implies the recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

According to the Ten, this twofold requirement implies a number of logical consequences, including the right of all the countries in that part of the world to live in peace within secure, recognized and guaranteed borders; this applies not only to Israel, whose need for security, as the Ten see it, clearly goes beyond the strict military interpretation usually given to this concept and clearly reflects a deep-rooted wish to be accepted by the surrounding Arab countries, but also to the Arab countries in question and to the Palestinian population in the areas now occupied.

The aforementioned principles also imply that a just solution must finally be found to the Palestinian problem, which is not simply one of refugees. The Palestinian people, who are conscious of existing as a people, must be placed in a position, by an appropriate process defined in the framework of a comprehensive peace

Van der Klaauw

settlement, to exercise fully its right to self-determination. The Ten take the view that the principles which I have just outlined apply to all the parties concerned, and therefore to the Palestinian people and the PLO, which will have to be associated with the negotiations.

Madam President, the activities undertaken by the Nine in the Middle East in the second half of last year — Mr Thorn's mission and the study to which that mission led — have strengthened the Ten in their determination to contribute to the search for the longed-for comprehensive, just and lasting peace settlement in the Middle East. I am fully conscious of the responsibility which is to be mine in the coming months of the Netherlands presidency for giving direction and substance to the efforts of the Ten to contribute to a peace settlement in the Middle East. I know my task will not be easy, but I am confident that I will be assisted in it by the fact that all the parties concerned realize the sincerity of the feelings which guide the Ten in their search for peace.

Madam President, I shall not go into detail at this stage on the conflict between Iran and Iraq but simply refer you to the text. If the Ten are in a position to usefully help in achieving a solution — although I do not see any such opportunity at the moment — we would naturally be prepared to do so. I can assure you that we are continuing to take an active interest in moves to end the continuing inhuman detention of the American hostages in Iran. Let me turn now to the Euro-Arab Dialogue. In November of last year a meeting took place in Luxembourg which marked the resumption of cooperation between the countries of the European Community and those of the Arab League. This meeting was a success, and we may now expect that more substantive discussions between representatives of the Ten and the Arab League will begin in the foreseeable future.

It is intended that these discussions should cover the different areas of the Euro-Arab Dialogue: viz. political, economic, technical, financial, social and cultural matters.

At the abovementioned Luxembourg meeting the desirability was emphasized of holding a Euro-Arab conference at the level of Ministers of Foreign Affairs. On both the Arab and European sides it was agreed in Luxembourg that any such conference would have to be prepared with the utmost care and that it should be held before this summer.

As regards our relations with Turkey, these will naturally continue to be of great importance, and this will be emphasized within the framework of the existing agreements.

Cyprus will be another subject for discussion in our political cooperation, as well as our cooperation with the ASEAN countries and the countries of South

America — I am thinking of the countries of the Andean Pact, with which initial contacts have been established. All this will form a major part of the political cooperation in the months to come. An essential element in all considerations is our relations between Europe and the United States, with whose new administration I feel close contact must be kept.

Madam President, this brings me to the end of my survey of the presidency's activities, objectives and ambitions. I realize that it has been long and perhaps complicated, but this simply reflects the breadth of the field in which the European Communities and the political cooperation machinery are active.

One can say many things about the Community and about political cooperation, and it is not difficult to point to deficiencies and gaps in their operation, but one cannot say that they do not wrestle with the big, urgent questions of our time. In other words, they are highly relevant; relevant for the governments of the Member States and also for the citizens of the Member States.

In many respects, or so it seems to me, the success of the work which we are undertaking is of decisive importance in answering the question whether Europe can come through the present period of increased tension and more rapid change with success, and can maintain and use its influence.

If we are to ensure a future for a Europe of free peoples; of a society under the rule of law and of social justice; of firmly anchored human rights and carefully fostered cultural riches; of internal stability and economic power — a Europe which does not look only to its own interests, but is also aware of the contributions expected of it in world affairs — it is essential that the work of our Community institutions is successful.

It is a privilege for me, in my office as President of one of the institutions, to be able to contribute to this objective.

It is also a duty which I shall fulfil, not alone with devotion, but also with conviction. In this task, frequent and fruitful cooperation with your Parliament, Madam President, will be for me a source of great support and much pleasure.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman on a point of order.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — A point of order under Rule 30, Madam President. The President-in-Office in his most interesting and wide-ranging speech, for which we sincerely thank him, three times referred to his written text which he said Members had, and there-

Kellett-Bowman

fore parts of which he would omit. I am slightly puzzled here — we have not got this text. But if we had — presumably we shall shortly be getting it — would we be entitled to refer to those parts of his speech which are not in fact part of the record of this Parliament?

President. — I call Mr Van der Klaauw.

Mr Van der Klaauw, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) Madam President, I thought that the text was available in all the languages, but evidently it has not been distributed yet. I apologize to the House for this omission, which is probably the result of a technical hitch. The whole of my text will obviously be distributed; I merely shortened my speech somewhat so as not to try the Members' patience too much.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Van den Heuvel to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — (NL) Madam President, I have listened with great interest to the statement which Mr Van der Klaauw has just delivered as President-in-Office of the Council. I listened, indeed, in some anticipation because I had great hopes — I am sure you will understand why — that it would contain indications that the Dutch presidency would be one marked by initiative and a very specific approach to the major problems facing us.

In my view, initiative and specific ideas are vitally necessary to get the European Community out of the doldrums. Well, I must say that my great hopes have been dashed. Mr Van der Klaauw did deal with a wide range of subjects, and did not restrict himself to areas which might be regarded as less controversial, which has been rather the habit in Europe lately. I salute him for that. But while the range was wide, the specific proposals were few in number indeed. The Socialist Group understands, of course, that it is not easy for the president of a Council of Ministers, in which the views are by no means always unanimous, to make clear-cut statements. We understand that a presidency which puts forward concrete ideas is laying itself open to attack. Specific, concrete ideas and plans can be monitored, and if they are not achieved the very fact of their failure is obvious to all.

None the less, it is our view that that risk should have been taken since the future of Europe is at stake here. European integration is, after all, as someone — Mr Jenkins, I think — once said, like a bicycle: it either moves forward or you fall off. I have the impression that some members of the Council prefer to shut their eyes to that fact. The Dutch presidency is taking over in very difficult circumstances. The economic climate

is continuing to deteriorate; the number of unemployed grows alarmingly; the financial problems of the Community are severe and in the sphere of international political relations the balmy days of the 1960s and 1970s appear to have gone for good. All the more reason, therefore, to have specific, concentrated and well-planned action. All the more reason to have a presidency that dares to take the risk of failing or of not entirely succeeding, because what is at stake is the welfare of the citizens of Europe, and particularly those who are unable to defend themselves. Moreover, the maintenance of peace in the world is more important than not losing face or getting one's hands dirty.

With respect to the restructuring of agriculture, Mr Van der Klaauw used the expression 'adjustment of agricultural policy', an expression which I find much weaker. Together with my Group I am consequently a little suspicious, but perhaps he will be able to reassure me. With respect to the restructuring of agricultural policy and the financial problems facing the Community — in the light of the forthcoming enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal these problems are rapidly approaching an acute stage — the President-in-Office had fine but equally vague things to say, and failed to inform us whether these questions will be dealt with together or not. When I spoke to the then President-elect of the Commission, I got the feeling that he was very aware of the unbreakable interdependence of these problems, and that he planned to sketch the main lines of a possible solution in the policy statement which the Commission intends to make in February. Does the President-in-Office have any information on this? And if he does, surely the Dutch presidency can then prepare a schedule for discussion of this in the Council. I should like to have a specific answer from the President-in-Office on this. Six months pass quickly; the Dutch presidency will have to work efficiently if it is going to achieve its aim to — and I quote:

lead the beginning of this idea-forming process along adequate and constructive paths so that on this basis decisions can be taken as quickly as possible.

Before being officially in the saddle the Dutch presidency took the initiative of calling a special session of the Council of Ministers of Economic Affairs, Finance and Social Affairs on the problems of employment, and it deserves praise for this.

This is something which the European trade union movement, in particular, has repeatedly called for. But the Dutch presidency cannot rest on its laurels. Without any wish to sound over-sanguine — Mr Van der Klaauw has warned against this — I should like to urge the need for swift and concrete action. Is this special Council going to meet, and before June? Is there ongoing preparatory consultation between the Council and the Commission? Six months pass very quickly.

Van den Heuvel

As regards cooperation with Parliament, I was gratified to hear the President-in-Office of the Council say that he considered that the sharing of the budgetary authority which has been achieved is one of the essential stones in the existing Community edifice. I have the feeling sometimes that there are governments which regret rather than welcome Parliament's budgetary powers. Mr Jacquet will deal with the current problems surrounding the budget. In my view it is certainly important that there should be consultation about the conciliation procedures; in this way, perhaps, relations between Council and Parliament can be improved. Parliament certainly wants to see this happen, but we find this conciliation procedure very important. None the less, consultation means that there must be something to consult about, and this means that the parties participating in the consultation must have some margin of manoeuvre, something which has not always been present in the past. Despite all the consultation and all the fine words I have the feeling that some members of the Council would rather clip Parliament's wings than take it seriously. In this connection I would draw your attention to a comment by Raymond Barre, which I read in the paper today. At a New Year reception Mr Barre said, 'I am not in the slightest interested in the comments of these Members of Parliament'. In this context I believe that this Minister will have a hard row to hoe in the Council of Ministers.

I do not wish to offend you. Mr Van der Klaauw, but your remarks about the personal attention which you will ask the Council to give to this Parliament's decisions have the effect of making me want to laugh. Obviously we expect you to do this. Here again, however, there was a striking lack of specific ideas and proposals. Perhaps the President-in-Office ought to take a look at what Parliament decided in this area in February 1980, and examine the ideas and proposals put forward by this Parliament. There is enough there for him to be going on with, I should have thought. Moreover, a great part of the work of this Parliament is done in the parliamentary committees and I should like to hear from the President-in-Office whether he has any plans to improve cooperation, primarily via these committees.

His comments on the seat of Parliament were also pretty unimpressive. I would like to ask Mr Van der Klaauw very specifically what priority the Netherlands presidency plans to give to the question of a permanent seat for this Parliament. Which has priority: the effective operation of this Parliament or the interests of the countries concerned in the question? If the former is the case, I take it that the President-in-Office objects to the agreement which has been made, that to begin with the three countries concerned in the question of the seat should make proposals for a solution. It is hardly to be expected that these countries will regard the efficient operation of this Parliament as the most important criterion in their choice!

The phasing and the organization of the accession negotiations with Spain and Portugal will require wisdom and care on both sides, says the text of the President's speech. Well, nobody is going to argue with that! But what does it mean? Can the accession date of 1 January 1984 be maintained or can it not? Moreover, the list of areas in which the Presidency wishes to make rapid progress contains several items, but not agriculture. What am I supposed to conclude from that? Does it mean that agricultural problems relating to enlargement will be dealt with in the context of the restructuring and the problem of own resources? I am curious to hear the answer.

As regards European political cooperation, I must say that Mr Van der Klaauw's comment that the question of human rights is hedged round with great difficulties does not surprise me. While Parliament does consider that the governments do not always go far enough, the governments of the ten European Member States have only limited influence. We understand that. But I also think that this Parliament would show much greater understanding if the Council and the Ministers of Foreign Affairs were to demonstrate that they took the declarations of this Parliament seriously. My question is as follows: Is the President-in-Office prepared to urge the Council to report systematically to Parliament on questions relating to human rights? Even in the Member States the situation with respect to human rights is sometimes less than ideal. So I hope that an appeal from the European Parliament to the governments of the Member States will be received with the same alacrity as it would if it dealt with matters far from home.

On the Middle East the President-in-Office stated that great attention will continue to be given to this area, but he is perhaps aware that in Dutch political terminology this expression is regarded with some suspicion, because it is generally regarded as being synonymous with the idea that we are powerless to do anything. We are striving in principle, he said, towards the security of all States — and I would add, of all peoples — in the region. But I should like to hear the President-in-Office outline his plans in more specific terms. When does he intend to visit the region again? When will he meet the new President of the United States, as announced? And what European ideas will he take to that meeting? Can he, for example, throw any light on the question of how the continuation of the Camp David initiative can be coordinated with a European initiative. How can the Camp David approach, which is based, after all, on the idea of phased peace negotiations, be made compatible with a solution for the Palestinian people, who are demanding an overall, integrated approach? On that point, could the President-in-Office explain the meaning of the cryptic expression 'the Palestinian people and the PLO'? What is the Palestinian people? During his recent trips to the Middle East did Mr Van der Klaauw speak with Palestinians other than those whom the PLO represent? And when he goes to meet

Van den Heuvel

the new President of the United States, perhaps he can raise another matter which I know interests him greatly, namely El Salvador. If the Ten really believe that the situation there is unacceptable, it would seem to me to be very useful to discuss this matter with our ally. As regards Turkey, I turn to the text which has been distributed; fortunately I have not had to wait for the translation. I read there that Mr Van der Klaauw is pleasanter and somewhat more optimistic about Turkey than Mr Thorn was during his presidency. What is it that has convinced the President-in-Office that the Turkish Government will fulfil its promise to work for a rapid and complete restoration of democracy? In this context I should like to repeat the question which the chairman of my Group put to Mr Thorn. Do the Ministers of Foreign Affairs ever actually read the newspapers? My colleague referred on that occasion to a number of violations of human rights which had been reported from Turkey. So I should like to hear a clear and specific answer to my question as to why the President-in-Office is so optimistic.

The President-in-Office spoke of the need for all Member States to use the limited resources as sparingly as possible. This means that throughout the Community the authorities will introduce measures which will hit the ordinary people hardest. But it is worth pointing out that the other side of the picture is that tax fraud and the flight of capital are assuming gigantic proportions, even in the Community. This situation could be much improved by a common approach. The Socialist Group has called for such an approach on a number of occasions and made relevant proposals. I would ask the President-in-Office what the Council is waiting for.

I turn now briefly to Southern Africa, particularly to the problem of Namibia. The free world is generally quicker to jump in with reproaches to young States and liberation movements than with concrete aid. Comments about pro-Moscow views or guerilla movements backed by Moscow are not uncommon in our so-called free world. Can the President-in-Office tell us what plans exist in the Community to help young countries — I am thinking here, for instance, of Angola — to become genuinely independent of any superpower? What is the attitude of the Ten to the liberation movements in this region? Can the President-in-Office indicate in concrete terms when a liberation movement is an acceptable discussion partner for the Ten? Surely the criterion can not merely be 'if the liberation movement is supported by oil-producing countries'? That would at least be astonishing, and I should like to hear the President-in-Office's answer on this.

Finally one more question: the Netherlands Government, and Mr Van der Klaauw himself, have made some very critical remarks in the Netherlands about the salaries of the officials of the European Communities. Does the Netherlands presidency plan to take any initiatives in this area in the coming six months?

I have put a large number of specific questions to the President-in-Office. I am relying on him to give me as specific answers as did his direct predecessor, whose performance during the debate in this Assembly I recall with satisfaction.

President. — I call Mr Penders to speak on behalf of the European Peoples Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Penders. — (NL) Madam President, may I begin by welcoming most warmly the Dutch President of the Council. There is little doubt that criticism will be heaped on him in the coming months, and it seems therefore only fair at least today to wish him success.

The President-in-Office is known to be a modest man, all credit to him, and today his approach was again extremely modest. There is nothing wrong with that, but I do feel that in matters of policy modesty must not be allowed to grow out of all proportion. There is a slight danger of this happening. Mr Van der Klaauw put considerable emphasis on the need to set our own house in order: agricultural problems, restructuring of the budget, the imminent exhaustion of own resources. But while putting our own house in order is indeed necessary, it is no more than a means to an end. Other action is necessary. What must our objective and that of the presidency be? We must ensure that the European citizen neither despairs nor becomes apathetic. There is a real danger of this unless we are able in the short term to make some headway in overcoming the economic crisis, particularly unemployment. For this reason I welcome the plan for a super or jumbo Council, that is a Council of Ministers of Finance, Economic and Social Affairs. I am aware that the European Parliament, too, is working on the preparations for this jumbo Council. Proposals are expected from the Economic and Monetary Committee. All of this requires further preparation and intensive support. In my view we should not hesitate — and I am including the Dutch presidency — to postpone this Council, if necessary for some months, in order to be sure that it will then work more successfully. The same applies to energy policy. We must avoid getting bogged down in the single question of whether or not to use nuclear power. It is vitally important to realize that there can be no vigorous social and economic policy without a strong European energy policy. The two things are inextricably interwoven.

I should like to urge also that something should finally be done about the harmonization of company law and company taxation, which is long overdue. How can we achieve healthy and vigorous European enterprises when absolutely no progress is being made in this area, and there are indeed signs of retrogression?

The modesty of the President-in-Office is all too obvious in his remarks about putting our own house in order. I had expected to hear something much more

Penders

specific than 'beginning idea formation', 'beginning cooperation', and so on. There is a very clear impression that the President-in-Office is taking cover behind the fact that the European Commission has to come forward with proposals before 1 July, so that he himself does not have to do anything at the present time. This is too narrow an attitude, and one which is moreover at variance with the statements which Mr Van der Klaauw has repeatedly made in interviews, when he spoke about regular contacts within the Commission and sounded off a bit about his good relations with the new President of the Council — I am delighted to hear that — but why is his attitude so uninspiring and limited today?

I should also welcome some initiatives in the area of moderating the salaries of European officials. You cannot, after all, ask European citizens to make sacrifices if you do not give a good example yourself. The citizens of Europe are gradually becoming a little cynical about exhortations about cut-backs, combating inflation and tightening the belt, when they see how the top officials in Europe behave.

The third chapter tackled by the President-in-Office — and I was pleased to see this — related to international economic relations. He rightly devoted a long section of his speech to that and I consider what he said very valuable. In my view the two development councils which the Netherlands presidency has planned for the coming six months belong in this context. We feel that most attention must be given here to the non-associated regions. We must not become fettered by Euro-African conceptions and entirely outdated thinking of this kind. We must open the windows of Lomé, and not only out of charity: this is vitally necessary if we are to achieve a radical improvement in North-South relations and guarantee the mere continued existence of world trade. May I recall once again the initiatives which the European Parliament itself has taken with respect to the non-associated countries? I am thinking naturally of our major project for combating hunger in the world.

International economic relations bring me of course directly to the world economic summit in Ottawa. It really is a bit — I will not say scandalous — but regrettable that these conferences are only held when a 'large' country holds the presidency of the EEC. I congratulate Mr Van der Klaauw on his intention to ensure that the preparation for the economic summit in Ottawa is thorough. This is the way in which small countries can exert some influence. If this preparation is satisfactory, and if the effects of the Dutch preparation are felt at the Ottawa summit, this will be an additional argument to discourage the appalling discrimination which appears when the dates for such conferences are set.

I have now arrived more or less automatically at the President-in-Office's so-called fourth chapter, institutional problems. Here his modesty reaches its apogee,

for he promises a fourth chapter, and there is no fourth chapter. What we have is three-quarters of a page in a fairly meaty speech of 37 pages. Three-quarters of a page, that's all, and not a word about the budgetary difficulties which are in all our minds. May I in this context — Mrs Van den Heuvel raised this point — ask you to ensure that there is new consultation on the budgetary procedure between Council and Parliament. As a member of this Parliament I have enthusiastically supported what we have been doing in the last few months in this area. I am 100 % behind this, but I also realize that this kind of approach cannot be repeated indefinitely, and that it is therefore necessary that there should be a sound and constructive consultation on the budget between the Council and the Parliament.

On the question of the relations between Council and Parliament the President-in-Office certainly did not commit himself too far. I know that his margins of manoeuvre are limited, and that the respect for the European Parliament is not as great in all Member States as it should be, but he has indeed been exceptionally modest here. It is naturally terribly nice of him to promise to bring the most important Parliamentary opinions to the attention of the Council, but it would be of more value to inform Parliament what has actually happened with these resolutions. For example, there has been *absolutely* no reaction on a large number of human rights resolutions. One question: will the President of the European Council report personally to the European Parliament on the Maastricht summit? I know all the arguments for and against on this, but I would point out that even if the opponents of this suggestion can call the Treaties in aid, or at least do not have the Treaties against them, those in favour are entitled to appeal to a normal sense of democracy. What we are talking about here is respect for the European citizen and voter, and the appearance of the Netherlands President of the European Council in the European Parliament would mean a slight, a very modest implementation of the many pompously worded decisions of earlier European summit conferences on European union and so on. So it remains my opinion that it would be a good thing if the Dutch Prime Minister, Mr Van Agt, were to come to the European Parliament.

May I just turn briefly to the question of the seat of Parliament. I do not envy the President-in-Office. To be honest, and speaking purely personally, I am strongly in favour of concentrating the executive and Parliament in a single place of work, and for me that can only be Brussels. Parliament's job is, after all, to keep an eye on the government and represent the people. The European government — the Commission — sits in Brussels and, in the eyes of the European people, so do the media, but as I said this is a purely personal opinion. What I would like to ask the President-in-Office, and I do this on behalf of our Group, is to ensure that when a decision is finally taken it will stand the test of democracy. We are not interested in

Penders

hearing that the Council has been terribly clever and managed to save Brussels and Luxembourg and Strasbourg. No, what we want is a solution which we shall be able to justify realistically to the European citizens. I hope that I am speaking on behalf of all of us when I say that it is time we stopped being circus artistes and became representatives of the people.

My last comment on the institutional question relates to the Greeks. We welcome Greece with open arms. They were reasonably critical in their introductory remarks on Monday. They are entitled to do so, and there is nothing wrong with that. But I would say to them this: you are now a Member of the Community, and you should avoid imitating the habit of another Member State, whose accession is no longer so recent, of standing regularly with one leg inside and one leg outside the Community. It may be that the Greeks will have economic problems arising from their accession. We must help them with these, and Greece can help us in turn in other non-material matters. I am thinking for example of the treatment of conscientious objectors, Jehovah's Witnesses and relations with Israel. Moreover, I expect a great deal from political cooperation with Greece. I am convinced, and happy to be so, that there is a connection between Greek entry to the EEC and Greece's reintegration into NATO. These two events, occurring at more or less the same time, represent an essential strengthening of the Western world.

This brings me to European political cooperation, the showpiece of the EEC. But nobody should get the impression that European political cooperation means anything in the world merely on its own account. It only has any significance because it is the flagship of a strong economy and a properly functioning market. The outside world does not respect European political cooperation merely because we have such jolly meetings or because we are so good at coordinating our points of view in the United Nations. The respect comes because we have an impressive economic, cultural, innovative and scientific potential. European political cooperation cannot function in a vacuum. We must remember this when we turn our attention to the Middle East, which is at present the main area of activity of European political cooperation. Everywhere there are doubts and hesitations about the so-called European initiative. Israel has long had such doubts. Is that so difficult to understand, given the threats to the security of that country? But the Arabs, too, are beginning to express doubts, as Mr Van der Klaauw himself discovered recently in Kuwait and Qatar. Is the Middle East initiative really anything more than a magic formula which allows us to create an identity for ourselves? Are we merely trying to protect our energy position?

The EEC now wishes to implement two principles: two of the four papers which the Council with its well-known openness is unwilling to give as confidential information to the Political Affairs Committee of

the European Parliament. As regards 'self-determination' it will be necessary to break down the inflexible attitude of Israel with respect to the settlements. But Israel's position is stronger in the discussion on the right to exist and the security of all States in the region. The EEC cannot give any real guarantees. The only power that can do that for Israel is Washington. We must be realistic. For this reason I regret that the President-in-Office's speech made no mention of 'Camp David'. This shows a lack of courage, and you will need courage to preside over the Euro-Arab Dialogue when the PLO is present.

As a final comment I would say this. We are now ten members of the European Community, ten democracies. What does that mean? It means that at any given moment there are either national or local elections going on in one of the ten countries. That is how democracies work and that is how it should be. But it follows that it is vitally important that elections should no longer be used as an excuse to halt European processes. At the present moment one large Member State is certainly giving this impression. Surely approaching elections should be a stimulus to a European policy. We are after all doomed to cooperation. May I urge the President-in-Office of the Council, who is also facing elections in his own country, to see these thoughts as encouragements to him in his future work. The citizens of Europe will understand him and reward him.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

President. — I call Sir James Scott-Hopkins to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins. — Mr President, may I take the opportunity of extending a welcome to the President-in-Office and to congratulate him on one of the most exhaustive speeches that I have ever heard on what the new presidency intends to do over the coming six months. I shall have to study with interest the full details of his speech which, as I understand from what he said just now, is being circulated as an unofficial document.

I want in point of fact to draw his attention to just a few of the problems which our Community will be facing in the coming six months. Of course during next month's debate on the Commission's programme we shall be going into the details of the forthcoming Community action. I am going to confine myself today purely to those matters which fall within the

Scott-Hopkins

Council's purview; and in the Council I include of course, besides the actual Council, the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, as he did himself.

Like all presidencies this one will inherit a certain amount of unfinished business. Therefore the first question that I must ask is what exactly is the President-in-Office going to do to follow up the European initiative on the Middle East which was taken last September? I have looked again at what he said while the other two honourable Members were speaking and I am not clear in my mind exactly what initiatives he intends to take following Mr Thorn's tour when he was President.

I ask this particularly relevant question in the light of the highly critical remarks which were recently made by Dr Kissinger. I do not know exactly what his position is in the new Reagan administration, but he did call into question the value of our European initiatives. He did it in a particularly unpleasant way, and he commented in very plain terms on the impossibility of maintaining united defence and separate policy. Clearly this is an issue which just cannot be allowed to drop and which must be examined further. I hope that the President-in-Office will do everything in his power to make sure that, in the field of foreign policy, independent European initiatives which, unlike Mr Penders, I think are of great value do not upset the European/United States relationships. And it is those relationships that are equally crucial. So it is a very delicate task that I think the President-in-Office will have in the coming six months. We must maintain the solidarity of the alliance.

May I add in parenthesis how much I think that the development of a specifically Community foreign policy — and this is what I am sure he is actually working towards — would gain greatly from the establishment of a permanent secretariat for the conference of Foreign Ministers. I would ask him once again to look at that particular issue.

From the Middle East may I now turn quickly to the question of energy prices. The decision by the OPEC countries to increase their prices by \$ 4 a barrel yet again throws us into turmoil and again seems to take away the small advantages we have gained. Oil prices have trebled in two years and we have really reached a point where any increase in gross domestic product is taxed by an immediate increase in the price of oil by the OPEC countries. Existing levels of employment are proving difficult to maintain in those circumstances and the finance that might have been set aside, and should have been set aside, for new investment and new jobs is being removed. At the same time the lack of economic growth weakens the Community's ability, as he said himself, to aid those countries of the Lomé Agreement to which we attach particular importance.

I ask the oil-producing States rhetorically what is the point of these higher oil prices, what purpose is served

by doing this, when one is running the risk of economic and social instability amongst their customers? It seems to me to be absolutely lunatic. The Arab oil-producing States and Iran account for 85 % of the Community's oil supplies. It will be the particular task of the Dutch presidency and Dutch diplomacy to give an impulse, as he mentioned himself, to the Euro-Arab Dialogue. Unless there is effective Community action and coordination in this and other aspects of energy policy, particularly in encouraging the use of coal and the building of new nuclear electricity generating plants, there is no political ideology or philosophy which will protect the people of Europe from the growing unemployment and the spread of already worldwide recession. That really must take top priority in the programme of the Dutch presidency during these six months. We must try to maintain, or try to achieve, a plateau of energy prices.

Now I turn finally, Mr President, to the last matter, the arrival of a new Commission. This is my first opportunity, as chairman of the European Democratic Group, of expressing formally on behalf of my group our great sorrow at the death of Finn Gundelach. He was a great friend of all of us, and I will say no more than that we shall miss him very badly indeed.

Over the past few months the institutional questions have come up. I am glad that the President-in-Office actually referred to the fact that on 20 November we passed in this House a resolution saying that we wanted a decision taken on the seat of Parliament by 16 June 1981. I also note his remark that one of the Member States — he did not say this, but France was the country in question — raised the issue of the single seat, saying that member governments must take the decision. Although his words today were a little equivocal, I sincerely hope that member governments working in cooperation will, in fact, take this decision. I would draw his attention to the speech made yesterday, I think, by the French Prime Minister, which perhaps will make his task easier. The French Prime Minister said he was not interested at all in the opinions of the European Parliament. So quite obviously the French do not care where the Parliament goes. If the Prime Minister and the Government of France are not interested, as has been reported quite clearly, in what Parliament says, or indeed what it does, then that will make it much easier for the President-in-Office to come to a decision as to where we should have our single seat.

(Applause)

Over the past few months we have called attention to the continuing absence of any action on the eminently sensible report, which he mentioned himself, of the Three Wise Men. I do hope that that report, which is now 14 months old, will not be allowed to moulder on the presidency's shelves, because it is of great importance. The recommended institutional reforms were, in the view of the committee responsible and also indeed

Skott-Hopkins

in my view, to have become established practice by the time of the arrival of our new colleagues from Greece whom we have all welcomed here during this week. But what has happened? Absolutely nothing! Now the President-in-Office really cannot allow that to continue. That report is lying in a limbo between the European Council, which originally asked for it, and the Foreign Ministers, who were told to consider it. That is just not good enough. I sincerely hope that that report will not suffer the fate of a similar previous one by our colleague, Mr Tindemans, who is not actually here at the moment, which seems to have gone into limbo. So I really do ask the President-in-Office to look into that and see whether he cannot get the Council moving to take some action on the reforms suggested in that report.

In conclusion I wish the President-in-Office well in the very large tasks that lie ahead of him. I am sure he will apply his mind to those tasks with the vigour and the intelligence that I know he has. On behalf of my group I wish him the very best of good fortune.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Galluzzi of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Galluzzi. — *(I)* Mr President of the Council, I wish first and foremost, on behalf of the Italian Members of the Communist and Allies Group, to give you credit for the time which you devoted in your statement to what we regard as the most interesting European initiative which the Council has taken for many years — the attempt to find a peaceful solution to the Middle East question, decided upon at the end of the Venice Summit.

Moreover, as you know, Mr President of the Council, it is an initiative which has fully and directly occupied Mr Thorn in the last few months and which was revised at the beginning of December by the European Council held in Luxembourg shortly before the transition from the Luxembourg to the Netherlands presidency, as a central part of the Community's international relations. It was therefore difficult not to discuss the subject, and indeed I must admit that you discussed it in full; but I would say that you spoke of it as if we were still in June 1980 instead of January 1981 — as if we were still in Venice — since you reiterated exactly what was proposed then, without telling us anything — although more than six months have passed — about the real content and significance of this initiative, and without taking account of the events of the last few months.

Mr President of the Council, what is behind the initiative of the Ten? On what analysis of the Middle East situation is it based? What do its instigators make of the Camp David peace agreement, of the Israeli settle-

ments criticized by the United Nations General Assembly, of the question of Jerusalem, of European recognition of the Palestine Liberation Organization? That recognition is something different from the hoped-for participation of the PLO in the peace negotiations, for it is a precondition of Palestinian participation in those negotiations, which in turn is the condition stipulated once again by the Arab League at its last meeting with the European Community for peace in the Middle East and the resumption of the Euro-Arab Dialogue. The latter is essential, as you know, for the revival of the North-South Dialogue and for solving the energy problem — a problem of some interest for Europe.

Mr President, as other speakers have pointed out, you did not mention this, although it is an urgent problem for the European Community. Moreover, you cannot be unaware that in the last few days Dr Kissinger, in the course of a visit to the Middle East on behalf of the new American Administration, issued a press statement in which, after describing the initiative of the Nine as a damaging one which hindered American policy in the Middle East, he defined its limits, warning the Europeans not to continue on that road but to scuttle back under the American umbrella and give up any foolish aspirations to autonomy. As Sir James Scott-Hopkins reminded us just now, Dr Kissinger plainly stated, in a most unpleasant way, that he could see no reason why countries should have different foreign policies if they have a common defence policy. He is thereby letting us know beyond a shadow of doubt that the American military guarantee, as far as the United States Government is concerned, is conditional on the full acceptance by Europe of the strategy of the Atlantic Alliance. This is a disturbing statement — and I hope you will agree, Mr President of the Council — all the more so when one remembers that the step taken in Venice was not in conflict with American policy, since it was merely stated that in order to solve the Middle East problem, it was necessary to look for an overall solution which would take account of the rights of all those involved, and particularly of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination. Not a policy, then, of opposition to our chief ally, but one aimed solely at calling for a say — for a greater role — in the determination of American strategy.

That is why the failure to take a stand, to talk about real issues, to raise the slightest objection to this new and blatant interference in European politics is something which can only be deplored, and which is bound to worry all those who call for greater autonomy for Europe.

But beyond questions of principle, Mr President of the Council, we are concerned about the things which were said after the pressures — first Israeli then American — were brought to bear. Indeed, we have information about pressures on the part of various Member States of the Community to freeze the initiative pend-

Galluzzi

ing American decisions. It has been stated that we are still in a very vague initial phase, when on the contrary it is well known that there is a report by the Directors of Political Affairs containing precise proposals for the key points of a possible overall negotiation on the Middle East.

Mr President, in concluding your statement on this point you told us that you felt committed to provide, in the coming months, direction and substance for the Ten's efforts to contribute to a peace settlement in the Middle East. However to do this it will not be enough — as you suggested — to convince all the parties concerned of your sincerity and that of Europe.

It is necessary to follow through with this initiative courageously and independently, not against anyone or on behalf of anyone, but giving it some real meaning of its own and countering any attempt to block or vitiate it. That is what we Italian Communists expect from the new Netherland presidency, Mr President of the Council, for otherwise all the statements, however interesting on Europe's role in the process of *détente* and disarmament, in the North-South Dialogue and in overcoming the most serious crises and conflicts, would have the hollow ring of the old Europeanist rhetoric designed to camouflage what would be essentially a policy of acquiescence and renunciation.

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mr Berkhouwer to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Berkhouwer. — *(NL)* Mr President, I naturally associate myself with Sir James Scott-Hopkins' remarks on the tragic death of our friend Finn Gundelach. In common with others our group offers its condolences to the Commission.

We also of course wish the new President-in-Office of the Council success, courage and inventiveness in the performance of his duties. He will need very broad shoulders, for he will have some very heavy burdens to bear. I am glad to see Sir James Scott-Hopkins entering the Chamber. I have just mentioned his name, and I should like to add a personal word of congratulation to him, since we share in the honour which has been bestowed upon him by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. We congratulate you on your knighthood, Sir James.

With respect to what has become known as the *querelle budgétaire*, we should like to state that the primary function of the President-in-Office of the Council is to improve the consultation procedure in the Council itself. This relates not merely to the coordination of the various specialized Councils, but also to the so-called jumbo Council. This can be of major importance in consultation with the Council and the

other institutions, particularly Parliament. As regards conciliation, I was delighted to hear Mr Van der Klaauw say that he intends to submit specific proposals to Parliament on the improvement of the conciliation procedure. We look forward eagerly to that.

In his highly-detailed speech the President-in-Office mentioned many major and minor problems, but what we really would like to see this President-in-Office do is concentrate in the coming months on a number of specific matters which must be brought to the stage of solution and implementation, on the basis of the central goal: the improvement of consultation between all the institutions and improvement of the decision-making procedures in the Council.

Here I would like to make a couple of comments and ask a couple of questions. For instance, what is the position as regards the political responsibility of the European Council, this body which has become, almost by customary law, the most important body in the Community? The European Council takes decisions which are, in fact, not always carried out by the Council of Ministers. But I wonder whether it would not be useful to draw up a list of all the decisions taken in the European Council since the first one met at the end of 1974. I am thinking particularly of the decision which was taken on that occasion to give the European Parliament greater legislative powers, and of the solemn decision — and here I turn again to a proposal of which I may claim to be the author — to set up the famous passport union, a matter about which the ordinary citizen may have something to say in the next six months as he gets ready once again to go off on a trip somewhere. Perhaps he will be able to get rid of that expensive national passport, the price of which is gradually becoming prohibitive. I see that the President-in-Office is smiling, and I hope that that smile means that he is going to be able to tell me something pleasant in his answer, that he will be able to get the passport union going. He and I can then walk together hand and hand into the history books — I as the instigator and he as the man who put it into effect.

(Laughter)

As regards the Council I would say this. The Three Wise Men have urged the abolition of the Luxembourg Agreement, and certainly something must be done about that, especially now that there are ten of us and shortly twelve. I do not need to remind the President-in-Office of that, he knows that well enough. But, if I may take up the point made by Sir James Scott-Hopkins, Parliament must now keep a very watchful eye open to ensure that the report of the Three Wise Men does not suffer the same fate as that of Mr Tindemans, now a Member of this Parliament, and is simply forgotten. You will recall, indeed, that the Tindemans Report was not the first to suffer that fate; the Vedel committee some years ago produced another major institutional report, which did not lead

Berkhouwer

to much either. It, too, was simply forgotten. But as European parliamentarians we are entitled to express our gratification — Mrs Van den Heuvel has already done so — that the Presidency now intends to set up this jumbo Council, for the results should be an end to the working at cross purposes of all these different Councils. Apart from that, the question immediately arises — will this Council also be accountable to the European Parliament? We naturally are very pleased to hear the President-in-Office say that he expects a fruitful dialogue between the European Parliament and this jumbo Council, for I would like to repeat on behalf of my group that we prefer a fruitful dialogue between Council and Parliament on the basis of constructive proposals from the Parliament to sterile verbal conflicts.

A final question — I am dealing only with institutional aspects — I have been very struck by the fact that in the context of the proposal by the Three Wise Men, Mr Penders has asked the President-in-Office on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party whether we can expect the Netherlands Prime Minister to come to this Assembly, after the European Council meets in Maastricht, to render an account. We are very interested in his answer.

President. — I call Mr Israël to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Israël — (*F*) While listening to you, Mr President of the Council, I had the impression of very considerable goodwill on your part. In the light of your remarks, I am convinced that relations between the Council and Parliament will improve considerably, and that far from being — as has been suggested — natural enemies, Parliament and the Council can become natural partners. Of course there is no lack of causes of friction. Parliament has a certain power of initiative for expenditure, while the Council holds the purse strings.

But how can one forget, Mr President, that Parliament is the great original feature of European integration. It enables Europe to avoid the pitfalls of a technocratic system. Is it too much to ask that the Council should be always attentive to Parliament? It is not that we are more knowledgeable or that we have a monopoly on European goodwill, but that better coordination between the Council and Parliament — a rather less detached attitude to our opinions — could make for better operation of the 'machinery' of Europe.

I would draw your attention to one particular point. You mentioned the work of the Committee of Experts. It is displeasing in a Parliament, to be told that a Committee of Experts filters and analyses what the representatives of the European peoples are quite capable of analysing for themselves, and in some cases have already decided upon.

The budget of the European Communities is an important event in Parliament's life. The President of Parliament has finalized it, and for us it exists. The Council should draw the appropriate conclusions from the difficulties we encountered. I am also pleased, Mr President, that you insisted resolutely on the importance of social problems. Unemployment is truly the scourge of our society, and anyone who did not endeavour to solve this problem would really be failing in his public duty as a European.

The common agricultural policy is essential to Europe. I would say, paradoxically, that it comes before the budget — it is the very essence of European solidarity. However, one should not be too afraid of possible restructuring. Let us try to see what improvements can be made. Any improvements must meet certain absolute requirements. The farmers, who regard agriculture as the chance to draw resources for human beings from the soil, must not be penalized. Agriculture is very different from industrial production which is very often based on processes which do not involve our soil. The chairman of my group, Mr de la Malène, frequently makes the following observation — that many people approach Europe tangentially, draw profit from it and leave it once more. Obviously, the most important thing is to understand that the policy of surpluses is very troublesome. There is some sort of contradiction between world hunger and the inevitability of surpluses. Our argument — you are familiar with it, for Mr Debré expounded it here a few days ago — is that clearly one cannot tolerate agricultural overproduction in European countries when famine is raging in the world. In our view, the Council ought, in accordance with Article 135 of the Treaty, to ask the Commission to make proposals for improving the agricultural policy, with a view to avoiding surpluses and ensuring that our agriculture continues to operate for the benefit of all.

The subject of political cooperation is central, Mr President. You mentioned our relations with the ACP countries, and expressed the view that more must be done. I would say that more must be done not only in economic terms but also in moral terms. It is anomalous — and here I am expressing a personal view — that we should have this relationship with the 60 ACP countries without the question of human rights, in particular, being raised in any way. Of course, there is no question of giving Europe ideological control over the ACP countries, but it is a question of working out with them to what extent things can be improved.

You alluded to the Helsinki negotiations. In that context, it is inconceivable that in our relations with the socialist countries some mechanism cannot be found for comparing progress achieved in human rights, i.e. in practical terms, in improving the lot of individuals.

Now a word about the Euro-Arab Dialogue. Mr President, you must understand that many of us are

Israël

shocked by the fact that this dialogue is taking place without the involvement in the negotiations of the most powerful and populous Arab State, the one which has shown the greatest desire for peace in this region of the world, namely Egypt.

Finally, you reiterated, with considerable feeling, the terms of the Venice Declaration. For my part, I shall tell you once more that it is anomalous for you to have stated that the Palestine Liberation Organization must be involved in the negotiations. Would you say that it should be involved in any case, Mr President, or would you set conditions for the participation of the PLO?

This matter, like the other points I have raised and everything which concerns Europe, is very important to us. You will understand that the questions I am putting to you do not detract in any way from all the good wishes which I have the honour to express on behalf of my group for the success of the task which you are about to perform in accordance with the great tradition of Dutch diplomacy.

President. — I call Mr Bøgh of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Bøgh. — *(DK)* Mr President, I am speaking on behalf of the Danish People's Movement. In his statement, the President-in-Office of the Council mentioned the importance of the accession of Greece as the 10th member of the European Community, which is, in my opinion, undoubtedly the most important innovation at the start of this year. But we did not hear very much about the serious problems which will ensue both for Greece and for ourselves from this enlargement of the Community. We know that the political and economic prospects for Greece are virtually unpredictable. We know that the Greek people have very mixed feelings and expectations about the Community, which has been foisted on them without their having had the chance to consider the issues and express their opinion in a referendum. We know that economic life and the job market in Greece will be exposed to a more violent onslaught than that experienced by some of the other nine Member States in their period of adjustment to the Community.

But the other nine Member States too will be faced with incalculable economic, administrative and linguistic problems as a result of the number of Member States reaching double figures. Any further enlargement of the Community from now on will bring with it qualitative — as well as quantitative — changes to the Community. As spokesman for the largest Danish group, I shall do no more than mention those problems which will be exacerbated by any further enlargement of the Community from the point of view of a small Member State like Denmark. The four pillars which are supposed to guarantee our security are

weaker than before, and will become weaker still with the accession of each new Member State. I am thinking here of the agricultural market organizations, the small Member States' relative over-representation in the Community's executive institutions, the right of veto and the official status of Danish as an official language.

We Danish opponents of Community membership would like to express our fellow-feelings with the Greek people, who will now be faced with the same — or even worse — problems we have had to contend with throughout our membership of the Community. At the same time, though, we shall look forward to joining with the Greek Members in this House to protect the small Member States from all the attacks on their sovereignty, which is something far more important and more vital for the small Member States than for the big guns. I should therefore like to address a personal word of welcome to the representatives of a people which is like the Danish people in wanting at long last a lively debate on the repercussions of Community membership. This is a role which is eminently suited to the country which is the cradle of democracy.

President. — For the first time in a debate with the Council, a Greek Member is going to speak.

I call Mr Pesmazoglou.

Mr Pesmazoglou. — *(EL)* Mr President, we listened with great interest to the President of the Council presenting the action programme for the next six months. I shall not go into the details of what the President said, but shall refer only to certain points relating to the policy of international cooperation in the European Community and more generally to matters of external policy. A number of Members stressed the importance of Greece's presence, and I think it goes without saying that the Greek people want peace and cooperation with all nations, especially its neighbours. I am naturally referring to all the Balkan nations, the Arab and other Mediterranean nations and those of the Middle East. But in view of the critical nature of world developments as a whole, we feel that a vigorous approach to tackling international problems is called for, and I shall refer to three specific questions on which we should like to hear the President-in-Office's views.

Firstly, what policy will the Community pursue in future in order to prevent local wars and invasions? This is a particularly serious matter since local invasions can lead to a world-wide crisis, a world-wide threat to peace, and so any invasion or occupation whatsoever of foreign territory must be condemned. On this point I am bound to draw your attention to the fact that the occupation of Cyprus is continuing and constitutes a most serious and abnormal interna-

Pesmazoglou

tional situation. I would further refer to the President-in-Office's remarks on the Cyprus problem, and I feel I must mention in this House that the talks resumed in recent weeks between the two communities on the island have not produced to date any indication whatsoever that progress may be achieved. And yet if peace and security in the area are to be restored on a lasting and just basis, progress towards this end cannot be made unless the United Nations resolutions are implemented and the island is demilitarized, so that the entire region is free of danger, i.e. trouble of any kind is excluded. This is a matter of concern to all European nations and to all peace-loving nations in the world.

The second which I feel requires clarification is what the Community's policy will be on a number of very wide-ranging matters which concern all the nations in the world. More specifically, we should all very much like to hear what sort of unified Community action there is going to be in the following important fields: firstly, the law of the sea, which concerns the zone of national or Community interest and national and Community control as regards both the problems of the continental shelf and those of control and of protection against pollution in the regions which surround us. This is obviously of interest not only to Greece but also to the whole of Europe and to the Community, which is surrounded by sea. We attach particular importance to clear rules, international rules, to regulate these matters.

I should also like to add a third subject to which we attach very great importance: we believe that the protection of human rights and the creation of a new form of society which will carry all the nations of Europe and the world into the twenty-first century cannot be achieved unless new institutions are created. We are making a specific proposal on this, and I hope that the President-in-Office of the Council, and more broadly the Community, will state their position on it. We propose that citizens of Member States who settle in another Member State on the basis of free movement in order to take up employment and to exercise free professions as doctors, lawyers, engineers and architects should be able to take part in local elections. We feel that this will be the beginning of a wider and deeper cooperation between the European nations which make up the European Community.

I have confined myself to these three subjects on which we should like the President-in-Office to state his position.

President. — I call Mr Jaquet.

Mr Jaquet. — (*F*) Mr President, at the beginning of this year, and at the moment when the Dutch presidency has come into office, I would like, after my friend Mrs Van den Heuvel, to make a number of observations on the situation and future of our

Community. For many months the Community has been in crisis, and no real light has appeared at the end of the tunnel. The reasons for this crisis in European integration have frequently been outlined by us, and I shall confine myself to summarizing those which seem to me to be essential.

There is no doubt that the European Community has not fulfilled, and today is still far from fulfilling, the hopes we pinned on it. Our ambition was to create a grouping of peoples and States determined to act together, which would be capable of meeting the great challenges of our time. It was to that end that we adopted common rules and mechanisms designed to provide us with 'own resources'. The main aim of this scheme was to facilitate consultation, harmonization and joint measures, and above all to promote common policies drawn up in accordance with a common interest, i.e. the well-perceived interest of all the countries which make up the Community.

Let us admit that in many respects we are far from achieving our aims. It is true that we have 'own resources', but where are the really effective joint measures, and above all the common policies? Of course, in the agricultural sector a European policy exists. It is far from being perfect, and even contains numerous unjust elements, but it is a reality, and it is something on the credit side. We willingly admit that it needs to be revised and amended in certain respects, provided that we remain faithful to the basic principle which inspired it. We hope that this study will be undertaken soon, away from the passions normally aroused by the budget debates, and that it will be undertaken by our Parliament as well as by the other institutions of the Community.

But outside the agricultural sector, can one talk of a common policy? In particular, is there a social policy, at a time when there are more than 7 million unemployed in the Community and when underemployment is increasingly regarded as normal? Our action in the regional field is insignificant in the face of the scale of the imbalances. Is there an industrial policy, when the crisis in the steel and automobile industries appears increasingly severe? What serious progress has been made in the energy or research fields? Little more than idle chatter. Meanwhile, inflation is increasing throughout the Community.

You have had the opportunity to note all these inadequacies several times. We are obliged to note them today yet again. Indeed, it is much more a free trade area which we have created than a really united Community. The *laissez-faire* policy involved in such an approach has clearly not made it possible either to reduce social inequalities and regional imbalances or to prepare the reforms which are essential in order to safeguard our independence in the face of the growing threat from the multinationals. The Community crisis, moreover, became even more acute when the problem of the British contribution to the budget arose. This problem was presented badly and solved badly. It was

Jaquet

presented badly, for it is obvious that the rule of 'fair return' is difficult to envisage within a real community. It was solved badly to the extent that the Council, by its very considerable concessions, behaved in a way which obviously damaged the Community spirit.

Today we have the right to put this question to the Council: where are we heading? If we continue with this easygoing policy, there is a risk that we shall go down one more step towards something which would be little more than the free trade area I mentioned just now. If this long decline continued to its logical conclusion, in what situation would our States and peoples find themselves? In particular, would we be able to retain a Parliament elected by universal suffrage? Moreover, what would be the point of it, and how could it perform a monitoring role if there was no longer anything to monitor?

It is precisely at this moment, when we are beset by all these worries, that some would like to compound this Community crisis with a new institutional crisis. I must admit that I do not understand the reasoning of the governments which are opposed to the implementation of our recent budgetary decisions. We have voted a supplementary budget for 1980. On that occasion we used the scope for manoeuvre which remained available for last year, and which we would have been entitled to use earlier. That does not seem shocking to me. Moreover, the Council had the chance to object to it. We would have then had a second reading of the supplementary budget. Council did not do this. Not only did it fail to organize any real consultation with Parliament, but in addition it failed to decide on the amendments which we had adopted by a considerable majority. This shows once again how little importance it attaches to the work of the European Parliament. At all events, Article 203 of the Treaty is unambiguous. Since the Council did not modify any amendment adopted by Parliament, the supplementary budget was *ipso facto* finalized. The same was true of the ordinary budget for this year, and the President of Parliament could not but note this.

These observations do not mean in any way that we regard the budget which was voted as a good budget. It can be criticized in many respects. In particular, the French Socialists regretted the reduction of 2% in the expenditure of the Guarantee Section of the EAGGF. Moreover, the Socialist Group as a whole feels that the budget in its present form will definitely not permit the creation of the common policies which we wish to see, and which are so sadly lacking. But this is another aspect of the problem, and we are obliged to admit that the budget, however unsatisfactory, has been properly drawn up. What, then, is the reason for this dispute initiated by some governments, which is taking on such a dramatic character all of a sudden in some countries — and I do not know why?

The President of the Council told us very little about this in his statement. Could he enlighten us further in his reply?

However, I would not wish to end on too pessimistic a note.

I would still like to believe today that the European Community will find within itself, in its institutions and its peoples — and I hope also in its governments — enough strength to overcome our current difficulties, and that it will manage in the end to meet the challenges of our time and ensure really democratic control of its social and economic life. I would like to believe also that the Dutch presidency will play a decisive role to this end. I would like to believe this, because I hope that it will be the case. Finally, I wish to say to the Council that unless we act quickly it will be too late!

President. — I call Mr Travaglini.

Mr Travaglini. — (I) Mr President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, the periodical presentations of programmes by Presidents of the Council — which are truly too frequent because of the very short period of responsibility each President has — should be considered, naturally, as a proof of the viability of Community institutions, but we must also, and perhaps above all, view them as opportunities for Parliament to confront the power of the Member States.

This confrontation is only meaningful if it attempts to answer one of the basic questions which people both inside and outside Europe put to us, as the representatives of the peoples, and to you, as representatives of the Member States, who have furthered progress towards a Community with all the ups and downs this has meant, whilst maintaining our courage and far-sightedness. The question is 'Can the Europe we have face up to the challenges now before it?'

It is difficult even for the President of the Council to give an affirmative reply to this question, which is definitely an urgent and all too unavoidable one.

No-one can deny that there exists today in Europe a feeling of resignation because of our inability to meet the demands of economic and social problems — such as the serious unemployment problem, the difficult situation for young people, the continual increase in the number of outsiders, and the gradual rise in regional imbalances lead to situations on which the increasingly powerful process of the disruption of political life is based, a process which threatens the very backbone of our society.

The European Community is — and must remain — a Community made up of democracies and free peoples. We cannot remain indifferent to the danger of our freedom and democracy falling. And our first line of defence against this can be found in ourselves. The first truly decisive step towards political unity should be that of progress towards establishing firm shared

Travaglini

mechanisms which will protect all member countries against the risk of a political upset.

But over and above the methods and terms through which the Community can and must assume responsibility for this type of concern, we ought also to move rapidly towards greater cooperation and bold steps.

This shift in policy should be capable of enlisting unflinching support for the existence of Europe based on a real and heartfelt consensus of our peoples.

However, in the immediate future what we need are some concrete measures which would lead once and for all and with no more hesitation to the removal of the major shortcomings in the every day working of the Community, shortcomings which this House has pointed out times without number. I should also here refer to the perverse and reprehensible refusal to grant the Community — through increasing own resources — the means to advance in a much more decisive way than has been the case up to now, by furthering the common policies which can in their vast majority stimulate development and convergence between our economies and re-establish the balance between our regions.

In this respect, transport policy has lived up to almost none of its promise. Theoretically at least, regional development policy is considered as the meeting point for all common policies but its sphere of action must be redefined for all the less-favoured areas and various sectors according to common measures which originate from the Community, the Member States and from the regions. However, the financial appropriations for structural policies remain ridiculously small, especially when compared with the huge demands placed on them by the enlargement of the Community to include the Mediterranean countries.

A more responsible language may perhaps be used in the next few months when we consider the Community's shortcomings in industrial structures policy. The speaking time I have available means that I am unable to go into this extremely important topic, which we shall certainly have to refer to again in the near future and consider with courage and clear-sightedness. I shall simply say that a Community industrial structures policy is part and parcel of the obligations of the Treaties, that it is greatly behind schedule and that its inadequacies during this period of overall restructuring of the European production apparatus, threaten to hamper the none the less imposing Community potential for readaptation, because the individual Member States, even though they are suffering under the same short-term economic pressures, are undertaking this process of restructuring and readaptation completely independently of each other, without matching experience and knowledge gained at national and regional level. What is more, the Commission has repeatedly denounced the very real dangers which exist. Its reports drawn up during the

70s are a series of cries of protest against the Council. The fact that they denounce these shortcomings is naturally not enough to reduce their own liability in this matter. We must intervene in a coherent manner and at the opportune moment.

The President of the Council's speech was wholly concerned with the prospects for beating stagflation. Deflationist policies have reduced employment in all countries. A reflationist policy which we will all sooner or later be forced to apply, cannot be applied country by country, with no consideration being given to its repercussions on other countries in the Community. Therefore, a common policy is all the more necessary, a policy which should be pursued as a single entity throughout the whole Community in conjunction with a careful and effective regional policy.

Similarly, we must put an end to the tiresome arguments which take place in all seats of Community institutions on the procedural difficulties linked to the budget. It is well known that there are very many technical problems involved in this. They can, and must, be examined and discussed in time, away from the burning passions which rage during the concertation procedure.

However, the problem is much wider in scope. We are faced with a huge political problem. Everywhere in Europe, and not just in Europe, a massive demand for a share in the building of the best possible future is making itself felt. Is it possible to turn a deaf ear to the growing and insistent demands to share in this task?

Some of the top leaders, during the period just after the Second World War, put forward and achieved the first steps towards this Community. At that time, the similarity of intent was apparent in concerted action, not just because of shared history but also because of a shared vision of human life and history. Since then the political outlook has changed in Europe.

It is no longer enough to have exchanges of views between States. The dialogue should now basically and in the first instance be carried out between the major political forces which have given this Parliament the basic root onto which political representation at European level has been grafted. Europe can only be built with the broadest possible grouping of political forces, and therefore the European People's Party turns with this request to the Member States and to national governments, but also turns with the same force and passion to the major political forces represented in this House, so that a productive confrontation may take place, through a critical assessment of the distance covered and in order to agree on what should be the major stages in the future construction of Europe.

The European People's Party has placed great faith in an examination of how to improve and perfect, whilst respecting the Treaties, the relationship between the various Community organizations and procedures for and methods of implementing Community programmes.

Travaglini

Mr Penders mentioned this and we are all behind him in his demand for an improvement in quality which should be achieved as quickly as possible. We have brought together in a motion for a resolution some precise demands we put to the Commission in order to rationalize and give new impetus to its work, by greatly improving its constructive dialogue with Parliament.

Whilst recognizing the inability of present Community structures to achieve real solidarity between the peoples of Europe, to provide for a harmonious development of their economies, to reduce the imbalance between regions and make Europe safer and bolster its role as a defender of peace in the world, we should like to see a democratic Community leading on to European Union as was outlined at the Paris Summit of 1972.

Even if the Heads of Government seem to shy away from the political courage shown on that occasion, our group will not fall down on what it stated in its programme.

There may well be disagreement on the means and the time needed to do these things, but we are sure that we shall receive on this objective, which is the very reason for our presence in this House, the backing of all the political forces here, fully aware that this is the only way in which they can live up to the remit delivered to them by the peoples of Europe.

President. — I call Mr Martin.

Mr Maurice Martin. — (F) Mr President, in my speech I would like to concentrate on what seems to me to be the essence both of the current life of the Community and of the introductory statement by the President-in-Office of the Council.

We, the French Communists, believe that the grave concern which we have already voiced so often here about the independence of our countries, and especially of France, within the Common Market is justified by your statement.

Your programme could be summed up in two points: even more austerity for the workers, and more supranationalism.

Projects which threaten national independence are proliferating. They come from the luxurious cabinets of the Commission and of the European capitals. They are approved here by the great majority of political forces in this Parliament, and particularly of the French Members. I do not wish to state this without citing precise examples, such as the enlargement of the Community to include Greece and the prospective accession of Spain and Portugal. The industrial and agricultural risks entailed by the latter are well known on both sides of the Pyrenees. Once more we hear the

siren song of those who would like to impose on our country European decisions rejected by the French people. We are told: Don't worry, the Tindemans Report and the Report of the Three Wise Men both commissioned by the President of the French Republic, have been shelved. But does not Mr Thorn himself, the new President of the Commission, propose to question once more the unanimity rule which still permits a Member State to reject a European decision which is not in its interests?

I have not so far heard any protest from the Members of the Council about that statement. Nor have I heard anything in Paris or from the office of the French Prime Minister. A pretence is being made — indignation is now being feigned for electoral reasons over a budgetary *fait accompli* by Parliament which only the French Communists and their allies have been denouncing for years, for it is a recurring event. As far as the Council is concerned, I heard Mr Genscher, the West German Foreign Minister, arguing the case for a common foreign policy which would be similar to the notorious 'European foreign policy centre' advocated five years ago by Mr Tindemans. That would mean the end of any chance of an independent foreign policy for our country, and would lead to a foreign policy aligned in effect with that of the United States. The *coup d'état* in Turkey provides the most recent proof of this. Supported by NATO and encouraged by the Community, the régime of the Generals is now financed from the European budget, and not so long ago a delegation of senior officials from the Commission visited Ankara without being at all concerned at the thousands of arrests, the dissolution of parties and trade unions, the state of martial law, and the torture occurring in the prisons.

In Brussels, Paris and Bonn, no-one seems particularly concerned at these violations of human rights — for that is what is taking place in Turkey. And yet, only three days ago the editor-in-chief of the moderate newspaper *Hürriyet* was arrested. The newspaper *Çumburiyet* was banned, reducing the Turkish press to the military press alone.

Mr President, will the Council at last protest against these violations, or will it continue, in this conspiratorial and approving silence, to finance the régime of the generals and to urge the resumption of diplomatic relations with it?

Finally, Mr President, after this rapid review of European threats to our independence, I wish to address you formally. I have before me a note by the Commissioner Mr Davignon accompanied by a report from an 'independent' expert, Mr David Greenwood. This note comes out in favour, subject to the usual provisos, of a common policy for arms production. Mr Davignon even proposes to create a special body for this, with which the Commission would be associated. He proposes that a debate be held in Parliament and that the governments should discuss it. Mr President,

Martin

what does the Council think of this initiative? Will you refuse, as Miss Flesch did last month, to confirm that defence questions are not to be discussed within the European Community? I would add that all Members of Parliament have been informed of this document and that we have not heard any French Member protest here.

You will realize, Mr President, of the Council, that Europe already has a bad press in our country on this matter. And, in conclusion, I would say that you can rely on us to remind everyone of election promises which have been totally forgotten by now. The French Communists and Allies will continue whenever necessary to oppose your plans which threaten the independence of their country.

President. — I call Mrs Castellina.

Mrs Castellina. — (I) Mr President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, I should like first of all to make a comment on the general approach used. I am well aware that the President of the Council has to take account, when speaking in this House, of the point of view of all ten member governments and that since these points of view differ he is obliged to choose the path of saying nothing in order to avoid offending anybody. However, even though I understand the reasons behind this choice, I do not think we can continue in this manner if we do not wish to lower the standard of our debates and of the contacts between the Council and Parliament. This is why I ask you all to focus your attention on these problems, and in particular to ask yourselves if it would not be a much more serious approach if the President of the Council gave us details of the various points of view existing within the Council itself, thereby enabling us to make a closer assessment of the question and above all to relieve the feelings of frustration which I presume to be general. Today, for example, the newspaper *Le Monde* had a leading article entitled *The EEC's interne-cine struggle*, whilst you, Mr Van den Klaauw, in your speech concerning the budget, pretended that absolutely nothing was going on.

This way of acting means that Community policies are restricted to a series of statements which are always the same because they are unaffected by time and world events. I should like to give just one example: Palestine. Have we retreated or advanced on the views adopted at the Venice Summit? You all know that we have retreated. Since then many Israeli settlements have been established in the occupied territories, Palestinian mayors in the occupied territories have been blown up by dynamite or expelled. Well, would it not perhaps be necessary, if we wish to conform to the views of the Venice Summit, to condemn the Israeli Government in strong terms, instead of merely repeating this statement, worthy of Pontius Pilate, according to which Israel has a right to a State but the Palestinians have a right to having their legitimate rights recog-

nized? I think we have retreated even in comparison with what was said in Venice because you, Mr President of the Council, succeeded in not uttering even once the letters PLO. You talked about processes, but in Italian at least a process is by definition something which 'moves'. Well, what direction are we moving in? To be perfectly frank, Mr President, it is difficult to glean that from your speech.

You also talked about Lomé. As far as I know, the Lomé Convention has reached a grave point of crisis. I would rather hear something about this from you than from the rumours running round the corridors of this House. You talked about human rights too. On this topic, Mr President, there are times, moments of priority in which one subject or another ought to be stressed. Thus, Mr Van den Klaauw did well to talk about them. Today the most drastic problem apparent in this respect is that of El Salvador, not just because it has been proved that a terrible battle and massacre are taking place there, but also because we know from a document published in the United States, what the intentions of the advisers of the President-elect of the United States, Mr Reagan, are. His published views have extremely serious implications for Latin America. Well then, what does the Community have to say? Are these theories in line with Community policy or not? Amongst other things, if you, as President of the Council, had mentioned El Salvador then you could not have avoided referring to matters which did not concern you. The fact unfortunately remains that the speakers of the Group of the European People's Party, even though they are aware that members of the international Christian Democratic Movement are part of the Fascist government of El Salvador, felt no need to utter a single word on this affair.

In conclusion, there is yet again the problem of North-South relations. Here again I had hopes that you would refer to this without telling us why the negotiations did not work out or referring to the fact that the majority of the resolutions passed by this House concerning steps to be taken to aid developing countries were rejected. Mr President of the Council, you stated that North-South negotiations should be based on flexibility, inventiveness and conciliation. I only hope that our more or less ritual confrontations with the Council will become a little more inventive, if this is possible.

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it would be insincere of us to state that at the present time relations between the Council and Parliament are at their best. Obviously, this is no-one's fault in particular and even less that of the successive presidencies. It is the fault, in our opinion, of the institutions which are growing old and are no longer in step with the changes time brings with it or of the demands

Romualdi

and the specific nature of the economic, social and political difficulties which it is our responsibility to deal with. For some time, we have had the feeling that the Council had not yet truly grasped the new state of affairs which a Parliament freely and directly elected by universal suffrage represents, not just in terms of numbers but also of political weight, with a view to the pursuit of European policies.

Mr President of the Council, it is no longer possible for Parliament merely to be called upon, as you have said, to express opinions, but it should be considered, not just by the Commission, but also, and especially, by the Council, as the ultimate powerhouse of the Community designed to create a healthier economic and political Community of Ten. This can be achieved only through pooling all resources which can meet the need to protect the Community's own interests and through its becoming, as it must, an instrument for restoring the balance of power and guaranteeing safety for peace and freedom throughout the world.

The day before yesterday, when the new Commission was being presented to us, we expressed to Mr Thorn the wish that he might succeed in preserving his own sphere of independence and initiative. The Council must become aware of this need for the Commission to act as the executive organ of the Community, but it should above all recognize that it is Parliament which is the direct expression of the interests and hopes of the peoples who elected it.

After having referred to the thorny problem of the budget and to the decision taken relating to it by the President of Parliament, which was approved by the President of the Commission and on which we feel there can be no going back, the President of the Council explained that there were four very urgent problems which the Council intended to tackle: the common agricultural policy with the resulting readjustment of Community expenditure, the economic and social crisis with its distressing accompanying factors such as unemployment which has now reached 8 million, inflation and recession, the question of external economic relations, of the North-South Dialogue with the complex interplay of interests involved and finally the problem of the institutions. We do not contest how important and urgent these problems are and we shall have to devote our attention to them specifically when the matters to which they are related are submitted for our consideration. But we should like to point out that there is one other problem, of extreme importance, without which it would be extremely difficult to coordinate the various Community policies, and this is the question of regional and social policy, which you, Mr President of the Council, if I am not mistaken, did not talk about.

This is a fundamental, sensitive and difficult question which must be squarely faced up to if we want to see Europe rid of the poverty-stricken patches it now has, which go against our notion of civilization and our

constantly reaffirmed determination to progress earnestly towards balanced and harmonious development in Europe. In this respect, I am forced to note with great regret that nothing was said about the intervention the Community needs to carry out to help the areas of southern Italy recently struck by an earthquake — our interest in these areas should not be considered as diminished because of the first batches of aid granted last month. And nothing was said either on the scourge which terrorism represents. This is a phenomenon which is having an extremely serious effect on life and politics in Italy at the moment but which is a potential source of danger for the whole Community and the whole Western world. It is a terrible problem which should be faced as if it were a shared problem with all that implies in terms of crime prevention and political action.

As for political cooperation, we naturally could not expect anything new during the first speech by the President of the Council, but we do not understand how he could define as 'good' the results recently obtained at the Madrid Conference. It is true that the Conference did take place, but only, unfortunately, in order to avoid a complete breakdown in cooperation and because of our total surrender. It was a long way from defending human rights and a long way from recognizing peoples' rights to freedom and independence! Russia is determined to save *détente* by way of the Madrid Conference but this will be one way only and aimed at seeing the conference on European disarmament which is its real objective organized. This is an objective which is unfortunately showing signs of being achieved with the aid of certain steps, which to say the least are improvident, taken by certain States and certain leading figures of this Community.

We had many other things to say on the subject for example of Poland, which as the President of the Council rightly pointed out is at this time a cause for concern, and also on the subject of the increasingly more complicated and sensitive situation in the Middle East, in particular with regard to recognizing the sacred and inalienable right of the Palestinians to their independence, which we should not however like to see confused with recognition of one of the roots of certain forms of terrorism by giving official recognition to an organization such as the PLO which does not in fact seem as yet to have sorted itself out sufficiently to be viewed as a factor for unity and peace in this strife-torn area.

There were also other things which we should like to have said on Afghanistan, a country which is not just occupied but truly crushed — without the same worldwide protests being raised as can be heard from time to time in this Parliament — as we did a short time ago — to protest against what is happening in certain American republics, which are above all guilty of not having wanted to become communist.

But we shall have occasion to say all this at other times whilst paying close attention to the work of the Coun-

Romualdi

cil during the difficult months ahead of the Dutch presidency, and to the new President who spoke this morning for the first time in this House, we extend our best wishes in his work.

President. — I call Mrs Walz.

Mrs Walz, Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Research. — (D) Mr President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, I should like to begin by expressing the hope that Mr Van der Klaauw's good intentions — especially as regards cooperation with the European Parliament — will be crowned with success, because it is a fact that, with the world in its present state, the European Community must work together as closely as possible and accomplish as much as possible. That is the only way we shall be able to assert ourselves in world affairs.

Unfortunately, a common European energy policy is, to all intents and purposes, conspicuous by its absence. Everyone is out to save his own skin. It is true that the consumption of oil has been cut by a few percentage points thanks to industry's efforts to change to other sources of energy and thanks also to savings achieved by consumers, but the political decisions taken by the Council of Energy Ministers and at the economic summit in Venice provide for only 40% of our energy requirements to be met by oil by 1990. However, I very much doubt whether the proposal put forward yesterday by the Socialist Group to create a European oil-buying consortium to cut out the multinationals is the right way of going about this, particularly as the multinationals have provided us — and particularly the countries being blackmailed — with very good supplies at times of crisis.

The aim is for coal and nuclear energy to provide 75% of our electricity-generating capacity by 1990, compared with 50% now. That, at least, is the idea. But what, pray, is being done to implement these summit declarations and to make it possible for us to take them seriously? I would expressly exonerate France from this criticism.

We now have eight million unemployed in the Community, an intolerable figure. It is a fact, though, that adequate supplies of energy are a prerequisite for all economic activities and all economic growth. Hundreds of thousands of jobs could be created every year in the energy sector by increasing our production of fossil fuels — especially coal and coal processing — by stepping up the use of nuclear energy, by energy saving and conservation and by developing alternative energy sources.

For all this, though, we need a genuine Community will and an investment programme which will make it possible for us to achieve these aims, and which will require considerable sacrifices to be made by all concerned. The most expensive form of energy is that

which we do not have, both politically speaking — where we have become open to blackmail — and economically speaking, where we must draw up a joint energy programme to enable us to reduce the level of unemployment.

We hope, Mr Van der Klaauw, that you will, in your all too brief period of office, be able to do something to point us in the right direction.

President. — I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, I would like to associate myself with what has been said about the tragic death of Commissioner Gundelach.

In the short time that is mine I want to say that there are certain important things that the Council of Ministers, now under the Dutch presidency, could do to help Northern Ireland. And if the EEC really wants to assist us, then let it tackle these matters with resolution and purpose.

For example, in the all-important area of agriculture there is a £ 40 million package for the less-favoured areas of Northern Ireland, which to date the Council of Ministers has blocked. At meeting after meeting it has been adjourned for further discussion and put on the long finger. Now while this package is not some wondrous panacea for the severe difficulties of Northern Ireland's agricultural industry, none the less its implementation would be of some help to those areas covered by it. Therefore I appeal to the new President-in-Office as a matter of top priority to ensure that the 'less-favoured areas' package is given an immediate go-ahead. As I have told this Assembly before, the agricultural industry of Northern Ireland is haemorrhaging to death. While this EEC package, envisaged since last June, will not save our industry, it might at least act as something of a transfusion and short-term relief.

However, even more pressing in the agricultural industry of Northern Ireland is immediate aid for the intensive livestock sector which, due to the excessive cost of feedstuffs in Northern Ireland resulting from the unique costs involved in importing grain, is in the gravest danger of total collapse. Remembering that it is the EEC which prevents Northern Ireland from availing itself of cheaper grain on the world market, the Council of Ministers must in the next few months sanction some short-term relief such as was afforded to Italy through the Italian levy rebate scheme and must settle upon a long-term solution. As I reminded this House on Monday, the only long-term solution that I can see is to permit the storing of intervention grain in Northern Ireland, so that the EEC bear the cost of transportation and the Northern Ireland farmers could then avail themselves of grain at prices more in keeping with those prevailing in other parts of the

Paisley

Community. With an all-time high of 617 000 tonnes of grains now held in intervention in Great Britain, this surely would be a very viable undertaking. I trust that serious and sympathetic consideration will be given to this proposition and that by the time we come to look back on the Dutch presidency, we will be able to say with relief that realistic steps were taken to save the intensive livestock industry of Northern Ireland.

The plight, Mr President, of Northern Ireland's farming could not be over-exaggerated. Farm incomes have fallen in the last two years by a staggering 60% per annum, with the result that it is anticipated that incomes for this year will, in real terms, be only 20% of the 1978 level. Farmers are tottering on the brink of disaster, as evidenced by the fact that in the last 12 months they have had to borrow an extra £37 million. Such a situation cannot continue; action must be taken and taken quickly. In Northern Ireland we have a large number of young go-ahead farmers. These have invested heavily in new equipment and new buildings. The interest rates on borrowed capital are now crippling these men. Direct borrowing facilities at low interest rates from the European Investment Bank would be an immense help.

To date there has not been in my opinion the political will to face up to these issues for Northern Ireland. Tomorrow Mr Peter Walker, the United Kingdom Minister for Agriculture, will meet the representatives of the Ulster Farmers' Union. I trust that when he next meets his colleagues in the Council they will listen sympathetically to what he has to say about Northern Ireland farming and that they will be able to take appropriate action.

President. — I call Mr De Goede.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to use a part of the few minutes available to me to offer my warm congratulations at the start of the Dutch presidency. It is true, of course, that a presidency of six months can only be of marginal significance against the background sketched by the President-in-Office. I should personally like to add my hope that this presidency will be no less effective than that of Luxembourg and before that of Italy. Though six months is a short time, adequate — that is, major — efforts are required to solve the very major problems confronting us.

The four priorities which have been mentioned, Mr President, are in our view correct. But I should like to make a couple of comments.

The first is that I share the view that neither the basic principles of the common agricultural policy, nor the common financial responsibility should be tampered with. However, restructuring must not in my view merely mean a regrouping of budget figures, with the

aim of giving the agricultural expenditure a cosmetic facelift. No, restructuring must mean primarily rationalization of the many excesses, including surplus production. I feel that a Dutch presidency which is knowledgeable in this field can certainly contribute much to achieving this, and this must be given top priority. Perhaps the President-in-Office shares this view.

Now that I have mentioned the word 'budget', I wish to express my disappointment that the President-in-Office failed — and I find this a serious omission — to discuss adequately the problem of the exhaustion of own resources. If there is one urgent problem threatening the future of our common policy it is this one.

This afternoon we shall be debating here the excellent Spinelli report on these problems, and I should like to ask the Netherlands presidency to promise that from next week this report will appear on the Council agenda. We should then be able to attach some credibility to the promise made by the President-in-Office this morning that the opinions of Parliament will be treated as they ought to be treated. I endorse fully Mr Penders's remarks on the continued necessary consultation between Council and Parliament with respect to budgetary procedure.

Secondly, I believe that the combatting of the economic crisis is rightly set as the number two priority. But I find the suggestions as to how it might be achieved inadequate. The only specific element is the announcement of the decision by the European Council to call a special Council, the so-called jumbo Council, to discuss unemployment.

I believe that the Dutch presidency has an obligation to act much more vigorously than its expressed intentions indicate. The 1980s will be years of even greater problems. May I therefore ask you to come up with some imaginative initiatives to help achieve a coordinated tackling of the economic problems? The past offers good examples.

I also find the passages on energy remarkably uninformative, even though it is in this area that the cause and to a large extent the solution to our problems may be found. A document of 37 pages, which contains so little on this key problem, can only be regarded as uninspired, imprecise, and not up to much. I really wonder whether there is sufficient realization of the problems which face us.

My third comment relates to the Community institutions. Nothing that was said on the functioning of the institutions has inspired me with much confidence. Sir James Scott-Hopkins and others have rightly pointed out that the Report of the Three Wise Men has led to little, if anything, specific. The problem of the seat of Parliament is part and parcel of this. What is the President-in-Office going to do about it now?

May I also say something on the suggestion that the Dutch Prime Minister should come here as President

de Goede

of the European Council after the Maastricht Summit. He must not yield to pressure from anybody not to appear. We expect him here.

My fourth and final point, Mr President, relates to European political cooperation. I approve the policy which has been pursued as regards Poland, which has been more uniform and more effective than that on Afghanistan. As regards the Middle East I can summarize by saying that I agree with the remarks and questions of Mr Penders and Mrs Van den Heuvel. I find the passage devoted to cooperation with the United States extremely weak. What is very necessary, and this applies also to the Middle East as recent events show, is a Community policy more closely aligned to that of the United States and vice versa in matters relating to foreign policy and major economic problems. I would mention Japan in this respect. Now that a new administration has taken over in the USA, there is not only a new possibility but a new necessity to achieve a less fragmented policy in the West in the face of the much increased tensions in the world. I hope that the President-in-Office will be able to give us, this afternoon or in his answer now, some more specific indications than he did this morning.

President. — I call Mr Van der Klaauw.

Mr Van der Klaauw, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) Mr President, I have listened with great attention to this, my first debate in the European Parliament. In the run-up to the first direct elections I made a number of speeches in various parts of the Netherlands in which I stressed the importance which I attach to this directly-elected Parliament. It is my conviction that Parliament must play an increasingly great role in European Community cooperation, but as history has repeatedly demonstrated Parliament will have to conquer this role for itself. It is not a matter of being given but of fighting for a role of its own, and the Netherlands presidency will do its utmost to strengthen that role. Much has been said on this, great hopes have been expressed, and there have been some rather sceptical reactions to what I said. But I do believe that Parliament will have to fight and fight hard. For my part I shall try to help this process by working strenuously for it, for the actions of the President of the Council on this are of primary importance, and my attitude is favourable. I wish to make that clear right from the start.

It is naturally almost impossible to deal with all the questions which have been put here. I should like to assure you that I have listened with great interest and I have the feeling that this is indeed a vital parliament, and one that is serious about wanting to exert influence on the Council and the Commission. I welcome that. I have listened with attention and interest and have learned a great deal from this debate.

Following this general comment I should like to try to answer a number of your questions. The extremely important problems of the restructuring of the budget, the agricultural policy and the consequences thereof have of course been discussed. As one of the last speakers said, the Spinelli Report is of importance in this context. I do not believe that the Spinelli Report should be put on the agenda for next Tuesday's Council meeting. But I do believe that the Spinelli Report should be an important element in our discussions on restructuring. It is part of this discussion, for these are not matters which should be dealt with separately. The problem of own resources is, of course, very complex. As we all know, one of the reasons for the restructuring is that own resources are threatening to become insufficient, with all the problems this entails. My own belief is that we shall have to raise own resources in due course, but I also feel that we must work towards a rationalization of agriculture — I quote Mr de Goede — at the present time so that we can devote more attention to other policy sectors — Mr Paisley spoke of regional policy — and carry out a better regional and social policy. If this happens, and the Community accepts its responsibilities in these areas, this will provide grounds for the national governments to provide the Community with additional own resources. The first thing we have to do is to restructure. Mrs Van den Heuvel described my use of the word 'adjustment' as feeble. But it makes no difference whether I use the word 'adjustment' or the word 'restructuring'. When I speak of adjustment I also mean the maintenance of the common agricultural policy. There are indeed excesses, and these must be remedied, but we must retain the common agricultural policy. This is an essential element of the Community, as I pointed out in my earlier speech. As regards the timetable of the restructuring, the Commission has been instructed to report on 15 June. That date has been fixed. Of course I do not believe that the Council should sit idle until 15 June. I am convinced that it is vitally important that the restructuring should get moving this year and that we should take decisions this year. That means, of course, that if we only start to progress after 15 June, with the summer holidays and so on, things will become extremely difficult, and it is naturally of great importance to solve these problems before the end of this year, particularly in the light of the 1982 budget. This also brings to mind the problem of the British contribution. This being so, we have to stand by the basic principle that it is the Commission which must put forward initiatives. That is the Commission's job and the Council must not steal the Commission's clothes, but I do consider that it is vitally important that the Council should maintain constant contact with the Commission on these problems so that there is a high degree of certainty that when the Commission comes with its proposals in June they will be acceptable to everyone.

With respect to the jumbo Council, the Council of Economic, Financial and Social Ministers, I am convinced, like other speakers, that what is important

Van der Klaauw

is the results. I do not find it important in itself that this Council will be meeting with a Dutch chairman. The Netherlands did not propose this Council in order to gain prestige: the important thing is to be able to employ all the resources of the Community to pursue an economic and social policy which will combat unemployment. That is the objective of this Council and that is the important thing. The question of the seat of Parliament was also raised. First of all, I would emphasize that this question is not limited to three countries in the Community. It is a matter on which the entire Community must make a decision. This question will be discussed at the conference of Member States, and it will be discussed again next week. It is being actively studied at the present time, but I am unable to say anything about the results of these studies — and I think this is wise — even about such questions as whether it is national interest or efficiency that is at stake. I believe that many elements have a role to play, and these undoubtedly include the element of efficiency.

Mrs Van den Heuvel commented that I did not mention agriculture in the context of the negotiations with Spain. I believe that we must all be sufficiently realistic to understand that in the negotiations with Spain the question of agriculture is the most difficult, as the Spaniards themselves realize. A great many factors are at play; we only have to think of our own restructuring, our own agricultural policy which we have to put in order. The Dutch presidency will do its best to help this along, together with its other tasks, but given our own problems it seems sensible to postpone the discussion of the agricultural problem, just because it is the most difficult, to a later date. It is none the less vital that we continue these negotiations with Spain and Portugal, because it is important to support these democratic countries so that they can accede to the Community, and to do so energetically. There are more than enough problems to be discussed and it is indeed the intention of the Netherlands presidency that this should happen and that negotiations should really start in earnest. Agriculture will therefore be added to the agenda in due course.

As regards the Middle East, the present situation is that there will be further consultation next week and I hope that we shall see agreement on the terms on which I shall carry out the mission. The decision to send me on this tour was taken by the European Council in December and I shall naturally carry out my mandate conscientiously, in full awareness of the responsibility of the Netherlands presidency. It will not be a simple task, it will be an extremely difficult one, but I believe that it is good that Europe should show its face in the Middle East, that it should put genuine questions, and try to clarify the various standpoints so that the parties can, if possible, be brought closer together. Europe is not putting a peace plan forward — it cannot impose its views — but Europe does have a task in the Middle East, because this area is so close to us and because we have so many ties with

it. It is Europe's duty to try to bring the people and countries in that region closer together again. I am convinced that this tour should not conflict with the initiatives of the United States. I believe that the important thing is for Europe and the United States to try, possibly from different points of view, but acting along parallel lines, to bring peace to that part of the world.

I see that Mr Berkhouwer is back with us, and I should simply like to say to him on the question of the European passport that this matter will be on the Council agenda for decision — I repeat for decision — in March. I am hopeful that this will indeed prove to be possible, because I consider it a step forward for the Community, even in the eyes of the world.

The Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs discussed the Report of the Three Wise Men. It was also discussed at the last European Council. If I may speak briefly as a Netherlands minister I consider this an excellent report and I believe that a great deal of it can be put into effect. In general I would say that a number of points have been implemented and a number have not yet been implemented. But I do believe that these points should continue to receive attention. One of the items raised by various speakers is that of the accountability of the European Councils to Parliament. This is one of the matters that has not yet been decided and on which discussion is continuing. So I cannot at this time tell you what the result of this discussion will be or what the consequences will be for the European Council in Maastricht. If the Netherlands Prime Minister is unable to come, although he is personally quite prepared to come here, I myself will report on this Council meeting to Parliament.

Mr Israël spoke of the Euro-Arab Dialogue and particularly of the fact that Egypt is not participating in it. That is indeed so. I believe it to be important, and it is our intention to ensure that this happens, that in the context of our own Middle Eastern policy we Europeans maintain good contacts with Egypt, which is an important Middle Eastern country. Egypt has a policy of its own which is of vital importance in the Middle East situation, and we shall keep these contacts going.

Our new Greek colleague, Mr Pשמazoglou, put three questions to me, firstly about local wars. We are of course against these, and within the limits of its powers the Community is trying to use its good offices here. But this is by no means always possible, for example in the war between Iran and Iraq which we naturally all greatly deplore, and which we hope for many political and economic reasons will shortly cease. None the less, we all know how little success attempts at mediation by Islamic countries, for instance, have had. Naturally, we should like to see the Community having a role here too.

Van der Klaauw

Mr Pesmazoglou's second point touched on the law of the sea. As far as I can make out, the Conference on the Law of the Sea has gone generally well.

The Community has also adopted common positions at this Conference. I am hopeful that this Conference can finish this year, and that it will lead to a breakthrough in the law of the sea. I believe that this is one of the things we can look forward to with some optimism, and that it is a matter of extreme importance for the entire world, from a political and from an economic and legal point of view, and also as regards the exploitation of marine resources. It will be a real achievement if we can manage that this year.

Finally, he raised the question of municipal elections and the participation of EEC citizens in municipal elections in other countries. This is, of course, a highly complicated question, involving voting rights, registration, and so on, but it is something which is being actively studied and I hope we shall achieve some results, because it would in itself be a good thing.

Mr President, El Salvador — I am hopping about a bit because the various questions came up one after the other in the debate — El Salvador is an area which is causing us all great concern, of course. The murders and the violence which are taking place there must move the conscience of any normal person. It is not easy to see to what extent the Community can play an active role there, but it is certainly something which we shall look at during the next political consultation.

The Commissioner's report about a Community arms industry is unknown to me — Mr Martin referred to this — I do not know it, and cannot therefore express any views on it.

Two final comments, Mr President. A number of Honourable Members expressed surprise that I did not discuss the current budget problems. This may have been because they had my speech before them in the form in which it was originally composed. I did, however, add a passage in which I discussed the budget problems, and referred to the primary responsibility which is the Commission's at this moment, and the willingness of the Presidency to take action if this proves necessary.

As regards the salaries, discussions are going on at Brussels at the moment and the Presidency has made a number of proposals which are being examined at the present time. I hope that we can reach a solution. I do believe, of course that we on our side must respect the legal obligations which we accepted in the past year *vis-à-vis* the officials. On the other hand, I do believe that when we look at salary policies in the individual countries of the Community, and the colossal economic and social problems facing us, and when we understand the need to make economies in all areas, a sacrifice will have to be asked this year of the officials of the Community, for all our sakes.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of all those who have stayed until the end of the debate, I regret that the Chamber is not as full as I would have hoped, since a number of Members are absent at a religious service in town for the late Mr Gundelach. I hope that the President of the Council will not take this amiss.

5. *Urgent debate*

President. — Pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, I have received

- from the Commission a request for urgent debate during this part-session on its proposal for a regulation on cereals (Doc. 1-701/80).

The reason put forward to justify urgent debate is the fact that this proposal should have been adopted by 15 December 1980.

I would point out that a report on this matter was placed provisionally on the agenda for 15 January, but the Committee on Agriculture was unable to adopt this report.

The vote on this request for urgent debate will take place at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting;

- from the Council a request for urgent debate during this part-session on proposals for regulations on sugar and isoglucose (Doc. 1-700/80).

Since the Committee on Agriculture has submitted a report by Mr Delatte on this subject (Doc. 1-792/80), there is no need for urgent procedure.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 3.00 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 12.45 p.m. and resumed at 3.00 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR POUL MØLLER

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

6. *Council statement on the programme of the Dutch presidency*

(continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the programme of the Dutch presidency.

President

I call Mr Nyborg.

Mr Nyborg. — (DK) Mr President, I should like to begin by addressing a word of welcome to the Dutch presidency represented by Mr Van der Klaauw. A lot of Members are, like me, looking forward to the Dutch tenure of the presidency because the Dutch have always been regarded by their European colleagues as being very good at getting things done. I hope that this reputation will prove justified in their work for the Community, not only as regards whatever new problems crop up, but also in terms of their ability to dig out some of the things which are lying in the Council's drawers waiting for a decision. It is always frustrating and depressing for the Commission and Parliament to discover that much of the work to which we devote so much enthusiasm simply gets stuck into the Council's drawers and all too often does not even get discussed, let alone decided on.

As the Dutch presidency undoubtedly realizes, our speaking time is strictly limited in this House, and I shall therefore confine myself to a few remarks. I very much hope we shall see a real effort made to get the customs union to function as it was supposed to. What I mean by this is the removal of technical barriers to trade — the kind of barriers which are difficult to get around when it comes to transporting things or people from one part of the Community to another. I very much hope that a start will be made on a Community fisheries policy worthy of the name, but not at the cost of any one Member State. I have confidence in the Dutch presidency's ability to get things moving here.

I also hope that the Dutch presidency will be able to solve the problems which are currently plaguing the common agricultural policy in such a way that the principles which have applied so far and which have proved to be a cornerstone of the Community remain unaffected.

I think that, perhaps to a greater extent than we have so far, we should concentrate on implementing the provisions of the EEC Treaty rather than taking political decisions and coming up with political gestures which do not fall within the Treaty framework.

The Nine — now the Ten — will, I am quite sure, give the Dutch presidency plenty of work to be getting on with over the next five to six months. Given the economic conditions obtaining at present, it is in my opinion essential to extend cooperation as much as possible between the countries of the Community and Western Europe as a whole, especially in the fields of economics, energy and the environment.

I wish the Dutch presidency the best of luck in its work.

President. — The debate is closed.

7. *Community's own resources*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-772/80), drawn up by Mr Spinelli on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the Community's own resources.

I call Mr Spinelli.

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) In the short time at my disposal, Mr President, I shall not be able to explain as I should have wished how much of this report is due to the individual work of the six members of the working party from the six major political groups in the House and also to our close team-work. You will find their names on the first page of the document in front of you. What you will not find, because it is not customary, are the names of our helpers from the committee secretariat. I should like to take this opportunity of thanking them all, and especially Mr Guccione and Mr Giraud. Without their willing and expert help we should not have found it so easy to cope with the task we had.

A parliamentary motion on the Community's new own resources proved necessary, Mr President, because of the last Commission's obvious and shocking reluctance to fulfil one of its specific duties. The old Commission knew better than any other institution that the Community resources covered by the Treaties were about to run out and on several occasions it announced its ideas. But all it could come up with was a white paper in which various tax-related alternatives were considered. I know it is useful for the Commission to prepare white papers and memoranda, but its special job is to produce proposals for regulations and directives and changes to the Treaties.

This depressing allegation of deficiency does not apply to Mr Tugendhat. As we all know, he was constantly trying to stir the old Commission out of its lethargy, but without success. We hope he will be more successful with the new Commission, in which we are delighted to see that he has kept the same job as he had before.

If Parliament adopts this motion for a resolution — and this is what I am asking on behalf of the Committee on Budgets — it will be asking the Commission to comply with what the motion demands. This will be the crunch point in the hoped — for cooperation between the Commission and Parliament. For this reason we do not expect Mr Tugendhat to be very specific in outlining the Commission response to this report. We appreciate that the new Commission will not have had time to discuss it, but we expect an answer next month.

The proposal to provide the Community with new fiscal resources is inextricably linked to the adoption of regulations and directives on the organization of

Spinelli

agricultural markets. While complying with each and every one of the Treaty conditions on agricultural policy, the new legislation will nevertheless put an end to the soaring costs of the price support system and the creation of expensive surpluses. If this condition were not satisfied, it would be inadmissible and irresponsible to go looking for more money for this bottomless pit. It is not our job to say what the new agricultural policy could be at this time, but we were duty-bound to make quite clear — and this we have done — what budgetary policy it will have to comply with.

New resources are needed because new common policies are needed. We are asking the Commission, when it submits its programme to the Council, to undertake to propose without delay the abolition of the 1% ceiling on the VAT yield and the VAT corrective mechanism. We want it to undertake to present proposals for developing the loans policy in line with the wishes of the European Parliament, and we want it to include the co-responsibility levy in the budget revenue. We want precise details of the timetable for presenting proposals on complete harmonization of the basis of assessment and subsequently of VAT rates, introduction of the declaration-based method of VAT collection, supervision of collection of duties, issue of ECU-denominated Community bonds and possible harmonization of the basis of assessment and of the rates of direct and indirect taxation. Finally, we want the Commission to withdraw the 1973 proposal for an amendment of Article 201 EEC and introduce a new proposal in line with the decision-making mechanism suggested by the European Parliament.

I should like to mention in more detail two points which may perhaps be considered the major innovations in our proposal. The first point is that we need to introduce greater equity among the Member States in the Community tax system. For this purpose a corrective mechanism which will not affect the method by which own resources are paid by the citizens of the Community but which will raise the Community VAT rate for the richer countries and lower it for the poorer ones. Mr Arndt devoted himself to working out this idea with exceptional skill and attention and he will probably have an opportunity of explaining it himself in greater detail.

The second innovation we propose has wider implications. The Community and its Member States are separate political entities, each with its own institutions, its own policies, its own budget and therefore its own resources. Both the Community and the Member States are financed in the same way, by taxes paid by the citizens who are at the same time citizens of their own country and the Community.

We therefore propose that Parliament, as representative of the Community's citizens, should in the first year following its election consider with the Commission whether, and under what conditions, there should be a reallocation of responsibilities and financial

resources between the Member States and the Community for the next five-year period, and that it should also adopt a draft joint declaration on the Community's financial needs and resources. This would serve as a genuine guideline programme in political and financial terms for the following five years.

Since we are already in the third year, we think this idea could be introduced at once, at least for the time we have left before the next European elections. This would be a very democratic way of finding out which of the fiscal resources should be switched for a time from the national to the Community budget or the other way, and there would be no risk — which we fear just as much as the Council and some of the governments do — that the Community's financial autonomy would degenerate into financial irresponsibility. It is an open question where, in which institution, the danger of irresponsibility lurks.

On the last and umpteenth occasion that a budgetary crisis split Parliament and the Council, one Head of Government said that when it came to deciding on the Community's revenue the governments had the final say. He was way off the mark. It is Parliament which has the last say on the entire budget, both revenue and expenditure, apart from the so-called compulsory expenditure.

You just have to read the Treaties, and as someone who spent years in the Commission, which acts as the guardian of the Treaties, I ought to know what I am talking about.

It is about time we stopped this squabbling which recurs at the end of every year between those of us who think that the Community is doing too little and making a bad job of it and the Council which considers that too much is being done. A way out can be found only if we introduce an opportunity for multiannual programmes which have been democratically discussed and adopted, and scope for policies to be implemented and consequently resources to be distributed.

Mr President, this topic of own resources really deserves more detailed comment on my part, but it is typical of the crazy times we live in that a debate of this importance has to be over in an hour and a half. So I am stopping now.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr Arndt to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Arndt. — *(D)* Mr President, this report raises a number of questions of principle, such as how to finance expenditure, how to deal with the extra load

Arndt

placed on the Member States and how these resources are to be collected. There will probably be a good deal of debate on these various aspects, but as far as my group is concerned, the really basic question is what do we want more money for. We are not content simply to say that we want another 50 or 100 million ECU. The main question in the opinion of my group is what are the Community's main tasks. We would therefore have preferred to see a more thorough preparation for this debate.

Let me just give you a simple example. Our Greek friends have only just been given copies of this report, which means that they are hardly in a position to go through all the details and give their opinion on it. The Greeks, for instance, could legitimately say that, if all the Community wants is more money, why should we vote in favour. But the situation would be quite different if the report and this debate were to make it clear what the money is intended for and what use the additional own resources would be put to — for example, for improving the economic structure of a country like Greece. On a number of occasions in the past, the Socialist Group has made it quite clear what it regards as its most important mandate from the electorate.

No-one would deny that the development of the economy and its financial interests took priority in the first twenty years of the European Community's existence. It is really high time we tackled the aim enshrined in the Treaty of Rome of reducing the differences in per capita income and economic structure between the regions of Europe.

Comparing 1980 with 1957 or 1958, one is bound to conclude that there has been a trend towards less equality, and that the gap between rich and poor countries has widened substantially. This comparison also brings out the fact that we have failed to solve the enormous problem of unemployment, and we shall never alter this trend by relying on market forces. Anyone who is acquainted with the rules of the market economy will know that they will never bring about social justice of their own accord. A combination of being situated on the outskirts of Europe — as is the case with Ireland, southern Italy, parts of Great Britain and Greece — and structural handicaps are bound to result in disadvantages under the market rules. We are also aware of the fact that the growing divergence in economic power and prosperity will endanger the Community. Our demand that the gap between rich and poor in Europe be reduced can only be met if we are prepared to exert an influence on social and economic developments — and that is something we can do. This must be the central point in the debate on more resources for the European Community.

My group is not concerned solely with getting more money. Our basic political programme states quite clearly that more resources should be made available for regional and social policy, with the aim of reducing the large discrepancies between regions and

sections of the population. How often have we heard in this House that more economic convergence between the Member States is one of the Community's main tasks? We in the Socialist Group are therefore in no circumstances prepared to endorse a demand for more resources without closing the gap between rich and poor in Europe; we are not prepared to join in the clamour for more resources simply to produce structural surpluses in the agricultural sector or to enable the Community to carry on in the same old way.

What the Socialist Group wants to see is more solidarity between the regions. We are in favour of structural reforms. We are in favour of providing aid to enable science and technology to modernize obsolete industrial structures and create new industries. We want to see funds made available for the regional policy. We want to see funds made available for employment, structural and short-term economic policies. We want to see funds made available for an effective programme on energy supplies and the development of alternative energy sources. We want to see funds made available to enable Europe to show its solidarity with the poorer regions of the world by providing those regions with concrete development aid. The Socialist Group is prepared to support the demand for additional own resources provided they are put to use for these purposes.

Our discussions with the Council of Ministers on the budget over recent weeks and months have shown us that we are right to be sceptical because, if we encounter this kind of trouble over the paltry additional amounts we have demanded for regional and social policy, one is bound to wonder whether — given more own resources for these policy sectors — the money will really be paid out. We, the Socialist Group, say quite clearly and categorically — and this is an additional element in the dispute over the budget — that what we want is for those Member States with a higher standard of living to pay more than the poorer countries. That is why we are so disappointed at the fact that precisely those Member States with a higher standard of living, and which have derived the greatest benefit from the Community in the past, are now refusing payment of the necessary funds in the dispute over the supplementary budget for 1980.

(Applause)

Those are my group's maxims. As far as we are concerned, the technicalities of how to increase the Community's own resources are only of secondary importance. The main thing is to decide for what European purposes — and hence for what people — this money is to be used. That is the yardstick we shall apply in deciding whether or not it is right to commit more own resources to these policy sectors.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Barbi to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Barbi. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party let me say that we endorse the Spinelli Report and hope that it will get the approval of Members in all the groups. It represents a significant point of view, in political as well as in technical and economic terms. What we in the European Parliament have to do and what we have to make the Council do, Mr President-in-Office, is to reach a decision on the financial resources which are essential for the implementation of Community policy. What is more, we have to reach a decision which will boost the credibility of the Community in the eyes of the general public and of our voters, so that there is no longer that vast gap we complain about nowadays between the solemn and high-sounding pronouncements of the European Council meetings and things as they really are.

Many Members, including myself, here in this Chamber have had occasion in the past to point out to the Council and the Commission that the fact of starting up the European Monetary System without doing a thing — a good two years after the Bremen statements — to introduce a policy for the economic convergence of the various regions in the Community is tantamount to jeopardizing the continuing existence of the EMS. This is because economies which vary so much and which are linked to such a wide range of inflation rates cannot, in the long run, depend on the same monetary system. We have also had occasion to say that the Venice statement on the intention to implement a Community energy policy without financing it properly — and indeed it was stressed that we should keep within the 1% VAT limit — meant that the people of Europe were being taken for a ride and that any European energy policy would be practically impossible.

But these policies are vital, not just for the development but for the very survival of the economies of the individual Member States, in view of the challenge posed by the current world situation and by the way things are developing politically and economically around us. There may still be the odd political group or individual ready to believe that these challenges can be met with the national resources of individual countries, but these people are really kidding themselves because our economies have now developed to such a degree of mutual integration and interdependence that the development of one depends on the development of another and any difficulty, crisis or recession experienced by one has an adverse effect on the economies of the stronger and more thriving countries. This is particularly apparent in monetary affairs where inflationary trends in the weaker countries have serious economic repercussions on trade and therefore affect production and jobs in the stronger countries. Anyway, this is really why the EMS was set up.

The same can be said about energy where the temptation to go it alone can be very enticing — I am thinking of the United Kingdom, for example, with its North Sea oil — but here the risk of kidding ourselves is even greater because of the vast implications involved, the speed of technological and economic developments and the tremendous amount of research required, and the tightly-knit pattern of economic interdependence.

Most of our fellow Europeans are well aware of all this, and those of us in the majority in this European Parliament are also convinced of it. Even the Council of Ministers has shown that it is convinced on several occasions, but if you are going to put such beliefs to logical use, you need the proper, adequate financial resources. It was with a view to offering a thorough and definite response to this requirement that the Committee on Budgets considered, amended and finally approved the working party's report which is now before the House. I am sure that Members will have had the courtesy to consider the document.

There were numerous points in the report which prompted lengthy, exhaustive and heated debate, first within the working party — of which I was privileged to be a member — and then within the Committee on Budgets, but there are only two which I want to mention here, as I feel they are relatively important.

The first point concerns the balance between agricultural and other spending. Almost everyone agrees that the balance is wrong and has to be put right. Just this morning the President of the Council was saying that we have to achieve a better balance in Community spending. He is quite right, you know. But I should not like us to fall into the trap of kidding ourselves again, in the sense of believing that we can achieve this balance simply by amending agricultural expenditure and thereby reducing it, so that we can boost spending on other policies.

Ladies and gentlemen, we all want to see the common agricultural policy changed, especially some of those automatic procedures which have led to uncontrollable and abnormal expansion and which encourage surpluses in sectors, such as the dairy sector, which really have nothing to do with agriculture, by which I mean the farm workers out in the fields. We all want to see this change, but not everyone is fully aware that there is no way that changes like this will manage to provide the financial resources we need for the other policies. The fact is that we do want to see the common agricultural policy changed, improved and brought to perfection, but we do not want to see it destroyed or eliminated. What we want to see alongside the common agricultural policy and the iron and steel policy — which was the first to emerge with the ECSC — and the customs policy are other Community policies, such as policies for energy, industrial reconversion and transport, or else we want to see the expansion of those Community policies which have

Barbi

barely got off the ground, such as the regional and social policies and our policy for the development of the Third World. We want these new Community policies to bring our Member States the same benefits of economic development and savings in national expenditure which accrued from the iron and steel policy, the customs policy and the agricultural policy, to our own general satisfaction and to the admiration and envy of those outside the Community.

What this means of course is that we have to spend more, a lot more. Our document mentions the MacDougal report which speaks of tripling the current level of Community expenditure — from 0.8 to 2.5% of the Community's GNP — as a reasonable prerequisite for making Community activity a viable economic proposition. Of course, this is not a level which has to be attained at once, just like that, but it is a goal we have to move towards gradually, taking a realistic approach, as each new policy gets under way and develops. However, it is a goal which has to be visible at the end of the road, and this is why we suggest eliminating the VAT ceiling and why we propose a new decision-making machinery, a method which will enable increases in revenue and expenditure to be subject to the democratic approval and supervision of Parliament and, what is more, to be considered, discussed and voted on every five years by the voters, the people of Europe.

There is a second and final point I want to make. Among the arguments put forward — with the voters in mind, if the truth be known — against the proposal to increase the Community's own resources, the one that stands out is the reluctance to allow any increase in public spending, with pressure on the tax-payer as a result, at a time when our economies are struggling to cope with the general crisis and our governments are striving to rescue the economies from the grip of recession and inflation. If you ask me, this is specious humbug because most Community spending has not meant, does not mean and does not have to mean in future an increase in public spending in our countries. It simply means a shift in the dividing line between national and Community expenditure. Another point: the use and utilization of Community funds can and will be possible only to the extent that they are more advantageous and more likely to give a general boost to the economy than spending financed individually by the Member States. They represent alternative, not additional spending and, what is more, it is spending that is more profitable than national expenditure, which means that the money of the European taxpayer will be used better, more efficiently and more usefully. We have already seen this with our policies on steel, farming and the customs union. It is so obvious that almost everyone — even the most ardent nationalist critics — acknowledges that the Community has managed to organize such a profitable economic system that it would be impossible to dismantle it without disastrous repercussions for the individual Member States, the individual economies

and, in particular, our businessmen and traders. It is so obvious that no-one wants to leave the Community and instead they are queuing up to join. Greece has just come in — and let me take this opportunity of expressing my welcome to the Greek Members — and next in line are Spain and Portugal, who we hope will be here with us as soon as possible.

It is not illogical and wasteful, Mr President, and it is not a misuse of public money to advocate expanding the activities and therefore the spending of the Community. On the contrary, this is the best course, the most reliable way in economic terms and the most enlightened and astute way in political terms, to serve the real interests of our fellow citizens. For this reason, I hope that our pointer towards new methods of raising Community finance will be followed by the Council and that a new era of development in our Community will begin, an era rich in material and civil progress for the people of Europe.

I therefore call on the Members in the Socialist and Liberal and Democratic Groups to use their influence with their national governments. Mr Arndt, we fully endorse what you said. The people that have to be convinced, when it comes to national reluctance on the matter of Community development, are Chancellor Schmidt and President Giscard. They are the people who are against the idea of increasing own resources. In expressing what is an old and deeply-rooted belief of mine, I appeal to the Members in these groups, because it is only with the help of Europe's political parties that this European Community of ours will make progress.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr J. M. Taylor to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr J. M. Taylor. — Mr President, many of my colleagues had not seen these documents in their own language until this week, so that whilst I am my group's speaker, you will understand if I say that our final view will have to be that reflected in our amendments in due course. None the less, I think I can fairly say that my group cautiously welcomes this document. Indeed, anyone who wishes to see Europe develop must acknowledge any serious thought about future budgetary arrangements. We applaud any sincere desire to make progress; Mr Spinelli has worked hard on his report, and that should be appreciated by this Parliament.

His opening recitals I think entirely fair although some may feel that it is a little hard to predict the future performance of customs duties with any precision in light of their erratic performance in the last two years, going up when all the orthodox economists said they would go down.

Taylor

The report goes on to deal, in Section I, with the growth of the budget and anticipated transfers of responsibilities from Member States to the Communities.

In this regard, I must say that my group would want to register two caveats. First, it would like to see economy of scale and effectiveness, and we think that any reasonable European taxpayer would want to see that too. Secondly, we look for what we think may well be growing evidence that the Community as a treasurer achieves as good an efficiency rating as the treasuries of the Member States. Then I think we should be considerably relieved about transfers of responsibilities and resources. In Section III of the resolution, we are uneasy about paragraph 14 and we shall be tabling an amendment there. It is not that we do not believe in the thorough supervision and enforcement of revenue collection, but we do think it more realistic to oblige the authorities of the Member States to carry out this role at least in the foreseeable future.

Meanwhile, we find a lot that we like in Section II, concerning what is called the 'unity and comprehensiveness of the budget'. We have always believed that all the entries should be in the books and that all the books should be available to the Parliament. We find the section on borrowing and lending attractive and progressive, and many of us like the possibility of individual investors being able to subscribe for Community bonds.

Mr President, my two final observations in the limited time are perhaps my most important.

Firstly, with regard to the remarks in the resolution on financing the Community budget in what is called the short term, here perhaps alone the report is, disappointingly, a little less imaginative. Is an increase in VAT really the only solution in sight? Do we not perceive considerable political difficulties from some of the larger Member States in that respect? Or will inflation and agricultural spending force such a decision on the Member States? Meanwhile, what about Mr Lange's excellent proposals of November 1979 for contributions based on *per capita* GNP? And what of the Commission's mandate up and coming? And are we now actually beginning to put aside thoughts of energy taxation, disciplining consumption, containing imports and concentrating attention and resources on how we cope with our energy problems?

Lastly, Mr President, this group would not, I think, agree that much political enthusiasm is likely to be readily to hand for Community income taxation of corporation taxes, at least not in such a period as this document calls the medium term.

These, however, are only precautions. They are merely caveats from this corner of the Parliament. There is much in this document that is stimulating and provocative and progressive, and Mr Spinelli has

worked hard and done well to bring it here today. Our thanks are due to him and, mainly, our good wishes go with his report. It was on that point that I opened and it is on that note that I conclude.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Baillot of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Baillot. — (F) Mr President, on behalf of the French Communists and Allies I should like to point out that the discussion of the report on the Community's own resources is taking place at a time when our budgetary problems are once again in the news in Europe.

This year has seen a revival of Parliament's aspirations to increase its budgetary powers, despite the fact that this contravenes the Treaties in force, and the apparent disagreement over the 1980 supplementary budget between the French Government and the European Parliament — and the Commission, according to Mr Thorn's statements — does nothing to belie this appraisal. There is no fundamental disagreement between Parliament and the French Government. It is purely circumstantial considerations — let us say electoral considerations — which are at the origin of the attitude of my country's government, and as proof let me mention an article in yesterday morning's *Le Figaro*. Let the government keep responsibility for appropriations. Some people would even go so far as to say that the resoluteness of Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and Raymond Barre is intended more to embarrass their allies of the political majority than to oppose the European Parliament. And if we need any further proof that we are far from witnessing a crisis or a catastrophe as some claim, we have this in the statements made by the President-in-Office of the Council this very morning in this forum.

The French Communist and Allies deputies cannot accept this proposals made by the Committee on Budgets, reported to us by Mr Spinelli. Our opposition is not due to technical budgetary or financial considerations, but to mainly political considerations, based on our view of Europe as we presented it during the European election campaign and on the commitment we gave to our fellow countrymen in 1979. Not everybody in France can make the same claim and the present situation provides ample proof of this. The attitude of our UDF, RPR and Socialist members of Parliament speaks volumes in this respect. A superficial reading of the report might leave one with the impression that the Community is experiencing budgetary difficulties. We are told that the shortage of resources will make the implementation of a restructuring policy for industry and enlargement more difficult, with obvious social and cultural consequences, that the common agricultural policy — which absorbs more

Baillet

than two-thirds of the budget — must be changed, that new common policies must be set up, etc . . . However we are not told that the worsening of the crisis and its effects on the purchasing power of the people is reflected in a decline in domestic consumption in all countries and therefore in income from VAT, which represents the bulk of Community resources. We are not told that the ruthless competition in trade between the capitalist companies which is very often to the advantage of the United States, has, as a result of tariff agreements, led to a relative drop in Community customs' duties, not to mention the impact of the smuggling of products from Commonwealth countries, in particular New Zealand, into the European Community by way of the United Kingdom.

However, on more thorough reflection we see that the Committee on Budgets' intentions are of quite another nature. As a result of the search for own resources, in particular the striving after the impossible ideal of economic, social and cultural convergence, will not the inequalities between the Community countries and within each of them become even worse? The aim is to draw the Community ever further along the path towards integration and supranationality, and in a recent speech in Munich Mrs Veil expressed this more clearly. In our view this is basically unacceptable. I have no doubt that the large majority of Parliament is being thwarted in its objectives. If it could it would call for the levying of a European tax, but considers that this would not be judicious in the present economic situation. Such a tax would add to the present excessive burden of direct and indirect taxes in each of our countries and many Members of Parliament fear that the popular discontent caused by such over-taxation would be fuelled even more. But Parliament's restraint is only temporary. It hopes to be able to resume action when the conditions are right. In the absence of such a new tax, the report proposes transferring Member States' resources to the Community. Thus programmes and achievements would be abandoned at national level to be taken over by the European institutions. We say quite plainly that such transfers are unacceptable. Apart from the fact that the cost of such programmes and achievements at European level is much higher than at national level, as recent analyses and statistics show, in principle — and this is the essential point — such transfers detract from the independence of each of our countries and represent a move towards increased European integration and supranationality.

Since there is no more time to discuss this important problem now, we will take the opportunity next month during voting on the report presented by the Committee on Budgets to defend an amendment which will reflect our opposition to the report presented by Mr Spinelli.

President. — I call Mr Nord to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Nord. — (NL) Mr President, my group feels that today's debate — to be continued next month — is perhaps one of the most important we have had in this House so far. What is at stake is the future financing of the Community's activities and hence the future of the Community itself. To a certain extent, we are also talking about the first stage in honouring a pledge which was implicit in the staging of the first European elections in our history, and which was stated explicitly by a number of parties during the election campaign — namely, that the newly-elected European Parliament would devote its attention to the way in which the Community should develop in the future, and the kind of Europe our peoples want. Logically enough, the question of the Community's financial resources is bound to be a starting point in any such process. The financial question is a topical one — indeed, it has become an acute problem — and it is, moreover, one of the things on which the new Commission must present its proposals before the summer. This debate may help the Commission to bear certain things in mind when it comes to putting forward its proposals in the near future.

Mr President, the background to this debate is that the definitive text of Mr Spinelli's report was not made available to us until the day before yesterday. As a result, preparation of the debate within the political groups was bound to be unsatisfactory, and, as far as my group is concerned, I must add the proviso that, in view of the fact that our discussion of this matter has not yet been completed, our opinion on certain matters may be subject to further refinement, or may even give rise to views and amendments which I am not yet in a position to reveal. This proviso applies in particular to the difficult problem of the redistribution mechanism — the revenue apportionment — a matter which is fraught with snags here and there, and which we still want to discuss in more detail.

With that proviso, I should now like to comment briefly on certain aspects of the Spinelli Report. I believe that the basic philosophy behind the report is spot-on. We are nearing the ceiling of VAT revenue, and we cannot be content forevermore with a Community which is concerned only with agriculture. The Community must be given powers over other policy sectors. It is a mistake to think that, by saving a bit on the agricultural side, we shall release enough money to enable us to pursue real policies in other sectors. In other words, what we need is more financial resources, but not so that this would add to the tax burden on our peoples. What we need is a transfer of policies which were hitherto financed at national level, as is the case with agriculture. The fact is, Mr President, that any decision to take joint action at European level is taken because it is felt that the same things can be done better and cheaper acting together than by every man for himself.

The conclusion we are bound to draw from this is that the present VAT ceiling cannot remain unchanged.

Nord

However, instead of *ad hoc* decisions to increase the VAT percentage — each of which will involve ten separate national ratification procedures — we must do away with the ceiling as such and set up a Community procedure to be applied in the future to the Community's financial requirements. We can proceed here — as the report does — on the basis of the proposals put forward by the Commission as early as 1973, which just need to be reactivated and revamped somewhat. Of course, Mr President, it will not be easy to put this idea into practice, but in the final analysis, we must accept the fact that, where Community policy is to be financed by the Community, the financial decision-making policy must also be of a Community — rather than a national — nature. It is precisely those people who are wont to claim that Parliament acts irresponsibly whenever it increases expenditure without taking responsibility for revenue at the same time who should be delighted at the introduction of a system whereby Parliament accepts part of the responsibility for revenue as one arm of the budgetary authority, and can thus play a full part as the representative of the people who have to supply the revenue in the first place.

Mr President, I should like to conclude my brief remarks by thanking Mr Spinelli on behalf of my group. It is thanks to his initiative that we have now made a start on a debate which we pledged to our voters during the election campaign.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Vié to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Vié. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the problems raised by Mr Spinelli's report are of such magnitude that it is really not possible to deal with them in a few minutes. I therefore have no alternative, speaking on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats which I represent, but to emphasize the points which we consider as being most vital and in doing so to limit myself to two main observations.

The first is that in our opinion this report is based on a fiction, that of a Europe which does not exist in the way Mr Spinelli imagines or wishes. If it did then undoubtedly the conclusions which he draws would be both pertinent and necessary. In my view the most important quality in a politician is realism, and if we ignore the present limits within which the European institutions, including our own, the European Parliament, must function, then we are building castles in the air and behaving irresponsibly. So what is the real situation? There is no Community budget in the sense with which the word 'budget' is normally used in our national parliaments. There is, happily or unfortunately, a single common policy for which funds are necessary. These funds, which we rather loosely call

the Community budget, can only be provided after policies have been defined. On several occasions — and even just now in this House — our group and others have called for new common policies for industry, trade, energy, space, but without success for the moment. If a decision were taken to introduce one or more new policies then of course we would be the first to work eagerly to find resources in the most technically appropriate manner, but not before. But to ask for new resources now without knowing exactly what they are for is, I repeat, totally unrealistic. What national parliament would dare to say to its electorate: we are going to increase your taxes by 30%; we will tell you later what the money is to be used for?

The second observation concerns the common agricultural policy. Parliament knows how much importance our group attaches to it. This is purely a matter of logic on our part — after all, it is our only common policy. If we did not put our heart and soul into implementing it and perfecting it we would be poor craftsmen indeed. I cannot and my group cannot agree with points 1 and 2 of Mr Spinelli's report in which he refers to the agricultural surpluses.

With its temperate climate, Europe is naturally one of the most productive areas in the world. It is Europe's duty, both a moral and political duty, to produce as much as possible in order to be able to provide sustenance for other less climatically-favoured peoples. The production surplus is not, as it is made out to be, a regrettable accident of temporary duration. On European soil production surpluses are an imperative duty. What we need of course, on the other hand, is a common trade and export policy. Is it not downright hypocritical to be wringing our hands one minute about hunger in the world, and the next to clamour for voluntary restraint in food production. Of course, we do not deny, and everybody knows, that there are substantial problems, but in our opinion these mainly involve artificially-imported products which only enter Europe to be re-exported — with added commercial value, it is true, and therefore providing a source of profit — but without really having any bearing on agricultural production on European soil. But where European soil is concerned, let me repeat, the surpluses are self-evident: they are the result of our geography and climate and we have a duty to maintain them.

There is not enough time, as I said, to analyse the more technical aspects of this report, but the follow-up to this debate and the amendments which we will be able to submit will give us an opportunity to broach the technical aspects later.

I thought it important, in the course of this debate and on behalf of my group, to remind this House of the real context within which we must work.

All of us here, whoever we are, are committed passionately, but also, and this enriches our debates,

Vié

with a great diversity of opinions and views, to the construction of Europe. This cannot be achieved by dreams and by the sole force of the imagination, even a magnanimous imagination, but by the down-to-earth reality of policies patiently drawn up and implemented.

Let us not spoil the future of Europe by measures of this kind. Magnanimity is a sentiment which does credit to humanity and which, I am convinced, does credit to us all. It is needed for our task, but it is certainly not sufficient to construct the rich, free, fraternal and united Europe to which I am sure we all aspire.

President. — I call Mr Bonde to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Bonde. — (DK) Mr President, the People's Movement will be voting against the report which proposes to increase the Community's own resources. We are not in favour of raising the VAT ceiling, nor of introducing any new taxes such as income tax payable to the Community. We have seen just what happens when this House is given an inch. In its eagerness to wrest more control over the Community's purse strings, one half of the budgetary authority did not hesitate to take the unfortunate Italian earthquake as a kind of hostage, as it were, to be used in its own ambitious plans. Instead of accepting the Council's proposal to send Dkr 312 million to Italy so that the money would get to Italy with all due speed, the issue was taken as a cue for adding a few thousand million kroner to all the other projects, and that is why we are now well and truly in an institutional crisis. Parliament flouted all its own interests in trying to get more money out of the national coffers. In view of that kind of conduct, there are no grounds for giving the Community more money to squabble about.

The lesson to be learnt from the other supplementary budget should instead be that next time, the money should be given to some other sensible project — for example, sending more money to the victims of the Italian earthquake — so that the money is not sent via Brussels, but direct from the national exchequers, the aim being to get around this delaying and cost-raising intermediate stage.

President. — I call Mr Tugendhat.

Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I must say I had a great deal of sympathy with Mr Nord when he said at the beginning of this speech that we were talking about something which goes far beyond finance. We are talking about something which really affects the future of the whole Community. I think that when I turn to the work of the committee which Mr Spinelli has chaired that is

very much my impression as well. A number of Honourable Members, some of whom have in fact spoken today, have contributed to the work of the committee. But though they were dealing with very technical matters, they were matters which go to the very heart of the way in which the Community should develop. I think it is right, therefore, that in dealing with a matter of this kind the House and the Commission should stand back for a moment and reflect somewhat cautiously and open-mindedly on the various propositions that have been put forward and the avenues which have been explored. I do not think this is an occasion for jumping to conclusions or for rushing into decisions. But I would like to say to Mr Spinelli — with whom I have had the pleasure of working for four years and with whom I look forward to a closer association than we have had in the past — that I think this is really a fundamental document and a document which is going to act as a basis for discussion and is the fulcrum within which debate actually takes place for quite some time.

I would also like to take the opportunity of thanking him, on a more personal basis, for the kind remarks he made about me. I am only sorry that, like some other Members, I sometimes wrongly anticipate when debates are going to begin and I was not therefore in my place when he actually made those comments. But I am grateful to him for them.

Now, as I said, a number of people have already spoken, some of whom contributed to the report. I would particularly like to draw attention to the speech by Mr Arndt because I thought that in dealing with this technical financial matter he showed a breadth of view and a generosity of spirit which is unfortunately all too often absent from discussions on the Community's finances. I only wish that the objective way in which he looked at these matters was more prevalent when matters of Community finances are discussed. All too often in this House, as well as in other fora, one finds that one can forecast fairly accurately the arguments which are going to be put forward and the interests which are going to be deployed. It is refreshing to find somebody who adopts a more independent attitude and I would like, if I may, to congratulate him for it.

The Commission, as I have said, will want to look in a very detailed way at the resolution before the House and the relationship between the argumentation in the report and the terms of the resolution. I do not think that now is an occasion for me simply to say that we agree with this and we do not agree with that.

There are, however, a number of points which I think I need to make in order to show what our initial approach to these matters is and to give some idea of the kind of direction in which our thoughts are moving.

Tugendhat

I would also like to draw attention — I am surprised really that no-one has yet done so in the debate — to the Mc Dougall report, one of the most interesting and valuable documents on Community finances and, in some ways, I felt, a precursor of some of the things which are mentioned in Mr Spinelli's report today. When one looks at the future of the Community's finances, one finds in that report too a great deal of basic work which will not only inspire the work of the Parliament but may also have an influence on some other institutions as well, although, as in this case, there are some propositions about which I think it is necessary to take a cautious view. Where I disagree with Mr Spinelli — let us take a point of disagreement first — is the proposition that the ECSC budget should be governed by the same procedure as the general budget. This is something which Honourable Members will recall I have spoken against from time to time in the past, and I would urge on the House the view that the flexibility governing the ECSC budget, deriving from the relatively simple procedures embodied in the Paris Treaty, is of some value. I know there are doubts in Parliament about the extent of Parliament's control and I sense that the suspicion which Parliament has of the ECSC budget is, perhaps, mainly a result of the problem of parliamentary control. I think that we, at all events, have shown that we have no desire whatsoever to use the ECSC budget as a means of getting round parliamentary control, and I would urge Parliament for its part to consider very carefully the advantages of the ECSC procedure before condemning them out of hand, as I think there is a dangerous tendency sometimes to do.

On the prospects for financing the Community budget, the report concentrates, at least for the short term, as Mr Taylor said in his remarks, on VAT, and Mr Taylor himself drew attention to some of the other ideas which have been under discussion, including those associated with Mr Lange, the chairman of the Committee on Budgets. Now VAT is a very complex subject indeed, and when I read the report of Mr Spinelli's committee I was struck by a number of ironies, if I may say so. The resolution on which the House will be called upon to express a view suggests very sweeping measures of harmonization; and yet Mr Burke's experience when he was dealing with taxation — and I dare say also my own, now that I am dealing with taxation — is that even when the Commission puts forward very limited proposals for tax harmonization, we often find ourselves running into a great deal of criticism in this Chamber and being attacked for what are regarded as needless and busybody interventions, rather than being praised for pushing forward the frontiers of Europe. I do not say that in any spirit of hostility — and I can see that I have struck a chord, perhaps with Mr Lange, with what I say — but I would ask the House, in the light of its own protestations, let alone anything else, to consider very seriously what in detailed and practical terms would be involved in paragraph 12 of the resolution.

I would add a last word on this point. When the resolution calls for the abolition of frontier checks on intra-Community trade, it is, of course, asking for the harmonization of all fiscal charges, and that is, as I say, something which the House itself has often tended to express a different view on when it finds itself dealing with particular proposals.

The resolution also calls for VAT to be collected on the basis of individual declarations, with the aim of isolating the element of Community VAT. Well, the House knows very well that the Commission considers this would be a better method than the statistical one decided upon by the Council; and the Commission for its part certainly wishes to see the Sixth Directive implemented in the same way as the House does by the Member States.

The question of an independent rate of VAT is a rather separate issue and one which raises complex legal questions which will, I think, need to be looked at extremely carefully. That is all I have to say for the moment on VAT.

I now turn to the question of loans. The resolution states that the Community borrowing and lending activities, exclusive of the European Investment Bank, should reach 25% of the amount of the Community budget and that an increase up to this rate should be achieved rapidly. I think the view of the Commission on loans is well known. The Commission strongly agrees with the draft resolution in the sense that we attach a very considerable importance to the development of loans, and we believe that that form of activity has an extremely important role to play in the evolution of a more modern, practical and flexible system of Community financing.

I would, however, caution the House against entering into a firm commitment to a particular figure and I would also caution the House against committing itself to a rapid build-up to a particular figure. Of course, the extent of the build-up and the figure are very much interrelated. But I think one does have to consider a number of practical problems of which the ability of the markets to absorb Community paper is certainly one that needs very careful examination. I think too that loans have a very useful role to play and I have shown my own approach to this is positive. But as my colleague, Mr Ortoli, and others have already explained to the House, we are dealing here with a very sensitive plant and I think we need to be careful about setting objectives for too rapid or large a growth. We want something that can take root and endure, not a mushroom which springs up and might be quickly cut down.

The resolution, Mr President, also looks forward to proposals from the Commission for ECU bonds for direct sale to the public. We regard this as an imaginative and far-reaching idea which, we believe, deserves serious consideration by the Commission. We should

Tugendhat

need, however, to be quite certain that a scheme of this kind does not itself have a disruptive effect on currency movements inside the Community. I draw attention to that problem not in order to build it up as an obstacle but to draw attention to the problem which, I think, must be overcome before we can embark on a path which both of us would like to follow.

When it comes to financing the Community budget, the resolution rules out the option of the further use of the Common Customs Tariff as a source of Community revenue. I say 'further use' because, of course, we already derive a considerable proportion of our revenue from the customs tariff — the latest figure is something of the order of 35 % — and clearly we could not do without it. So we are dealing here with something which we actually have, and the question is whether we should seek to take rather more from it, or not. I must say that it is not clear to me why the draft resolution should rule out the prospect of taking more as a matter of principle. Mr Barbi, who is no longer in the Chamber, expressed some views on this subject and I know perfectly well that views differ on some of the ideas which are currently being put forward. But my own view of the Community as an evolving organism, something that evolves rather than moves forward by revolution, suggests to me that, as we do derive a substantial proportion of our revenue from the Common Customs Tariff, it would be very unwise indeed to rule out as a principle the idea of deriving more from it. I think that this is something which ought to be looked at more closely rather than set on one side.

The resolution then tackles the question of how further finances might be raised and calls for the removal 'or at least the raising without delay' of the 1 % ceiling and it requests the Commission to introduce a proposal to this effect. It also talks of a VAT corrective mechanism, which is then set out in some detail in paragraph 26 of the resolution. I shall comment on this latter aspect in a moment. But as the House knows, the Commission has made it clear on a number of occasions that the development of the Community and its budget cannot be artificially held back by financing constraints and that an increase in revenues will be necessary. We have made that clear in the past and I make it clear at the outset of this Commission once again.

Today, however, the Commission cannot take a position, either on when such an increase will be right or necessary, or when it will put forward a proposal on this request. The matter lies at the heart of the problems which have to be solved in the context of restructuring the Community budget, and the Commission takes note of the view expressed in recital (g) the preamble to the resolution, and here I quote, 'whereas the alteration of the ceiling on own resources is conditional on a more rational and more economical restructuring of the Community budget'. I think it is

right that that particular paragraph should be included, and I draw attention to it because I think that, before the Community has an extension of its existing revenue, we must be able to demonstrate that the money we now have is being properly spent in the interests of the European taxpayer. I am glad that Parliament itself recognizes that that is something we have to do before we go on to extending the financing system. As I have said, we do not believe that the development of the Community or its budget can be held back by these constraints, but that is a condition which we must ourselves fulfil and I think Parliament is right to draw attention to it.

I think too that this is too important a matter to rush into taking a position on. I think we would be neglecting our duty to the Community if we simply committed ourselves to a particular proposition without first undertaking all the research we are now engaged upon and we are committed to finishing by the deadline — Mr Spinelli is beginning to look a little uneasy but Mr Spinelli knows he is beginning to press upon us.

Now it may be right, as the draft resolution suggests, to adopt the solution of raising the VAT ceiling. But Mr Taylor, in his speech, said that it may be right to think of other ways round this and he drew attention to the problems which some Heads of Government have themselves drawn attention to. I think that at this stage the Commission would be wise not to exclude other options which have not been mentioned in this resolution. So on two points I am saying really to the authors of the report that I think one ought not to exclude at the outset of one's researches certain possibilities — we would like to include certain possibilities before reaching conclusions.

I said too, Mr President, that I would want to comment on the mechanism which is outlined in paragraph 26. I shall be very brief on it. The authors have chosen a mechanism which takes gross domestic product and population in a certain ratio — the one to the other — and then, using a deviation index, arrives at a weighting coefficient to be applied to Member States' VAT shares.

Now the Commission itself, some time ago, said that progressivity in the context of VAT should be examined, so the idea raises no difficulties for us — it is something we have been talking about for some time. But I am not at all convinced that it would be wise to come out in support of a proposition of this sort before a great deal more work has been done on it. I did not find myself that the argumentation was convincing and I think a more rigorous analysis will be required. So I express my continuing interest and support for the idea of productivity. I express doubts — really quite substantial doubts — about the particular ideas which were put forward here.

Finally, Mr President, the resolution calls for a revised role for Community institutions in the matter of own

Tugendhat

resources. As its earlier proposals show, the Commission takes the view that institutional evolution is appropriate. I am sure it is a sound maxim that those who spend money should take some responsibility for its raising — and this is a point which I have heard mentioned in this House on many occasions and I know that this House does not duck the idea of having some responsibility for raising revenue.

Others take the view that it would not be appropriate, but not this House . . .

(Interruption)

This House would be prepared to undertake these responsibilities, it is others who would deny to this House the possibility of doing so, but for my part, I believe that it is a sound maxim that those who spend money should take some responsibility for the raising of it. I think we agree on that point.

There are other points, Mr President, that I could take up, but I have already spoken for rather longer than anybody else in this debate and I do not want to prolong my statement excessively. What I think the enumeration of the points contained in the resolution shows is how wide-ranging and, I would say, fundamental to the future structure of the Community's financing the resolution is.

The authors of the report have put a great deal of hard work into the subject and their conclusions contain ideas which are both imaginative and radical. The Commission welcomes that. I think it is fair to point out that it has taken some time to produce the report. The work began, as I recall, in 1979 and the Committee on Budgets have had the draft report in front of them for some months.

Parliament itself of course, as Mr Nord and, I think, others have pointed out in the course of this debate, have only just found themselves confronted with it and have naturally been cautious about jumping to conclusions. That is certainly our view too. I need to discuss with my colleagues — my new colleagues as well as my former colleagues — the ideas that are contained herein, not only because they are important in themselves but because they touch on the responsibilities of other Members of the Commission as well as myself.

At this stage, therefore, the Commission is not in a position, as the resolution requires, to submit a detailed timetable for a series of wide-ranging proposals affecting the fundamentals of Community policy. Nevertheless, Parliament will obviously wish to adopt a resolution on the question of own resources at an early date. If it does so, I hope it will understand and accept that it would not be right to try to bind the Commission at this stage in certain ways and on a particular timetable in matters on which some very considerable time is necessary for internal discussion

and which will be intimately linked to decisions which have yet to be taken on the mandate and on which the Commission will subsequently be called upon to act.

I will, however, undertake to the House that the Commission will consider the House's opinion — an undertaking I would have given in any case even if there were not a motion for a resolution. I would also ask the House before it next debates the matter to reflect upon the remarks that I have made and also, if I may say so, on the remarks which Mr Arndt, Mr Vie, Mr Taylor and Mr Barbi have already made and which the other honourable Members who are going to speak will be making, because I think all of us understand that we are dealing with something which requires further examination.

I conclude, Mr President, by saying that I hope Mr Spinelli will recognize that although I have been more cautious than him in my response to some of his proposals I have also gone further than him in certain other respects where he has put up a barrier and I have said that we should not put up a barrier, we should look further. I hope that shows that the imaginativeness and the willingness for change is therefore not all on one side. There is willingness for change and for evolution on our part as well as on your part.

(Applause)

President. — Mr Tugendhat, although you have made the debate longer, you have also added interest to it. However, I should like to ask the two Members of the Commission to keep an eye on the time, since otherwise there will be no time for the Members to speak.

I call Mr Notenboom.

Mr Notenboom. — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, I should like — following on from Mr Barbi — to address a sincere word of thanks to Mr Spinelli and the other members of his working party — Messrs Ansquer, Arndt, Barbi, Nord and Taylor — for their fast and inventive work, which was done to a very high standard. Like Mr Spinelli, I too fail to understand how it is that such a fundamental debate as this should have been allocated so little time on the agenda. Short speeches are good in themselves, but if they are too short, they may give rise to serious misunderstandings.

A number of amendments may be tabled by our Group; then again, they may be not. I hope not, but at any rate we support this motion for a resolution. It incorporates certain compromises, and I should like to thank Mr Spinelli too for being prepared to accept these compromises. It is a fact that his original report was a lot different from the one we have before us

Notenboom

now. I saw myself what a laborious business it was to get it through the Committee on Budgets and how much trouble it sometimes took to make concessions, but Mr Spinelli was instrumental in creating a majority in favour in the Committee on Budgets, and next month we shall have to make sure that there is a majority in favour in this House, because it is time Parliament spoke out on this issue — not, of course, on every single detail, and of course there are things here which can be left until later — but it is time Parliament came out in favour of raising the own resources ceiling quickly and with the necessary qualifications. Mr Spinelli has already tried his luck, as has my Group, but neither of us have been successful so far. I hope that Parliament will manage in February to pronounce on this matter. In this respect, I must say that I thought Mr Tugendhat's speech contained too much in the way of hesitation, diffidence and doubt. If this was due to the fact that he has to speak on behalf of a Commission which has only just been installed, I can appreciate the problem, but if this is to be the Commission's position over the coming four years, then there are bound to be difficult times ahead in this House. I hope that what Mr Tugendhat had to say at the end of his speech to the effect that he still had to discuss the matter with his colleagues applied to his whole speech, but I must say that, generally speaking, I found his speech disappointing and over-cautious. Of course, we think that the best way out is for more kinds of own resources to be made available. Of course, we are open to fresh ideas, including the Commission's, but at the present time, the best way out would seem to be to do away with the ceiling of 1 % VAT.

There are two comments I should like to make on own resources — one on the question of quantity and one concerning quality. As regards the quantitative aspect, I can only say that this is not a revolutionary idea; the decision on own resources was not designed to curtail own resources but, on the contrary, to increase them. The 1 % ceiling was probably introduced for experimental purposes, but the decision on own resources was designed to be a step forwards rather than backwards. Historically speaking, then, it is perfectly logical to call for the ceiling to be removed. Of course, we then need more agreement between the Council and Parliament in the annual budgetary procedure than is the case right now. I should therefore like to see Article 203 of the EEC Treaty improved; after all, the removal of the 1 % ceiling is a perfectly justifiable proposal from the historic point of view.

Mr Ansquer's colleague, Mr Vie, claimed that it was not right and proper to ask for more resources. The fact is that we are not asking for one extra penny from the budget; what we are asking for is for the ceiling to be removed so that, when we are agreed on new policies, we shall not first of all have to go trotting off to ten Parliaments for a ratification procedure which will take between two and three years. That is the point at issue here: this proposal — if adopted — will not

mean one extra penny on the budget; instead, it will remove the present obstacle — the time that a ratification procedure takes. That is the whole problem, and that is why progress is needed on this issue. My Group too supports the point made in g), concerning the conditions which will have to be fulfilled. Parliament must not ask the Council to give us our own resources so that we can then distribute them. What we want are new resources — under certain conditions — so that we can use them sensibly in those areas where expenditure at a European level would be more efficient than at a national level.

Mr Arndt stressed the distributive aspects — the Social Fund and the Regional Fund — but it seems to me a bit out of date to differentiate between distribution and production. The two rightly belong together, as do energy policy and development aid, as matters which can serve the cause of progress, in which term I include economic progress. I am absolutely convinced that these matters can often be organized more efficiently, more effectively and more cheaply at European level. That is the basic idea, and it is one we support.

As regards the qualitative aspect of own resources, Mr Spinelli made a number of important comments in his report. He did not make things easy for himself. He made very precise observations, stressing once again the importance of own resources for the Community and for its financial autonomy. The concepts of financial autonomy and own resources have suffered a severe mauling over the last few years. That is why Mr Spinelli has set out — and we all support him in this — to resurrect the idea. Own resources mean that money flows directly from the people of the Community to Europe without first of all having to pass through the national budgets. That is the point at issue, and the way in which the problem of the British contribution to the budget was presented violated the principle of own resources. As I have already said, I voted for the decision, but the way in which it was presented violated the principle that Europe should be financed by its own resources. Over the last few weeks, we have witnessed yet another violation of this principle. No Member State can say that it will only transfer resources to Brussels to finance policies it approves of and not for those policies it disapproves of. That is a violation of the principle of own resources and financial autonomy. Whoever feels that the budget is not legally valid must take his case to the European Court of Justice, but if the budget has been legally signed, the resources must be made available automatically and that is something for which the Member States are responsible. I would compare these Member States with a lady in the Netherlands who last year refused to pay over a proportion of the tax due from her because she disapproved of defence expenditure. She was immediately forced by the court to pay over the full amount on the grounds that no taxpayer has the right to reduce his or her tax bill by an amount corresponding to expenditure which he or she does not approve

Notenboom

of. Likewise, no Member State has the right to reduce its contributions to compensate for expenditure which it does not approve of. That is a violation of the principle of own resources and that is why it is so important that Mr Spinelli should have made such important comments — with our support — on the qualitative aspects of own resources.

I have one final remark to make on paragraph 13. We fully support Mr Spinelli's idea that it is essential for our people to understand why it is right for own resources to come direct from value-added tax, this being the most direct route. On the other hand, we Members of the Group of the European People's Party do not want to see small and medium-sized undertakings, in particular, saddled with an enormous amount of paperwork by virtue of the collection and channelling of own resources. Europe needs these firms, and because many of them are in a difficult position, we do not want to implement to the full any high-falutin ideas which may jeopardize their very existence. That is the essence of the compromise we found in paragraph 13, and it is merely up to the backroom boffins to find out how these two aspects can be combined.

That completes the remarks I wanted to make. Mr Spinelli mentioned some names himself, and as I have already thanked the Members of the Committee for their excellent work, I should like to take this opportunity to mention our officials who have put in so much work for us, in particular Mr Guccione and Mr Giraud, who have undoubtedly contributed towards the production of this outstanding report. I very much hope that the Commission — after a period of reflection — will be more enthusiastic towards our report than they were today. We are not just talking about money here. One's reaction to this idea is closely linked to one's attitude towards progress in Europe or the disintegration of Europe. That is what the Spinelli Report is all about. It is only superficially about money; the real issue goes much deeper.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Jackson.

Mr Robert Jackson. — Mr President, I should like to join with those who have congratulated Mr Spinelli on the work that he and his colleagues have done in this working party, and I should like to welcome a number of important passages in the Spinelli report and in the Balfour report which is being debated with it.

The first thing which I think we must welcome is the way in which these documents promote the concept of a 'convergence budget', rather than a budget which is simply a cash register for policies that have been separately agreed. I think that this will help us to prevent in future the existing perverse pattern of resource trans-

fers within the Community. A second element in the Spinelli report which I welcome is the insistence that new own resources should be conditional upon bringing agricultural policy spending under control. And a third feature of the Spinelli document is perhaps its most important feature, as Mr Notenboom has pointed out, and that is that a living and developing Community must have growing financial resources in order to do what it can do more effectively than the Member States can. So far so good.

However, there is a problem, and that is the problem of the relation between the Spinelli report and the short and middle-term issues of budgetary reform which now face the Community — the sort of problems being considered by the Commission in the light of the mandate given to it last May by the Council. The Spinelli group was set up on 17 April 1980 before the mandate was given, and essentially the aim of the Spinelli group, as I read the resolution and report, was to consider the long-term budgetary development of the Community. However, the report does contain two sections which can be read as constituting at least the elements of a European Parliament contribution to the fulfilment of the terms of the mandate given to the Commission — Section 5 on financing the budget in the short term, and section 6 on redistribution through budgetary measures, which refers to the concept of equity.

Now, while I salute the Spinelli report as a long-term document, I am afraid that it is not by itself a sufficient or suitable basis for the European Parliament's contribution to the work being done on the mandate given to the Commission, nor by itself does it answer the short- and middle-term questions about budgetary reform which are the subject of that mandate. The basic reason for this is that the concept of making the VAT progressive, on which Mr Spinelli bases his proposals for the short term, simply will not be enough to do the job of making the budget more equitable so that it can better serve convergence.

On the issue of equity, there are at least two sorts of what are now called in Community jargon 'unacceptable situations' in the budgetary arrangements of the Community. There is on the one hand the British problem, of a less prosperous country making a disproportionate net contribution. To this there has, of course, been found the temporary solution of 30 May 1980, which we will have to be addressing again in four months in the context of the 1982 budget procedure. Then there is the other unacceptable situation of which perhaps we are not yet sufficiently aware. That is the one experienced by Germany, a more prosperous country, which is making a disproportionate net contribution compared with other prosperous Member States who are in the same economic position and enjoy the same economic strength.

Now the trouble is that the idea of progressivity in the VAT simply cannot by itself solve either of these prob-

Jackson

lems. We need to do the arithmetic, and I am not sure this arithmetic was done when the Spinelli report was prepared. I have looked into this. The fact is that as far as the less prosperous country is concerned, progressivity in the VAT can hardly be expected to do more than offset the distortions caused by levies and duties, let alone compensate for the distortions caused by the Community's existing pattern of expenditure. It simply will not provide enough to correct that unacceptable situation. If we look at the other unacceptable situation, that of the more prosperous country bearing disproportionate burdens — the German problem, if you like to call it that — progressivity in the VAT will only add to the burdens carried by that country without doing anything to spread the burden more equitably among the other more prosperous Member States.

So, Mr President, to sum up, I believe that the Spinelli document is very useful. I agree that a progressive VAT has an important part to play in assuring a fairer budget, although I think that perhaps we have gone into too much detail about the mechanisms of that. I am afraid, however, that Parliament will have to do more work if it is to rise to the full challenge set by the dimensions of the problem of budgetary reform in the context of the mandate given to the Commission. In the first instance, I suppose, this is a task for the Committee on Budgets. I believe it could do worse than to look again at the ideas of the Lange resolution which were adopted by Parliament in November 1979, but which are not referred to or discussed in the Spinelli report.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Leonardi.

Mr Leonardi. — (I) Mr President, in this short speech of mine I should like to point out that the problems of our own resources have always coincided with times when there has been a crisis of development in our Community. This was the case in the mid-sixties and again at the beginning of the seventies when, with the ending as it were of the customs union, there came into being the current system of own resources which we now want to see expanded.

This happening because the Community as a whole is going through a period of crisis, as has happened before. It feels a need to expand and naturally greater financial resources are required. Consequently, we cannot look on the matter of own resources as a problem in isolation; we have to see it as part of a wider problem which calls above all for a political response. Just consider all the European Council statements that have been issued lately and the undertakings given by the Heads of State and Government for the development of various policies — data processing, industrial conversion, and so on — and then consider how they behave in quite the opposite manner when it comes to taking a decision on increasing own resources. Or just

consider the hankerings — which have always existed in the Community and which have been more or less contained — after a *juste retour*, which really would mean the end of this Community of ours.

As I said, the problem is primarily political. This is the point we have to hammer home if we want to win over public opinion. We do not think there is any need to increase finances just to transfer one or two national policies to Community level. We want more funds for different policies which require a Community approach and which will enable the money to be put to more efficient use, which means that the tax burden could very well be eased. You see, we are convinced that Community action in various areas will have such a positive effect on the development of income as a whole that the burden of public expenditure will be reduced.

This is what we have to convey to the public, instead of the impression I have got from listening to a lot of the speeches here, that with this request for more finances we are going to increase taxes. This is just not true! We are aiming at just the opposite: putting expenditure to more efficient use in order to cut taxes if possible. People in the Community have to get used to the idea of not viewing Community spending as something on top of national spending, but rather as a different, better and essential kind of expenditure for problems which now require a Community approach.

This means that the Italian Members of the Communist and Allies Group support the motion for a resolution and the proposals which have been put forward. However, I think it would be useful if we had a look at cost-effectiveness. Among other things this would help us get used to the idea of monitoring with greater care spending and its effects, and pursuing a policy of increased harmonization, more progressivity, greater use of loans, and so on. I cannot of course go into these very important but specialized aspects here.

As for the political effects — to which we shall have to pay special attention — I do not intend to spend a lot of time on that aspect of the problem which has also, quite rightly, been mentioned. I am referring to the fact that Community spending and the Community's own resources represent in the final analysis only a tiny part of the Member States' general public spending or of income and that, when all is said and done, the increase we are asking for would be a marginal amount compared with general public spending. This is not the major aspect of the matter. We are not going to make excuses the Italian people for asking for more resources of our own. We are asking for these resources because we believe that with their help, and with the help of the finances we shall get to implement Community policies on a Community scale, our countries and the Community will enjoy even greater benefits in the form of greater economic and political independence and fresh opportunities for development.

Leonardi

The people of Europe have to realize that nowadays even modest Community action, with Community policies on data processing, energy, research, training, and so on, can stimulate a new type of development and give a boost to development in the Member States and in the Community as a whole. However, we have to have Community spending, with Community policies and the Community's own resources.

The simple fact is that the problem we are discussing today in considering and asking for an increase in own resources is closely linked to changes in the Community which are pushing it towards active measures which require new policies and extra finance. However, as I said before, the results which we think can be obtained with these financial resources will more than compensate for any greater burden which we think the people of the Community may have to bear.

For these reasons, which are primarily political and not simply financial or economic in nature, the Italian Communists will support the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Spinelli.

President. — I call Mr Visentini.

Mr Visentini. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the tremendous importance of the subject of this debate has already been pointed out, but this is even more true in the case of the institutional aspects it touches on. I therefore think it is ridiculous that a subject of such importance is sacrificed for lack of time. What I mean is that there is practically no chance to consider or discuss the matter, since each of us has been given only a few minutes, with the result that we have to condense our comments without being able to develop them and expound them in a logical manner. I must add that the Groups did not have time to discuss the matter either, and so I am speaking here in a strictly personal capacity and not on behalf of the Group.

The first point — and this has to be stressed — is that the expansion and development of the Community's actions and operations require new resources. You cannot expect to develop Community action simply by cutting expenditure in the agricultural sector. A better balance between agricultural and other spending, in connection with the fresh initiatives which the Community needs to take, will and must come from the increased resources which the Community must obtain.

The second point is basic to the Spinelli report and is one which I support wholeheartedly. We have to be determined that this new level of greater finance is established according to Community procedures and with the participation of Parliament. However, I must say in connection with paragraph 31 and Annex I of

the motion for a resolution — and I reserve the right to table an amendment of my own on this — that the opinion of the Council should be adopted by a qualified majority rather than by unanimous agreement.

My third point concerns loans. As Mr Taylor's excellent and thorough report makes clear, the Community loans which are granted by various bodies and according to various mechanisms consist of loans which are granted to third parties by the Community authorities. The Community is therefore nothing more than a financial intermediary as far as these loans are concerned. In my view, Community borrowing in future should also be used to finance the Community's own operations. Of course, these will have to be investment operations or operations which bring medium or long-term economic productivity or profitability. Naturally, the circumstances are different from the situation of an individual State. The point is that when an individual State borrows in order to finance medium and long-term investment programmes, it can in theory — at least this is what one learns at university — service the debt by means of the increased productivity which the investment generates. The Community has no direct income of its own, and so it will be the Member States which will have to increase the Community's own resources on the basis of the ensuing general increase in productivity.

Let me just say in closing that with these changes which I intend to propose — and which in fact fit in with the tenor of the Spinelli report and are I think also in line with his own views — we really have to move forward, especially on the institutional level, because this is the major significance of Mr Spinelli's report.

President. — I call Mr Tuckmann.

Mr Tuckmann. — Mr President, I have been very impressed with the work that Mr Spinelli and the team around him have done, and I want to say that as far as the long term is concerned, I am very much behind the spirit, the aims, the large scale. I have more worry about the detail. As far as the short term is concerned. I cannot go along with it. I should, incidentally, stress that our Group have not had a chance to discuss it, so what I am saying is just my view, not a Group view.

As far as the short term is concerned, I want to see the 1 % VAT ceiling retained at this time. I am one of those who have to look after a lot of workers who are in ancient industries and who fall into unemployment — I instance here textiles, shoes and the like — and I still cannot see, even after 18 months of being exposed to influences from colleagues in this House, that if a steel-worker has to move out of his job because the sub-stratum, the demand from the consumer, has gone, he is to be differently treated from a farmer whose product may not be wanted in the same degree

Tuckmann

any more either. I know that in saying this I am in very fundamental disagreement with the bulk of this House, particularly those from south of the Alps, but nevertheless I continue to feel that way and therefore I must say it. Therefore, until the CAP is sorted out — and I do not mean by that that it should be abolished. I do mean that these enormous surpluses must go — I would not agree to abolishing the VAT; and in that, to my surprise, I seem to be in tune with the Council of Ministers, whose attitude I usually find much too restrictive.

I would, if I may, just refer — after all it is supposed to be a debate — to something said by the new Gaullist colleague just to the right of me. He said we should produce as much in the way of food products as is possible. Well, you know, this is a question of price and politics. We could go and put the whole of European production into armaments or education or social welfare if we made the price low enough; but the result would be thorough misery in all sorts of other sectors, and I feel that this ignoring, or wanting to ignore, the market principle is evidenced as a bad thing. Look at Russia, with an enormous territory rich in grainproducing potential: they are near starvation if America does not produce the grain. Well, I think that is an example which should be used as a comparison, and therefore I think this whole notion of trying to take agriculture out of the economic sphere is an error. One more example: we have in Europe — particularly I know about it in England and I know about it in Germany — taken another sector out of the economic sphere by just putting the price extraordinarily low, and that is housing. The result is that our populations feel deprived if they do not have as much housing as they would want. Yet they have about five times as much as the average Russian. Relatively speaking, therefore, I think we have reduced what is available in other sectors. On the whole front, I find that you have to have better reasons for ignoring the normal market principles than this House normally seems able to accept.

Now I turn to the long term. Here I go very much along with the spirit that lies behind the Spinelli report. It seems to me that we very often concern ourselves here with small-scale, short-term matters, whereas in fact what we are really engaged in is trying to build for ourselves a mechanism which the USA built for itself some 150 years ago, only they had a much easier job. They built their federal structure before the bulk of the people had arrived in their country. They built it at a time of 13 States, and today there are 50. They also built it before their population had been shaped and shaped into a one-language system. We in Europe are trying to operate with many different cultures, many different chunks of history and a very diverse mentality, as is shown by the fact that I find myself so heavily in opposition to many colleagues. Therefore, to consider what mechanisms could be brought about to bring us together, both on

the financial and on the content side, is an enormously valuable and important exercise.

Basing oneself on the McDougal report, which examined a number of subjects which have not generally been considered by our colleagues so far, was an important exercise. To take McDougal's indications of where a modicum of effectiveness may be found and to base one's policies on them seems to me to be an important and highly valuable approach and something that should be pursued further. Therefore, in tune with a great deal of the Spinelli report, I hope that this House will gradually come to accept it.

This leads me to my final point. I think it is extremely important that we in this House regard ourselves not merely as a doctor using the thermometer to find out how the patient is today but rather as opinion-formers who lead the populations of our countries to see that a united Europe on a number of subjects and fronts is needed, and that we push them in that direction by having reports of this kind ahead of the time for their implementation, so that by the time they come to be discussed nationally they have already become part of the accepted way of thinking.

IN THE CHAIR: MR ZAGARI

Vice-President

President. — I call Mrs Boserup.

Mrs Boserup. — (DK) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have no need to wait until February to reveal that I shall be voting against this proposal on the Community's own resources. It is true that the report sets out a number of points of which we are all aware and which I would not, of course, seek to deny. Nonetheless, the proposal does include certain assumptions which my constituents and the majority of Danish voters cannot accept. We are by no means convinced of the need for the Community to add to its commitments and burden itself with new tasks.

We have taken this view not because of a lack of solidarity but because we believe that the kind of joint policy we are talking about here will be in the best interests of ordinary wage-earners, who make up 80 % of the population in Denmark. The Common Agricultural Policy, which is the best developed and, in fact, the only real common policy we have, has been shown to be a very good thing for large-scale agriculture and the big multinationals trading in, and producing, feedingstuffs. On the other side of the coin, regional policy, to which many people would like to see more resources devoted, and which we should perhaps have supported too, has not benefited.

Boserup

In this respect, I go along entirely with what was said by Mr Arndt. The gap between rich and poor countries has widened rather than narrowed. Social policy, which we are seeking to develop, consists of isolated programmes, and the only result is that we have still more people unemployed and a more widespread feeling of despondency. We have a decent Government in Denmark — a social democratic government which follows the Commission's advice on economic policy. The result is a fall in the level of real earnings, a fact which the Government itself says is desirable; for instance, whenever wages fall, the Government comes along and asks the workers to contribute more to this Community. But that is simply not on. You cannot simply come along and help yourself to a bigger slice of the VAT cake, nor can you change the distribution key, and you can certainly not get your way by harmonizing income and consumption taxes.

Abolition of the ceiling on the Community's share of VAT revenue is, as far as we are concerned, out of the question; we refuse to enter into a commitment to pour taxpayers' money into a bottomless pit. The Committee on Budgetary Control, of which I am a member, puts a lot of honest effort into scrutinizing the use of resources. But to what purpose? Yesterday in this House, Mr Battersby's report on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control was adopted. Point 7 of that report says that Parliament is satisfied with the Commission's efforts to limit carry-overs from one accounting year to another. That is recorded in yesterday's minutes. This should ensure respect for the budget in the form in which it was passed. And now we are supposed to be passing something like this less than a month after reaching full agreement with the Commission on the supplementary budget, the main aim of which was to enable carry-overs to be made from one accounting year to another. That is what I would call two-faced behaviour, and I deplore the fact that the Danish Government has stooped so low as to pay its share of the bill which it had no need to do. There is, after all, no need to be compliant to the point of crawling, especially not for a Government in a country where interest in the Community is so lukewarm as in Denmark.

As I said before, I cannot support this proposal to give the Community more own resources. Instead, I would advise the Commission to apply its talents to working within the given framework.

IN THE CHAIR: MR HANS KATZER

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Møller.

Mr Møller. — (DK) Mr President, I think Parliament has done an admirable job of work in trying to show how difficult it will be to solve the economic problems facing the Community once the ceiling on own resources has been reached. But it seems to me that it would have been more useful to show how we could avoid the problem of the ceiling in the first place. Mrs Boserup referred to the problem of unemployment and said that the problem would not be solved by an increase in own resources. We believe that increasing own resources might — even if they were allotted to the Social Fund — lead to an increase in unemployment, because the money we take from the taxpayers cannot be put to other uses by those taxpayers. A more worthwhile undertaking would therefore probably be to get by with the resources we have and to make strenuous efforts to bring about changes in budgetary policy and spending policy with the aim of making do with the resources which are already earmarked for the Community.

If we were to tackle the problems of the scope for action offered by new resources, we should first of all have to give some thought to what new things could be financed. Before we set about thinking about creating new resources, we should first of all ascertain what needs they are supposed to meet. Where, pray, is the long-term budget which is supposed to tell us that, within a period of four to five years, we shall have to create more resources if we are to solve the problems facing Europe? We can see nothing of the kind. We cannot see how social problems or unemployment problems will be solved by creating additional resources to be taken from the taxpayers and doled out to the unemployed or the poorer regions. That will only make the poor regions even poorer.

I would therefore repeat that we could perhaps do with a long-term budget. No matter how valuable it has been to take a fleeting look behind the veil of the future, and no matter how valuable Mr Spinelli's view of what may happen in the future, I am still afraid to have to say that we could get by for a long time with the present ceiling so long as we concentrate on cutting expenditure drastically.

Mr Tugendhat said in his speech something to the effect that those who spend money should also create new resources and raise those resources themselves. I am not sure whether that applies to the Commission, the Members of the Commission, Commission officials, Parliament's Secretariat-General, Parliament's accounting staff and so on. As far as I am concerned, it concerns first and foremost those people who have to pay the money. We could give some thought to setting up a Community tax payable by all employees in the Community. But any attempt to get hold of funds by this means would not be very well received in a Community where employees and workers have as much influence as this particular case.

Møller

It is a point I would raise to add to the useful comments made by Mr Tugendhat in his speech. What I have in mind is a long-term budget from which we can see that if, over a period of four to five years, we can no longer get by with the resources we have, we must create new revenue sources, and from which we can see what resources we have and what possibilities are open to us. I believe it would be very bad for the Community to go to the taxpayers and say that we now want to introduce a Community tax as well as an increase in VAT — which is perhaps the cheapest and the most sensible solution — and as well as an increase in direct taxes, property taxes or other sources of revenue, because the Community is costing more than we had expected. I think I can promise you — like Mrs Boserup, although her view of the European Community differs from mine — that any such suggestion would fall on extremely stony ground, and would give Mrs Boserup and the other members of the Danish People's Movement — who are unfortunately not here at the moment — an excellent cue to agitate against the Community.

But when we talk about a long-term budget, we must also bear in mind the harmonization of resources. This question crops up over and over again. Clearly, we cannot carry on with different taxes and levies, but how should we go about the task of harmonization? In our efforts to bring about harmonization, we have already run into all manner of difficulties whenever it came down to the question of taxes and levies. My view is that no decisions on this matter will be forthcoming from the Commission or the Council or the Parliament. Harmonization must be a national matter. If we cannot hold our own in competition, we must harmonize our taxation policy in agreement with neighbouring countries so as to restrict border trade and even all trade to neighbouring countries where prices are lower than in our own countries. We must therefore simply take steps — as Denmark is now having to do — for example to reduce its tax on wine so that the Danes do not buy their wine only in Mr Arndt's country. Of course, we like the delicious German wines, and it is nice to be able to buy them in Germany itself, but because of the high level of taxation on wine, we are trying to get down to a level where we can manage the Danish trade ourselves. That is the road towards harmonization. Harmonization is something which will come about of its own accord so long as we apply free trade policies to the full, because then the people will buy wherever things are cheapest and best.

We tend to place too much stress on compulsory harmonization instead of saying that the result of pursuing a policy of free trade will be harmonization. I have made a study of the situation in the United States, where some taxes are collected by the individual States and not by the federal authorities. People who are acquainted with this system have told me that a 7 % difference in prices between two neighbouring States would have the effect of forcing the more expen-

sive of the two to reduce its overheads and its level of taxation on its own account without any intervention from the federal government or from the Congress in Washington.

I should like to take advantage of this first debate to point out that we must first and foremost oppose the idea of a long-term budget setting out what we want in 1982, 1983, 1984 and so on. The kind of thing we need is four-year budgets which we can revise year by year and step by step as we see that new problems are cropping up. If we can see that something will be coming along in 1985 which will have to be taken into account, we shall have to decide what to do about it: whether to build the Channel Tunnel or whether to set to work on one or other of the projects announced in this House. Of course, we must make provision for an expenditure policy setting out priorities for a four to five-year period, and try to bring revenue into line with the policy we have worked out in a long-term budget.

Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes what I had to say on this occasion, having been called as the last speaker. I do not think we can expect much more on this point from question time.

President. — I call Mr Spinelli.

Mr Spinelli, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, can I just point out that both Mr Tugendhat and some other speakers have mentioned another debate. There is not going to be another debate; we are simply going to present the amendments and vote on them.

In this connection can I ask the chair — and I am speaking here for Mr Lange, too — for a definite deadline to be set for the amendments, so that the Committee on Budgets has a chance to look at them and arrive at a considered opinion one way or the other, without leaving it up to me to interpret as best I can the views of the committee at the next part-session. Several Groups say that they have not thought about it yet. I find this surprising. We have been working on this subject for a year, and plenty of ideas and drafts and almost final documents have been around for a while. The matter could have been dealt with by now.

As for the various speeches we have heard, I am not going to bother about those which were actually against the development of the Community and which are therefore against any plans to increase the Community's resources. The reasons for this opposition are political and consequently have nothing to do with budgetary problems. If these people form a majority in Parliament, a motion like this will not get through. If it is going to get through, these people will have to be in a minority. I have nothing else in particular to say on this point.

Spinelli

I shall respond instead to those who said they were convinced that the Community had to develop. In the first place I should like to make one or two comments about what Mr Tugendhat said. Now if I were a cartoonist, I should draw a picture of him hopping about beside a tortoise and telling it: 'For heaven's sake take it easy, there's no rush; take your time, don't go rushing into things!' The Community we have takes months and years to carry out the simplest operation. You know very well, Mr Tugendhat, that if we do not want to end up in a year or so in the same state as we almost found ourselves this year, we have to start right away to submit proposals on the matter of own resources, because it all needs to be discussed, to be mulled over by the Council, and to be approved by the national parliaments. There is no time to lose.

Mr Tugendhat also mentioned the tremendous problems related to the changeover from a statistical to a declaration-based method of VAT collection. Two countries are already using the method of individual declaration without any problems. It is a well known fact, because it was the opposition of Belgium — behind whom all the other countries fell into line — which meant that this system was not introduced right from the start. At the time it was said that everyone should be using the declaration-based method by 1 January 1985. But what has the Commission done to bring this about? The Commission has been twiddling its thumbs and now it comes and tells us there are problems and complications. I fail to see why these problems, which Denmark and Ireland managed to solve, could not be solved in other countries which were basically ready to deal with them five or six years ago.

If the Community needs to develop, it must have the opportunity to do so. This is the point we are trying to make. If there is no need, it will not make use of the opportunity. The impression we did not want to give was that Parliament was asking for the 1 % limit to be abolished simply because, in a moment of madness, it felt it had to put forward ideas for vast expenditure. What we said was that we needed to introduce a method of preparing things and working them out, whereby we had to progress in parallel fashion by units which are naturally longer than a year. This explains why we referred to legislative terms in which the Community will have to be ready to tackle problems of this kind for the succeeding five years — and this is why it is going to need these financial resources — so that all the Member States, the national parliaments, the governments, the Commission and Parliament know what is going on. The tenor of the budget debates will then be one of settlement and everyone will at last know what the general policy of the Community is.

This is the only way we are going to give the lie to that specious argument which maintains that there can be no talk of new resources until we have some policies. How often did we hear the cry that Parliament could

not be elected because it had no responsibility and that it could not be given responsibility because it was not elected? The same thing can be said now: there can be no new resources because there are no policies, but no policies can be introduced because the resources are lacking. Consequently, it is up to us to say that we need new policies, explain why, work out an agreement and therefore give the Community new resources.

If this is going to be done, we cannot resort to some involved procedure each time. What we have to do in a way is create the opportunities and then make sure that they can be suitably implemented. This is why we suggested for a start that the 1 % ceiling should be abolished. A few Members who have obviously not read the report very carefully have put forward the argument that we have failed to realize that corrective mechanisms are required and that we should therefore go back to those proposed by Mr Lange. Can I just point out that Mr Arndt's contribution on the corrective mechanisms constitutes the finishing touch to the need outlined by Mr Lange as part of a European tax system. We want to put this together, although of course it is not going to be the answer to all our problems. It is a corrective mechanism, after all. Complex spending, meaning spending which is not restricted to one policy, needs to be overhauled but this is not the job of a report on the Community's new resources. We can just point out the need and this is what we have done.

As for the loans policy, our report is perhaps not explicit on the matter but it indicates clearly enough that policy on investment and development must not be limited simply to taking out loans and then granting them, which is what happens at the moment. The policy has to be conceived for investments and for development and not just for current spending or to cover debts which have been incurred for this purpose.

Several Members have said that this result could be reached in the long run. One Member said especially that he was against abolishing the 1 % limit, but then went on to talk about the limits mentioned in the MacDougal report. You cannot have two things at once. You have to make up your mind: one thing or the other. We realize that some of the needs we have outlined here will take years. When Mr Tugendhat tells us the Commission cannot give any dates, we should like to know when it intends to start on the job and how long, more or less, it reckons it will take. Was it not some English lord who said 'Death closes all, but something ere the end may yet be done'?

Mr Tugendhat correctly said that he could not give an answer to all these questions here and now. I had pointed out however that I was not expecting an immediate answer from the Commission. The new Commission took over only a couple of weeks ago and naturally will not have had the time to discuss these matters. Since at the same time the Commission has

Spinelli

said that it cannot cover a whole range of issues and that it has various views, I should like to offer it one specific proposal. For the time being this is a personal suggestion, but I hope that next time it will be a proposal made on behalf of the committee and with Parliament's backing. The point is that the Commission is undoubtedly going to look at our report and the MacDougal report, consider the views of the Commissioners and come up with a few ideas. You are going to disagree with us on many points, to be sure. As you think things over, however, we should like you to come back and discuss matters with us, principally together with the Committee on Budgets but now and then here in Parliament as well. You could tell us how your thoughts are progressing and give us an idea of how you see things. You could suggest how some part or other of a resolution might be reworked and offer ideas for changes, and so on. Let Parliament in on this process of working things out. It may be your job, but do not keep it to yourselves behind closed doors, or just with Coreper, which means sole regard for national interests, but come and discuss things with the committee and with Parliament itself. Let us not have a repeat of what happened in the case of the regulation on amending the staff regulations. This was a document which you in the Commission drew up but which was discussed by Coreper even before the Commission got round to considering it. Just look at the dates! We should like this document we have adopted to have a different fate. Start discussing it with us, and let it be a starting point for all the debates we have with you. I have no doubts about commitment to Europe at the head of the Commission, and so I am sure that if we go about things like this we shall be able to clarify our ideas and reach some agreement and that you will feel you are getting more support than you have been accustomed to in the past.

I want to wind up with these words, although there is something I should like to urge upon every Member. I realize that a few amendments need to be made, even though only one comes to mind at the moment, the point Mr Visentini made about streamlining the final decision-making mechanism, which is certainly a problem that needs to be looked at closely. Anyway, what I want to say is that Members should try to table as few amendments as possible and make do with the most relevant ones so that we do not get overwhelmed by modifications. I should like them to remember that this document is the fruit of a year's labour and that people from all sides have been involved and have given their opinion. This means that the report already offers a fairly wide basis for agreement.

President. — The debate is closed.

The tabling of amendments and the vote on the motion for a resolution will take place during the February part-session.

According to the agenda the next item should be the report by Mr Balfour. However, since Question Time

is due to begin at 5.30 p.m., I would ask Mr Balfour whether he would not mind his report being postponed until tomorrow, together with that of Mrs Van den Heuvel. I should be grateful if you would agree to this.

I call Mr Balfour.

Mr Balfour. — Mr President, of course I must agree with that, but I would not like this opportunity to slip by without noting the fact that this House seems to conduct its debates without any kind of discipline whatsoever. Speeches are made of the most incontinent nature that drag on for hours, as it seems. For the first time in my life I have sat through a debate from beginning to end where I am not one of the rapporteurs. I would remind the House further that the Balfour report was, in fact, completed at committee stage nearly 9 months ago. We have been waiting a very long time, and it is tiresome in the extreme to have to sit down and wait for people to continue speeches without a single interruption, so that it is not even a debate, it is a series of formal declarations without any kind of discipline. Any other assembly or parliament in Europe can conduct its business better. I suggest we institute procedures immediately to improve the order of business.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — Mr Balfour, I fully agree with you and could not have put it better myself. I took the Chair a quarter of an hour ago and could do nothing about the way the debate was going.

8. Question Time

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. No 1-778/80).

We shall start with the questions to the Council.

I call Question No 53, by Mr Davern (H-479/80):

Does the Council agree with the views expressed in a recent study by the German Ministry of Agriculture, which states that the EEC beef market is now close to self-sufficiency and that concessions on imports in future should only be granted in extreme cases?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (NL) The trend of beef and veal production and consumption does in fact show that for 1980 the Community is again self-sufficient. The Council will shortly hold a general discussion on the state of the market in the light of proposals which the Commission has recently submitted to it on the annual estimate of beef and veal import requirements.

Mr Paisley. — Would the President-in-Office of the Council not agree that the reduction of imports of beef into the EEC would increase demand for indigenous EEC production? And is he aware of the decline of the beef herd in Northern Ireland to 66 % of what it was in 1974?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The Council considers it desirable that this sector should not come to face even greater difficulties through an extension of concessions granted to third countries. However, Mr President — and I must emphasize this — the Council is faced with a complex problem, particularly as regards the requirements to be met on producers' incomes and the consequences for the budget, as well as international commitments and international trade agreements.

Mr Maffre-Baugé. — (F) The concessions granted to certain third countries on beef and veal have cost the Community budget 423 million EUA in lost levies. To ensure that EEC stockbreeders are not faced with unfair competition, does the Council intend to ensure that the principle of Community preference is respected in the case of beef and veal from third countries, particularly as regards exports from Yugoslavia to Greece?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I already indicated in my reply to Mr Paisley that this is a complex subject. I drew attention to our international commitments and to the budgetary aspect. Among the other points I referred to was, I think, the one mentioned by the honourable Member in his supplementary.

President. — I call Question No 54, by Mr Remilly (H-480/80):

Since the Council has not been asked to consider any proposal from the Commission on possible financial aid to the wood processing and construction industries, does it have any proposals in mind for this sector, which is of fundamental importance to the future of the European economy?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (NL) This question relates to a subject which has frequently been raised in Parliament. As my predecessor stated in reply to the oral question put by Mr Fanton, the Council has not received any proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to undertake, at Community level, infrastructure action with financial support in the wood-processing and manufacturing industries.

Mr Remilly. — (F) Although Parliament has frequently put questions to both the Commission and the Council about the need to establish a Community

forestry policy, and we have always been given affirmative answers, we have never had any concrete results. What, therefore, are the obstacles in the way of establishing this forestry policy, to which Europe should give priority in view of the energy crisis?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I said in my initial answer that this subject has frequently been raised in the House — and the honourable Member confirms this. However, he says that nothing much has yet emerged in the way of a policy. Let me say two things: Firstly, I made it clear in my answer that the Council has not received any proposals from the Commission. Secondly, I would point out to the honourable Member that timber does not figure in the list of agricultural products in Annex II to the Treaty, so that it is not possible to introduce a general forestry policy under the Common Agricultural Policy.

Mrs Ewing. — In the light of the fact that the Community is a net importer of timber products, is it not irresponsible that we can have a situation such as that in my area where a large mill was allowed to shut while making a profit, with the result that now the timber is exported to a third country, Norway, at great expense and re-exported from there back in again at further expense? Surely this is the kind of situation that cannot be assisting the Community in any way whatsoever. Can the Council not take some initiative or think of some initiative that could be taken to stop this nonsense?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The honourable Member points out that the Community is a net importer of timber, and if I understood her question properly, she says this is an unacceptable situation, since it may cause certain problems in some regions. My view is that this forms part of the Community's general trade policy, and up till now one of the main features of this policy has been that it is as open as possible. Even in such a difficult situation, it is always a question of balancing requirements, but the requirement which I have just mentioned — a trade policy which is as open as possible — must certainly not be disregarded in this context.

Mr Hutton. — May I assure the President-in-Office of the Council, whom I congratulate on his appearance here for the first time today, that those of us interested in forestry are not seeking a common forestry policy but a coordinated forestry policy? Is he aware that in March last year this House was promised proposals from the Commission which have not been forthcoming, although they were promised for the end of last year, and would he use his good offices during the term of his presidency to press the Commission to be a little faster in the production of these proposals?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I should like to thank the honourable Member for his kind words. He calls for a coordinated forestry policy and wonders whether the Commission should not make some proposals. In my initial reply I pointed out that the Commission had not yet made any proposals, and I would have thought — and the honourable Member knows this best himself — that a Member of this House is best placed to put questions to the Commission if the European Parliament so wishes.

Mr Adam. — Would the President-in-Office of the Council tell his fellow members of the Council of the tremendous importance of support for the forestry industry in rural areas, where employment prospects would be greatly helped by a coordinated policy in this particular field?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) Since there have been no proposals from the Commission, the matter has not yet been discussed by the Council. Does that mean that the Council is not free to discuss it with the Commission? Mr President, I think the Commission will undoubtedly read what the various Members who put supplementaries on this subject have said, and I think my replies will indicate to the Commission that I join with those Members in underlining the importance of this question.

President. — Since the author is absent, Question No 55, by Mr Ansquer, will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 56, by Mr Cronin, has been withdrawn.

I call Question No 57, by Mr Howell (H-636/80):

If the Council is aware of the growing threat to the North Sea, ecologically and economically caused by oil pollution, what action is the Council intending to take in order to facilitate greater safety in shipping movements, greater integration of pollution control in Member States, and greater accountability of offending ships flying flags of convenience dumping oil ballast outside the territorial limits of Member States bordering the North Sea?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) The Council is well aware of the growing threat to the North Sea caused by oil pollution and has made the prevention and combating of marine pollution one of its major objectives. The following measures have already been adopted: a Directive designed to facilitate and encourage the use of sufficiently qualified deep-sea pilots in the North Sea, and a Directive to monitor the movements and safety of tankers entering or leaving Community ports.

In addition, the following measures are under consideration: a Directive to harmonize implementation in

Community ports of the standards and International Conventions regarding the safety of ships; a Decision introducing a Community information system for the prevention and combating of oil pollution of the sea. In addition, in accordance with the Council action programme of 26 June 1978 regarding hydrocarbons discharged at sea, the Commission is studying measures to be adopted with a view to more effective application of the 'polluter pays' principle.

Mr Howell. — For once, I think, we have had a rather good answer from the President-in-Office, which is not always the case, and I am grateful to him for it. I hope that he will continue to set a good example in this matter for those who will follow him in the presidency. I should like to ask him one further question, and that is on shipping crew standards. Is he aware that it is still possible for individuals to walk into the embassies of countries which operate flags of convenience and buy for a very small amount documents entitling them to be masters of ocean-going ships of any size or standards? Indeed I have one of these documents in my possession. Will the Commission and the Council bring forward proposals to ensure that we can police not only shipping safety standards but also crewing standards, so as to make sure that we do not in future have to face the same sort of disaster on our coasts as we faced with the *Amoco Cadiz* and in my own constituency with the *Eleni V*? Will he treat this with the utmost urgency in view of the increasing flow of oil and other substances through the waters of the North Sea?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) Let me start by thanking the honourable Member for his kind words. Secondly, I must say that I think the situation that he refers to, i.e. that anyone — if I have understood him correctly — can easily become masters of ocean-going ships without qualifications and may thus jeopardize safety at sea, is primarily a matter for the Member States.

In conclusion, I would point out that the Council gives its full support to measures aimed at improving safety at sea — measures such as those taken by IMCO and the IAO — the regional conference held in Paris on safety at sea, and the memorandum of agreement between the North Sea countries. The Council has, for instance, taken steps to try to have the system embodied in its Directive on pilots incorporated in a recommendation from the Assembly of IMCO.

Mr Seeler. — (D) Mr President-in-Office, you are probably aware that infringements of the regulations you have just mentioned are usually punished by fines. However, these fines are often lower than the costs saved by the ships when they pollute the sea. May I ask you whether you are prepared to press the Council and the national governments to increase the penalties considerably, so that in addition to fines such pollution

¹ See Annex.

Seeler

of the sea will in future be punished by terms of imprisonment.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The honourable Member's question as to whether the Council is prepared to press for penalties for certain infringements to be increased has not yet been discussed by the Council, and it is therefore difficult for me to reply to it at this juncture.

Mr De Goede. — (NL) Since, after the recent almost disastrous pollution of the North Sea, reports are beginning to appear in the press that drilling platforms may also have been responsible for the pollution, I would like to ask whether the Council will be taking this aspect into account in any further studies and measures.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) Mr De Goede draws attention to the dangers which may arise from drilling platforms and asks whether the Council will take these dangers into consideration. I would have thought that this is one point which, no matter how genuine, in the first place requires the Commission to do something, to propose something. I do not deny the importance of the point, but I would suggest that it is something that must be solved through appropriate procedures which have proved reliable in the past.

President. — I call Question No 58, by Mr Clément (H-553/80):

Why, at its last meeting, did the Council reject the specific programmes proposed by the Commission for the improvement of agricultural structures? Would it not agree that the resulting delay will be damaging to the agricultural structures of the regions concerned?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (NL) At its latest meetings in November and December, the Council was not in a position to deal with the Commission proposals on structures policy, since other priority questions, and in particular the extension of Community agricultural regulations to Greece, required its full attention. The Commission proposals as a whole involve a substantive review of the 1972 Directives and the introduction of a number of specific measures and integrated programmes which — in the interest of the whole of agriculture in all the regions of the Community — deserve to be examined with the greatest care. The Council will not fail to devote as soon as possible all the time necessary for a detailed examination of these proposals.

Mr Clément. — (F) In this context, the Council had asked Parliament to give an urgent opinion on a draft Commission directive, so that it itself could reach a decision as soon as possible. Parliament gave its opinion and approved the draft directive on 17 Octo-

ber last. In view of this, is the Council aware that its delay in reaching a decision is likely to have an adverse effect on the economic development of less-favoured rural regions such as the French DOMs, where the unemployment rate among the active population is 25 %?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) In reply to this question drawing attention to the adverse effects of the delay which has arisen, I would point out that the Presidency will do everything it can to have this matter discussed in the Council and settled as soon as possible.

Mrs Ewing. — While thanking the President-in-Office for his answer because it still seems to leave the matter open, I want to remind him that in one of the areas concerned, namely the Western Isles, the people there have been led by the publicity which emanated from the Commission to believe that they have been selected. Could I ask him to consider that there can be nothing worse for the Community than people being told that they are getting some benefit because the Community cares about these peripheral areas and then suddenly being told that the Council has changed its mind?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) Mrs Ewing referred to one of the three integrated development programmes for the islands off the west of Scotland. However, there are numerous other regions which are awaiting a final decision on these proposals. I would remind you of what I just said — that the Presidency will make every effort to ensure that these proposals are adopted as soon as possible after discussion by the Council.

President. — I call Question No 59, by Mrs Fourcade (H-556/80):

Can the Council state whether the oil agreements concluded between certain Member States and certain Persian Gulf States contain clauses prohibiting the resale of oil to other Community countries? Are such clauses compatible with the Treaty of Rome?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (NL) The Council has not had occasion to discuss the subject raised by the honourable Member in her question.

Mrs Fourcade. — (F) If this is so, what would become of the sharing procedure laid down by the Council itself for periods of shortage within the Community?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I do not think the honourable Member's question as to whether particular

Van der Mei

clauses are contained in bilateral oil agreements and the question on implementing the sharing procedures really belong together.

Mr Galland. — (*F*) Mr President-in-Office, I am amazed at your initial reply to Mrs Fourcade's question. This question was put down in good time, and the Council has had several weeks in which to consider its reply. It is not necessary for the Council to have discussed this matter formally — the question was, after all, accepted — for the President-in-Office to look into whether or not Mrs Fourcade's question is justified.

My question to you is thus whether, since the Council has not discussed the subject, you yourselves have considered whether what is stated in the question is true or not.

Mr Van der Mei. — (*NL*) The question as to whether the Council has considered the matter simultaneously raises the question of whether this is something for which the Council is responsible, and my view is this is not the case.

Mr Seligman. — Does the President-in-Office agree that direct oil agreements between Member States and certain Persian Gulf States constitute an undesirable interference in the normal working of world oil markets, as carried out by the major oil companies? Will he ask the Energy Council to look into this and try to get some better coordination between Member States in order to reduce this sort of government-to-government trading?

Mr Van der Mei. — (*NL*) The question of whether direct oil agreements between Member States and oil-producing countries are inherently undesirable is, in my view, not one for which the Council is responsible.

President. — I call Mr Galland on a point of order.

Mr Galland. — (*F*) Mr President, at the last part-session we had an extremely difficult Question Time with Miss Flesch, and Miss Flesch told the House that she would ask the Council to improve the procedure for replying to questions.

Mr President, it is obviously essential for the Bureau to look into this. There are only two possibilities: either a question is acceptable, in which case it is indicated in the document which we receive and the Council replies to it, or else it is not acceptable, the Council says so, and it is not indicated in the document. We cannot go on getting into this kind of situation.

(*Applause from various quarters*)

President. — I call Question No 60, by Mr Vié: (H-558/80):

In view of the present deadlock in the negotiation of a cooperation agreement between the Community and Comecon, is it proposed to resort to bilateral agreements either in the agricultural sector or in the industrial sector?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (*NL*) The conclusion of bilateral trade agreements between the Community and each of the member countries of Comecon is one of the Community's constant objectives. As long ago as November 1974, the Community made an offer to all State-trading countries to negotiate trade agreements to replace the Member States' bilateral agreements which had expired. This offer is still open, and the Community would welcome a positive reply from any one of these countries which wished to normalize its relations with the Community by establishing contractual links. However, this offer from the Community is not an alternative to the process of negotiation with Comecon initiated in 1976 at the latter's initiative; no significant progress has in fact been made with these negotiations in recent months.

Mr Vié. — (*F*) With regard to Poland, has the Community made any concrete proposals to the Polish authorities for food aid in the form of cereals and dairy products? Has any agreement been reached, and if so, what are the financial details?

Mr Van der Mei. — (*NL*) As regards the attitude to Poland, the Commission has submitted a proposal to supply limited quantities of agricultural products to Poland at reduced prices. The answer to the honourable Member's question is thus affirmative.

President. — I call Question No 61, by Mr de Lipkowski (H-569/80):¹

When does the Council intend to adopt the measures to increase agricultural prices for the 1981/1982

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (*NL*) Agricultural prices are scheduled to be fixed before 1 April 1981, on which date the milk marketing year begins. The Council will begin its proceedings on the matter and will consult the European Parliament as soon as the Commission proposals have been laid before it.

Mr Fanton. — (*F*) I won't dare to call my question a supplementary, since I do not feel I have yet received any reply.

¹ For whom Mr Fanton deputized.

Fanton

I believe the Council will try to have the prices fixed before 1 April. However, since we are told the same thing each year, and each year there is a delay in fixing the prices, I should like the Council not to rest on its totally inadequate reply and tell us how it intends to meet that deadline.

I would point out that the marketing year starts on 1 April. There were delays in fixing the prices in other years, and since I know that some quarters frequently complain about the national aids some Member States are obliged to grant their farmers because of this delay, I should like to know whether — in the unlikely case of a 'slight' delay in April — the Council intends to grant aid to farmers who are already hard hit by inflation and will be even harder hit if the Council is late in fixing prices.

Mr President-in-Office, contrary to what you have done with the preceding questions, I should be glad if you would try to give a real reply to a real question this time.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I would deny that my previous answer was not courteous. I made clear that the Council intends to fix agricultural prices before 1 April 1981. The honourable Member and I certainly do not differ over the importance of the matter, but we both realize that both a Commission proposal and an opinion from the European Parliament are first required. Once we have these, the Council can act.

Mr Howell. — Can I ask the President-in-Office of the Council if at the time of fixing the price proposals he would also bear in mind that a common price mechanism throughout the Community is becoming increasingly unworkable in view of the differing inflation levels in different countries? It is also becoming increasingly unworkable because of the different levels of national aids in different countries and, in particular, I would draw his attention to the level of national aids at present being granted in France. Can I ask him to draw the attention of his colleagues in the Council to the national aid problem at the same time as he looks at the proposals for agricultural price increases?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) Mr Howell mentioned a number of factors which play a certain role in agricultural prices policy — and not just there — and pointed out that it was important that these factors should be taken into account when fixing agricultural prices within the next few months. I feel sure that the points raised by the honourable Member will be given due consideration in the forthcoming discussions on agricultural prices.

Mr Martin. — (F) When fixing the agricultural prices, does the Council intend to adopt the objective method, i.e. to take account of the increased produc-

tion costs and cost of living, as called for by farmers' organizations?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I know that the application of the objective method has been a matter of concern to many people in the past, and this will most probably continue to be the case in the future, but I think it is asking too much at this stage to say exactly what we shall be doing as regards this method. As I said before, we must await the relevant proposal from the Commission and the opinion of the European Parliament.

Mr Delatte. — (F) As regards the deadline for fixing the prices, I can see no reason why the Council should not be able to fix the prices before April, since the Committee on Agriculture has decided to discuss this question in February. This means that Parliament will be able to give its opinion by March at the latest, so I think the deadline of 1 April should be met.

As regards the national aids paid last year because of the delay in fixing prices, there is naturally no question of taking these into account when fixing the prices for 1981/1982, and I think the Council can confirm this. On the other hand, when the prices are being calculated it will be important to take account not only of the objective method but also of the loss in income suffered by farmers as a result of the inadequate rise in prices in 1980.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) Mr Delatte made a number of points, starting with his view that there are no grounds for a delay. I can only repeat what I have already said: we are awaiting the Commission's proposal and Parliament's opinion, and only then will we know whether there are grounds for a delay. As regards the national aids and the objective method, I would point out — as I have just said already in reply to another question — that these factors will undoubtedly play a role in our discussions on this question. However, I think the time is not yet ripe for a debate on this.

Mr Vié. — (F) While waiting for the procedures to be implemented as soon as possible, I think the House is united in hoping that there will be no delay this year. For our information, Mr President-in-Office, could you tell us whether you have already formed any opinion on the estimate by the European farmers' organizations that the price level this year will have to be more than 15 % than last year's? Have you any opinion on this, Mr President-in-Office?

(Laughter)

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I cannot answer that question as the Council has not yet reached any decision on this point.

Mr Cousté. — (F) High time it did!

President. — I call Question No 62, by Mr Cousté (H-574/80):

With a view to combating recently noted abuses, does the Council intend to adopt specific measures so that the practice may be stopped of sending temporary employees to an EEC country other than their own without any guarantee of the social security cover to which they are entitled? If it is unable to do this, could it not at least recommend to the Member States that they keep a close watch to ensure that their legislation is properly applied to temporary employees, even non-nationals?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) On 30 October 1980, the Standing Committee on Employment discussed the various aspects of the problem of temporary employment on the basis of a communication from the Commission.

With particular regard to temporary employment abroad, which involves the risk of illegal practices, there was a convergence of views on the objective of combating such practices and any possible abuse. It is for the Commission to take the appropriate initiatives to enable the guidelines which emerged from the Standing Committee on Employment's proceedings to be implemented and to submit any proposals to the Council.

Mr Cousté. — (F) My supplementary follows automatically. Since you say there is a convergence of views within the Council, I should like to know on what?

My question was quite clear; do you or do you not intend to protect temporary employees sent to an EEC country other than their own, so that they have adequate social security cover?

My supplementary is thus automatic, since it would appear that this convergence of views has not yet produced any concrete moves such as a directive or even a simple recommendation to the Member States to ensure that their own legislation is properly enforced within their own countries, regardless of whether their own nationals or foreigners are involved.

The problem is so clear-cut I wonder why the reply was so vague.

(Laughter)

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) I pointed out in my reply that the Standing Committee on Employment had taken a close look at this question last year and that, as regards temporary working in another country, it had noted the risk of illegal practices and the need to

combat them. As I also said in my reply, it is for the Commission to study the opinion of the Standing Committee on Employment and then submit suitable proposals to the Council.

Mr Schmid. — (D) Mr President-in-Office, you are quite right in theory to say that it is now up to the Commission to make proposals. However, you know as well as I do that things can be done differently in practice, and that the Council can drop a hint to the Commission that it wants such proposals. May I therefore ask you if the Council is prepared to drop such a hint.

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) This question has already been looked into by one major Community body — the Standing Committee on Employment. This committee made its views very plain, so plain in fact that it will undoubtedly enable the Commission to draw any conclusions which may be necessary.

Mr Doublet. — (F) Are there any plans to work towards general harmonization in all Community countries, in the light not only of the present enlargement but also of the possible future enlargement?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The honourable Member is asking me something I cannot answer, at least not in the way he would like, since he is looking ahead to something which is not yet there. The fact is that I do not know what kind of proposal the Commission will be making, and only when I know this can I answer the question. We therefore look forward with extreme interest to whatever the Commission will be sending us.

(Laughter)

President. — I call Question No 63, by Mrs Ewing (H-631/80):

Will the Council use its good offices to persuade the British Government that it would be an appropriate — and long overdue — gesture to return the Elgin Marbles to Greece in the spirit of the Cultural Committee of Lomé's recommendation that objects of art should be returned to their country of origin?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council. — (NL) This point is solely a matter for bilateral relations between the Governments concerned.

Mrs Ewing. — Surely the President-in-Office does not think that the day of the grand Community gesture is over already? As it was a Scotsman who perpetrated this massive plunder, the originals are in the British Museum. Since we know that museums in

Ewing

Europe and other places have the spoils of war and plunder on display, would it not be appropriate for the Council to consider the desirability of recommending that such great national treasures should be restored, as copies today could be made and retained?

(Laughter)

Mr Van der Mei. — *(NL)* As far as the second part of the honourable Member's question is concerned, she is overestimating my knowledge. I do know what treasures are held by which museum or where exactly they come from.

(Laughter)

However, as for the first part of her question, I can only repeat what I said before — this is a typical matter for bilateral relations between individual countries.

Miss Roberts. — May I ask the President-in-Office of the Council for an assurance that when Mrs Ewing tables a question asking him to use his good offices to have the Stone of Scone returned from Westminster to Scotland, he will respond in an equally vague manner?

(Loud laughter)

Mr Van der Mei. — *(NL)* Mr President, I am only too pleased to reassure any Members who may need reassurance, although I must naturally remain within the limits imposed upon me by the Presidency of the Council.

(Laughter)

President. — I call Question No 64, by Mr Seal (H-548/80):

In the light of Mrs Oppenheim's recent paper on compulsory country of origin marking covering a wide range of consumer goods, would the Council accept that it contravenes Article 30 of the Treaty of Rome, and, given the extent of fraud since 1978 and the importance of the paper (based upon the views of numerous Consumer Associations), would it now admit that there is sufficient case for origin marking? Would the Council be in favour of uniform criteria requiring all clothing to carry a clear indication of country of manufacture?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(NL)* The Council is aware that some Member States have taken steps to regulate the indication of the origin of some products, particularly textile and clothing products. In this connection, it would seem that while there should be provision for effectively monitoring products' origins and consideration should be given to consumers' concern for information, it is

also vital to ensure that the smooth operation of the Community market is maintained by avoiding the creation of barriers to the free movement of goods within the Community.

It is in any case for the Commission to assess whether a measure is compatible with the Treaty. I would remind the honourable Member that, after notifying the Council last March in a communication of its views on matters related to origin marking, the Commission put before the Council in October 1980 a proposal for a Directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the indication of the origin of the certain textile and clothing products. The European Parliament was consulted on the matter on 16 October 1980. The Council is awaiting the Opinion of the European Parliament before adopting any position on this proposal.

As far as fraud in this area is concerned, the Commission submitted to the Council at the end of July 1980 a proposal for a regulation based on Article 113, which contains a number of measures to combat fraud more effectively. These measures are being studied in the Council.

Mr Seal. — I would like to thank the President for his answer, even though it only answered part of the question I asked. Could the President assure us that the problem of fraudulent origin marking is discussed quickly by the Council and that it will report back to Parliament on this very important matter?

Mr Van der Mei. — *(NL)* I just said in my initial reply that, as regards fraud, the Commission had sent the Council a proposal for a regulation at the end of last July, based on Article 113. In this proposal the Commission calls for an improved exchange of information between the Member States and between the Member States and the Commission, for improved methods of investigation with the setting up of a Community investigation body, for more effective measures to deal with fraud, and for an extension of administrative cooperation in this field.

Mr Paisley. — Is the President-in-Office aware that these products are striking at the very heart of the shirt industry of Northern Ireland? Is he aware that these shirts are first imported into an EEC country on the Continent and then transported to Northern Ireland under terms greatly detrimental to the clothing industry in Northern Ireland, which is in great jeopardy at the present time?

Mr Van der Mei. — *(NL)* The matter referred to by Mr Paisley has already been raised this afternoon and — if I am not mistaken — this morning as well. I think, Mr President, that we can take note of what the honourable Member has said, and I would draw your

Van der Mei

attention to the replies given by the Presidency to Parliament this morning as well as this afternoon.

Mr Fanton. — (*F*) I did not quite understand what the President-in-Office was referring to just now when he spoke about barriers to trade caused by labelling laws. What worries me about this reply is the fact that, according to what he said, the Council has been in possession of proposals since last July, and still no decision has been reached on this matter. The result is that each Member State is obliged to take special measures separately to put a stop to this unfair competition. Could the Council tell us its views on this question, which is of vital importance for the future of the textile industry in the Community.

Mr Van der Mei. — (*NL*) The honourable Member raises a number of points — barriers to competition on the one hand and legislation in the field in question on the other. In my answer to the first questions — and I would ask the honourable Member to read that answer carefully so as to save time — I stated clearly how we saw this connection. Furthermore, the Commission submitted a proposal to the Council in October 1980, and the Council is awaiting Parliament's opinion on this. I assume that this opinion of the European Parliament will certainly go into the matter to which I have just referred the honourable Member in my answer to his supplementary.

President. — I call Question No 65, by Mr Hutton (H-552/80):

In order to inform the directly-elected European Parliament of the impact of its Resolutions on Council decisions, will the Council agree to make a monthly report to Parliament, as is done by the Commission, on the action it has taken on Opinions and Resolutions adopted by Parliament?

Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council. — (*NL*) The Council is always prepared to inform the European Parliament of the action it has taken on the latter's Resolutions, either on the basis of written or oral questions or in reply to a specific request by the President of the European Parliament.

Mr Hutton. — May I ask the President-in-Office if, in view of the admission made by his predecessor, Mrs Flesch, at the December part-session of what she called 'a certain legal void or lack of democratic control' arising from the Council's refusal to inform either this Parliament or the national parliaments about its decisions he would bring this matter before the Council and obtain its agreement before July on the question of providing substantially more information to this Parliament on all aspects of the Council's work?

Mr Van der Mei. — (*NL*) Firstly, a press communiqué is issued after each Council meeting containing exact information on whatever decisions the Council may have reached.

(*Laughter*)

Secondly, I would once again stress what I said in my reply, i.e. that the Council is always prepared to reply as exhaustively as possible to written or oral questions put down by Parliament. Mr President, I should like to emphasize this readiness on behalf of the Dutch Presidency.

Lord Harmar-Nicholls. — The answer on the face of it, seems conciliatory and helpful, but in point of fact it did not undertake to do anything, and something ought to be done on this. Of course they will answer questions that are specifically put to them, but just like the Commission, the Council ought formally, within the framework of their own machinery, to give a report as to what has happened to the things that have been submitted to them.

I remember that at the November part-session Mr Gaston Thorn, then President-in-Office, said what has just been repeated, namely that we should read the press agencies. But the press agencies are not a formal part of Parliament's machinery, and unless they pay for an advertisement in the newspapers giving a full report as to what has been submitted to them, it does not become part of Parliament's machinery. Cannot the President-in-Office go that step forward, instead of being just conciliatory and saying it will answer if asked? Will it do what the Commission does, which has proved to be helpful, and give a formal report on what they do with the opinions Parliament sends them?

Mr Van der Mei. — (*NL*) The honourable Member states that my reply does not contain any undertaking. It is always extremely difficult to determine whether or not something is of the nature of an undertaking. Since, however, I said in my reply that the Council is prepared to answer oral and written questions from the European Parliament as extensively as possible and to keep Parliament informed through suitable channels, should it so wish, and since I also said, Mr President, that the Dutch Presidency will make an effort in this respect, I do feel that this to some extent represents an undertaking. However, when the honourable Member calls for a report from the Council to Parliament, I think he is confusing the position of the Council with that of the Commission. The positions of the Council and the Commission are defined differently in the Treaty, and it is this difference in definition which determines their relations with Parliament.

Mr Hord. — Is not the present situation an example of the Council exercising power without responsibility,

Hord

and in the light of the reply given by the President-in-Office, is it not a fact that we now have government by press release? I should like to hear from the President-in-Office whether he feels that the Dutch Presidency can give such negative answers for the six months it is in office. Will he now agree to take this question back, reconsider it in Council and return to the Parliament with a positive reply before Easter?

Mr Van der Mei. — (NL) The honourable Member makes a number of points. To start with, he said that it was a matter of the Council exercising power with responsibility. In this context I would draw your attention to the Treaties; as I said a moment ago, the positions of the Council and the Commission as regards relations with Parliament are defined differently in the Treaty, and my reply was based on this fact. Secondly, it is not true that the Council is exercising government by press-release — this is something I strongly deny. Thirdly, I would repeat what I said about the Presidency — not just the Dutch Presidency — to the effect that each Presidency is prepared to provide Parliament, through appropriate channels, with any information Parliament may ask from it.

President. — We come now to questions to the Foreign Ministers.

I call Question No 78, by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli (H-624/80):

The press has reported that the EEC and Turkey have decided to organize discussions on a permanent basis between the heads of their political departments.

Does the Council not feel that initiating political consultations at this time in the context of political cooperation with Turkey, which is governed by a military regime that has abolished the constitutional rights of its citizens and dissolved Parliament, would be a purely negative act which would conflict with the democratic spirit of the EEC and the Member States and the concern expressed by Parliament?

Does the Council not feel, furthermore, that initiating such talks might be construed by outside observers as giving encouragement to the Turkish regime, on which pressure should be brought to bear in every possible way with a view to restoring democracy?

Mr Van der Klaauw, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (NL) The regular contacts between the Community and Turkey represent not consultations but rather an opportunity for the mutual exchange of information, so that whenever necessary the Community and Turkey can inform each other on questions which have been discussed by the Ten and which in some way concern Turkey's specific interests in the international field. In this connection, it is important to note — as was pointed out in the statement issued after the meeting of Foreign Ministers in Political Cooperation on 15 September 1980 — that the Turk-

ish Government, in accordance with the assurances it had given in this respect, is making an effort to create the conditions for re-establishing democracy as soon as possible, as well as respect for human rights, while at the same time giving assurances on the treatment of politicians under house arrest.

Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli. — (I) I should like to thank the Minister of Foreign Affairs for his reply, which nevertheless does not allay our understandable concern. We read disturbing reports — only a few days ago three hundred persons were arrested, most of them political leaders. Is there not a case for asking the Turkish Government to fix a deadline for the re-establishment of civil rights and, hence, for elections, which would at least give this Parliament a talking partner. The fact is that, as things stand at present, we cannot have relations with Turkey as there is no-one we can talk to. In addition I should like to know whether, within the framework of political cooperation between the Ten — not between the Ten and Turkey — the meetings which I assume have been held at ambassadorial level in Ankara have regularly produced common stances on the various questions discussed, and if so on which questions.

Mr Van der Klaauw. — (NL) I think we would do well to recall the situation in Turkey before the army came to power. I myself happened to be in Turkey on an official visit shortly before, and I saw for myself that the country had landed in a complete economic and political *impasse*. The public authorities were no longer operating, and while democracy still existed in theory it no longer functioned in practice. Of course this is a regrettable situation, and of course it is regrettable when the army takes such action. The army in Turkey regards itself as the guardian of Turkey's national heritage — rightly or wrongly, this is how they see their job. We have been given explicit assurances that the aim is to re-establish a functioning democracy in Turkey, and I have no grounds at all for thinking that the army will not be prepared to fulfil this commitment. As regards political consultation between the Ten, the ambassadors in Ankara are naturally in contact with one another, but equally naturally I myself have discussed these matters with the political affairs committee and with the other ministers, and the position of the ten Member States over Turkey is one and the same.

Mr Israël. — (F) Mr President-in-Office, our concern derives basically from the fact that we were given certain promises at the time of the coup d'état. You appear optimistic as regards these promises, but I am much less so, since there is the matter of a date. When democracy was abolished, we were told it would be re-established very soon — i.e. one month, two months, three months or four months, which is more than enough without democracy. May I there-

Israël

fore ask you whether you have fixed a date after which you will consider the situation irreversible.

Mr Van der Klaauw. — (NL) I do not think it is up to the Ten to set a date — that is something for the Turks to do, and they are perfectly aware that the Ten consider the re-establishment of democracy in the near future feasible and desirable. I think this demonstrates clearly enough our pressure on developments in Turkey.

Mr Schinzel. — (D) Mr President-in-Office, Turkey has a military dictatorship under which torture, arrests and murder are daily occurrences. It is scandalous that this Parliament should have to listen to you defending it.

At the time a military dictatorship took over in Greece, the Netherlands took steps to have Greece expelled from the Council of Europe because it no longer fulfilled the basic requirements for membership. Are you prepared to take similar steps in the case of Turkey?

Mr Van der Klaauw. — (NL) I have already made it clear that the Ten consider a return to democracy in Turkey necessary and desirable, and that they have made this view clear to the Turks. Another important factor is that the Ten have received assurances from the Turkish authorities that they are striving to re-establish a functioning democracy, and I therefore do not think that the comparison between the situation in Greece then and the situation in Turkey now is valid. Democracy in Greece was functioning, whereas democracy in Turkey was unfortunately no longer functioning, and that is why the necessary conditions for its functioning must be established as soon as possible. Furthermore, the honourable Member should not for one moment doubt the intention of the Dutch Government — as of the other governments of the Ten — to protect and promote democracy.

Mr Chambeiron. — (F) Mr President-in-Office, my question is quite specific. You told us that, since the Turkish army took over power in Ankara, it has been trying to create the necessary conditions for a return to democracy. However, the number of arrests has been increasing continuously ever since then. The representatives of democratic newspapers have just been arrested, and hundreds of trade union activists and leaders have been sentenced under arbitrary laws. In your talks with the Turks, have you asked what concrete steps have been taken to release from prison those people who have been detained illegally? What undertakings have the Turks given in this respect? And do you not think, on the basis of this reply, that your relations with that country should be marked more by firmness than by the certain softness which we regret to note?

Mr Van der Klaauw. — (NL) I thought I had already made clear the importance we attach to the re-establishment of democracy. It is naturally a matter of particular concern to me that people are currently being arrested. However, I would point out — and it is extremely important to remember this — that while it is regrettably true that people are being arrested now, the chain of political murders in Turkey had reached enormous proportions before last September. The situation in the country was desperate. I do not defend political arrests — you cannot expect that from a Dutch minister or from a President-in-Office — but I would ask you to give some thought to what had been happening in Turkey, and I think that, with this understanding and our commitment to a return to democracy in Turkey, we are best placed to put pressure on the Turks.

Mr Schmidt. — (D) Mr President-in-Office, since our views on the basic attitude to democracy obviously differ, I will lower my sights and simply ask you whether you are at least prepared to press for torture to be abolished in Turkey.

Mr Van der Klaauw. — (NL) I have no information on torture in Turkey. Should this be the case, you may rest assured that we will protest against it, since that is a completely different matter.

Mr Van Minnen. — (NL) Mr President-in-Office, do I understand from the reply you gave to Mr Schinzel that your interpretation of the fact that democracy in Turkey was no longer functioning implies that the Turkish army thereby had a moral right to intervene, and that we cannot therefore expect you to take steps — such as those taken by your predecessor, Mr Van der Stoel — to have Turkey expelled from the Council of Europe under the present circumstances?

Mr Van der Klaauw. — (NL) I thought I had already myself clear. The situation in Greece was different. A regime came to power which had no intention of restoring democracy. In Turkey, the situation was that democracy had completely ceased to function and that the country was heading for anarchy. That is regrettable, and it is also regrettable that it was necessary for the army to intervene. I naturally do not defend such events as such, but it was a completely different situation from that in Greece.

Mr Papaefstratiou. — (EL) I should like to ask the President-in-Office, quite apart from the important matter of the restoration of democracy in Turkey — in which we are all naturally interested — what he feels about the continuation of relations between the European Community and Turkey, and about possible economic aid, at a time when Turkey, contrary to the explicit decisions of the United Nations, is still occu-

Mr Papaefstratiou

pying a large part of the independent and sovereign State of Cyprus.

Mr Van der Klaauw. — (NL) As you know, relations between the Community and Turkey are governed by an association agreement. Alongside that, there are agreements on the exchange of political information, as I mentioned in my initial reply. That is the basis for the relations which the Community has had with Turkey for a long time now.

President. — Since the next two questions concern the same subject, they will be answered together.

I call Question No 79, by Mrs Lizin (H-626/80):

Will the Foreign Ministers explain in detail how they intend to follow up the initiatives taken by Mr Thorn and translate them into specific proposals?

and Question No 86, by Mr Israël (H-667/80):

Do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation believe that it is still possible for them to follow up their initiatives on the Middle East, when the nine Member States of the Community cannot even manage to vote the same way, notably in the debates of the United Nations General Assembly?

Mr Van der Klaauw, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (NL) One of the results of the European Council meeting on 2 and 3 December 1980 was the publication of a statement on the follow up to the moves made by Mr Thorn. In this statement, the European Council instructed the Dutch Presidency to establish new contacts with the parties involved in consultation with the foreign ministers. Such a meeting to prepare the way for new contacts is scheduled for 20 January.

Let me turn now to Mr Israël's question. In the statement issued after the European Council meeting in Venice on 12 and 13 June 1980, the nine countries of the European Community laid down the principles for a basis on which an overall settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict might be found. Mr Thorn's mission confirmed that these principles do in fact contain the elements necessary for an overall just and lasting settlement, as a basis for negotiations between the parties involved. Although it was not always possible to arrive at a common position at the General Assembly of the United Nations on certain aspects of the situation in the Middle East, the countries of the European Community have shown a tendency to agree more frequently than has been the case in the past. This shows clearly that there is basic agreement between the Member States of the European Community on the principles on which a solution to the Arab-Israel conflict will have to be found. The efforts made by the Ten subsequent to the statements of

Venice and Luxembourg last year will therefore be continued.

Mrs Lizin. — (F) May I start by asking the President-in-Office to explain why the answer to this question was already contained in the text given to us this morning. I suppose that, although he felt he could go into detail about his mission, he could not do it this afternoon. This is to be regretted. I hope that the journalists will not — as happened recently in Belgium — be better informed than the Members about the content of this initiative.

My supplementary question concerns one particular passage in this morning's text. You said 'The Ten consider that the principles which I have just indicated in general terms — and which the newspaper *Le Soir* had described in extreme detail — must be respected by all the parties concerned, hence including the Palestinian people and the PLO, which must be associated with the negotiations'. It is this somewhat strange plural verb [in French] which I should like to ask you about. How do you envisage the organization of this 'and' and of this plural verb in 'must be associated', and how do you envisage the organization of the representativity of the Palestinian people? Is there, in your mind, a dissociation between the PLO and this representativity?

Mr Van der Klaauw. — (NL) I can refer you to the statement made after the European Council in Venice, which states that the Palestinians, and hence the PLO as well, must be associated with the negotiations — I think that is the correct phrase.

Mr Galland. — (F) If the follow-up to the Thorn mission in the Middle East is to succeed — and many of us are not convinced it is a success at the moment — do you not think that would be better to improve Europe's negotiating position? To be specific, do you not think our position could be improved by issuing a clear call to the PLO to delete, before any discussions started, Articles 19 and 22 of its Charter, which as you may know call for the destruction of the State of Israel? I would remind you that many Members of this House have already advocated this preliminary step.

Mr Van der Klaauw. — (NL) The approach adopted by the European Governments is aimed precisely at breaking this vicious circle. On the one hand, the Palestinians have included the destruction of Israel in their Charter and refuse to give Israel any recognition at all before the Palestinian problem is settled, while on the other hand Israel refuses to talk to the Palestinians before other matters, including Israel's security, have been settled. The main point in the European initiative is to see whether we can break this vicious circle. We are therefore thinking along the same lines as the honourable Member. However, I think we must

Van der Klaauw

try to achieve this through talks — even with the PLO — rather than through laying down prior conditions, either to the PLO or to Israel, because that will naturally get us nowhere.

Mr Provan. — Would the Minister not agree that the best initiative that Europe could show at this point of time would be a strong statement saying that there will be no further negotiations with the PLO until we make further progress on the Camp David Agreements?

We must realize that Egypt is by far the largest country, holding over 50 % of the Arabs, and that until progress is made on that front we cannot really expect any progress elsewhere. And the initiative already shown by Europe is in fact holding up further progress on that front.

Mr Van der Klaauw. — (NL) I disagree with the honourable Member. I do agree with him that the Camp David Agreement is an important factor, and I do agree with him that Europe must do nothing which might run counter to the Camp David process. So far so good, but I do not agree with him when he says that the European initiative is hindering further progress on the Camp David procedure, which is currently marking time. I think there are other reasons for that.

Mr Purvis. — May I ask the President-in-Office, as Mr Henry Kissinger seems set to play an influential part in American policy towards the Middle East in the new American Government and in view of the fact that he has made some very critical, even dismissive, remarks about the EEC's initiative in the Middle East, has the Council of Ministers made any representations to the incoming American Government on this matter and, if not, is it going to and what would it say it were to make representations?

Mr Van der Klaauw. — (NL) Mr Kissinger is of course a great statesman and he knows it. He has been travelling all over the world and making contacts in a private capacity, and we have taken note of this. In the context of our moves in the Middle East, it will undoubtedly be important for us to establish contact as soon as possible with the new American administration, and all the necessary steps to do so have been taken.

Mr Israël. — (F) Mr President-in-Office, in the light of the reply you gave to my question, do you not think that what you are aiming at is no more than theoretical agreement between the Nine on the Middle East? Are we preparing an article for a specialized journal, or are we trying to establish to what extent the Community can speak with a single voice on the

Middle East? In this context, what point does Mr Thorn's mission now have, when the Member States of the Community cannot agree when they come to vote on specific resolutions in the United Nations?

Mr Van der Klaauw. — (NL) The honourable Member is undoubtedly aware that, in our European political cooperation, we try pragmatically and wherever possible to establish and formulate a common foreign policy. This also applies to the United Nations. I think I have made it plain that we agree on the main principles, but there are certain aspects on which we vote somewhat differently. This is not the only context in which this happens — there are other points of policy on which our votes differ. However, our efforts are aimed at having continuous talks to establish whether or not we can find a common standpoint. Moreover, Mr President, this is naturally much more than an intellectual exercise, it is an exercise of the greatest possible political significance, since the fact is that political cooperation, alongside the important cooperation on the basis of the Treaty of Rome, is the basis for the United Europe which is the ultimate aim of us all.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, if I may refer to two answers given by the Minister on this subject: first of all, is he seriously telling us that there has been no contact whatsoever on this subject with the leading lights of the Reagan Administration, particularly as there appears to be some danger of a rift between the Community and the United States on this subject?

And, secondly, when he talked about preconditions for the PLO, or indeed no preconditions, surely he would agree with me that one precondition must be respect for the existence of the State of Israel, at least on its pre-1967 boundaries?

Mr Van der Klaauw. — (NL) As regards the last point, I repeat that all moves made by the Nine are naturally based — and this is made clear in the Venice declaration — on the continued existence and security of the state of Israel. There can be no uncertainty about this, and it will be emphasized — and has been emphasized by Mr Thorn — in contacts with the PLO. As regards contacts with the new American administration, there have been procedural contacts to arrange for talks to be held as soon as possible on the Middle East in particular, and I hope to be visiting Washington soon. However, real talks can naturally not take place until the new administration is installed. Until then, it is not possible — not even informally, apparently — to have really detailed talks on the Middle East and other problems.

President. — The second part of Question Time is closed.¹

¹ See Annex.

9. *Urgent debate*

President. — I have received the following motions for resolutions with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- by Mr Hume and others on behalf of the Socialist Group and Mr Lalor and others on the Irish Rugby Football Union's South African Tour (Doc. 1-801/80);
- by Mr Van Minnen and others on the situation in El Salvador (Doc. 1-803/80);
- by Mr Coppieters and others on the fate of six Corsican prisoners (Doc. 1-806/80).

The reasons supporting these requests for urgent debate are contained in the documents themselves.

I shall consult Parliament on the urgency of these motions for resolutions at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

10. *Agenda for next sitting*

President. — The next sitting will take place tomorrow, Thursday, 15 January 1981, at 10.00 a.m., 3.00 p.m. and 9.00 p.m., with the following agenda:

- Decision on requests for urgent debate

- Vote on the motion for a resolution on membership of committees
- Walz report on decentralized energy production
- Continuation of joint debate on the Carossino report, two Maij-Weggen reports and the Spaak report on pollution of the sea
- Alber report on a research and development programme in the field of environment
- Combe report on maximum levels for pesticide residues
- Hooper report on recovery and re-use of waste paper and board
- Balfour report on budgetary questions
- Van den Heuvel report on human rights in Uruguay
- Delatte report on sugar and isoglucose
- Louwes report on the EEC-Brazil cooperation agreement
- Nyborg report on the importation of certain goods
- Schall report on the Community's information policy
- Interim report by Mrs Pruvot on cultural workers
- Prag report on linking work and training for young persons
- Castellina report on STABEX

3 p.m.: Voting time

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 7.25 p.m.)

ANNEX

*Questions which could not be answered during
Question Time, with written answers*

*I. Questions to the Commission
Question No 14, by Mrs Nielsen (H-528/80)*

Subject: Income support for workers in the shipbuilding industry.

With reference to Article 1(1) of the proposal from the Commission (COM (80) 410 final),¹ will the Commission please state whether this proposal will include workers employed in yards where ships are built for both military and civil use, and if not, which yards in Denmark fall outside the scheme and how the Commission plans to distinguish between different types of workers with regard to this question in particular?

Answer

The Commission proposal on assistance from the European Social Fund to provide income support for workers in the shipbuilding industry was not adopted by the Council. In spite of the fate of the proposal, I feel that the question is pertinent and shall do my best to answer it.

The Commission proposal which reserved the aid for workers in the *civil* shipbuilding industry did not in fact contain any details in regard to shipyards with mixed activities, both civil and naval. However, the logic of the proposal and in particular the close link between this social measure and the segment of activity for which restructuring was considered to be particularly necessary, help us to distinguish the beneficiaries intended in this case.

Thus it would have been necessary to adopt a certain flexibility in applying the measure to workers whose tasks are not limited purely to civil or naval shipbuilding. On the other hand, workers in an undertaking with mixed activities and working either full time on naval shipbuilding or in a separate yard dealing with this type of building alone, would have been excluded.

When it presented its proposal, the Commission made no attempt to specify beneficiaries at the level of the undertaking, either in Denmark or in the other Member States.

*

* *

Question No 18, by Lord Bethell (H-578/80): postponed

*

* *

Question No 19, by Mr Hume (H-577/80)

Subject: Milk production in the Community.

Will the Commission comment on the effect on milk production within the Community, of the increasing import of non-levy high protein ingredients for the production of animal feedstuffs, and indicate what steps are being proposed to deal with this problem?

Answer

The rise in milk production in recent years has been caused by several factors, namely the increased and better use of compound feedstuffs, which has led to increased imports of protein.

¹ Doc. 1-370/80.

The Commission is concerned about these rises in imports and production and, as we stated in our recent memorandum on the common agricultural policy, we want to try to tackle the problem in several different ways: by agreements with the producer countries, such as the one we are negotiating with Thailand on manioc; and possibly by changing the price relationship between milk and feed-stuffs and by means of the co-responsibility levy.

*

* *

Question No 20, by Mr Collins (H-591/80)

Subject: Compensatory finance for the loss of colleges in Scotland.

Scotland is recognized by the Commission as an area of acute deprivation, but is the Commission aware that the British Government intends to close certain colleges of education in Scotland and can they provide any hope of compensatory finance for the loss of these colleges?

Answer

The Commission is aware that the British Government has it in mind to close certain colleges of education in Scotland. I have to say however that there appears to be no means for the Community to offer compensatory finance for the closure of those colleges. The Commission is however examining the position.

*

* *

Question No 21, by Mr Kirk (H-601/80)

Subject: Labelling of prepacked bread and cakes.

Is the Commission aware of the problem which has arisen for thousands of small independent bakers in Europe who do not have the financial, technical or manufacturing resources to comply with the labelling requirements for their modest, but for them financially crucial production of prepacked bread and cakes, which they sell either locally or in their own shops, and how would the Commission propose to solve this problem?

Answer

All prepacked foods covered by Article 1(3)(b) of Council Directive 79/112/EEC of 18 December 1978 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs for sale to the ultimate consumer are subject to the provisions of this Directive. In its sixth recital it is stated that the Directive is intended to inform and protect the consumer, and the Commission attaches considerable importance to this requirement.

The Commission is of the opinion that the compulsory labelling of prepacked bread and cakes ought not to cause greater problems for bakers than for the other professional groups affected by the application of this Directive.

*

* *

Question No 22, by Mr Radoux (H-602/80)

Subject: Strengthening of the EMS

In view of the statement issued by the European Council meeting in Luxembourg on 1-2 December, to the effect that it will 'continue to seek to strengthen the EMS until, 'at the proper time', it can proceed to the institutional phase', can the Commission state what its attitude is towards this manifest delay?

Answer

Since it came into force, the European Monetary System has worked satisfactorily: the rates of exchange of the currencies concerned have been stable, the two central rate adjustments were only minor and they were carried out smoothly. This smooth operation of the EMS is all the more remarkable since the international monetary situation has been seriously upset; in particular, the oil price rises have led to the recurrence of considerable disequilibrium with regard to balance of payments, inflationary pressures have increased and there has been considerable fluctuation in the yen and the dollar.

Work on proceeding to the institutional phase of the EMS began as long ago as May 1979. Following preparatory technical work, the problems were assessed and the options defined. In the report on the European Monetary Fund submitted to the European Council in March 1980, the Commission took stock of the work done so far and the problems involved. Since then the Commission has actively pursued this work and has strengthened the system in a number of important points, of which I shall quote only two: the adjustment of the mechanism of Community loans, on which Parliament gave its opinion at its last part-session; the development of the role of the ECU as the *numéraire* for Community loans.

What is now required is to define the institutional phase of the EMS in such a way that it meets fully the needs which have gradually become apparent over the last two years and to set it up in the way which best accords with the basic aims of the system. Work on this is progressing, but some aspects have still to be clarified, since there are problems which it was impossible to foresee in 1978. The Commission hopes that these decisions can be taken in the near future; this is how it interprets the statement by the European Council at its meeting in Luxembourg on 1-2 December.

*

* *

Question No 23, by Mr Megahy (H-604/80)

Subject: Textile unions

What is the reaction of the Commission to the recent walk-out by European textile unions from talks in Brussels?

Answer

The honourable Member is doubtless referring to the meeting held on 30 October 1980 between the Committee of Textile and Clothing Trade Unions and a European Commission delegation, concerning which an answer was given on 15 December 1980 to Question No H-555/80 by Mrs Fourcade.

Since then, on 12 December 1980, Mr Davignon met a delegation from this committee of European textile unions.

At that meeting both sides were able to engage in a thorough exchange of views on current problems in the textile and clothing sector, in particular the problems involved in the renewal of the Multifibre Arrangement.

It was agreed that this type of consultation would take place regularly during the present preparatory phase of the Community position regarding the renewal of this arrangement.

*

* *

Question No 24, by Mr Nicolson (H-605/80)

Subject: Information retrieval service

Can the Commission say whether it has any plans to provide an inexpensive practical retrieval to allow MEPs' their staffs and interested parties to obtain information regarding existing and proposed legislation on any subject?

Answer

The Commission is not planning to set up a super-system to provide documentation on the national laws of the Member States. Several systems are operating at national level, and the Commission has been instrumental in setting up EURONET, which will facilitate access to the information they contain.

The inter-institutional computerized documentation system for Community law (CELEX) operates under the joint responsibility of all the Community institutions, and should be able to satisfy the Honourable Member's documentary research needs.

*

* *

Question No 25, by Mr Price (H-607/80): postponed

Question No 26, by Mr Patterson (H-609/80): postponed

*

* *

Question No 27, by Mr Bettiza (H-610/80)

Subject: Satellite transmission of radio and television programmes

Individual Member States of the Community are planning to transmit radio and television programmes by satellite and the Commission is looking into a proposal to introduce a European channel.

Does the Commission consider that it would be desirable to arrange news broadcasts to provide objective information about the European Community to the citizens of Eastern Europe?

Answer

1. The Commission will examine with interest any proposal seeking to create a European channel to transmit radio and television programmes by satellite. However, the Commission has so far not taken a decision to start work on such a project.
2. Of course the Commission is fully in favour of disseminating objective information about the Community, however, and wherever possible. There is also a draft resolution (Doc. 1-409/80), currently being studied by the Parliament's Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on the setting up of a Community broadcasting organization.
3. Apart from any technical complexities, the Commission would stress that it will be impossible to set up a Community programme unless there is agreement on its content. Any such agreement would be one of the most desirable results of the effort to achieve political cooperation.

*

* *

Question No 28, by Mr Harris (H-611/80)

Subject: Herring landings in Boulogne

On 10 December in Brussels, I presented formally to the Commission a dossier, including photographs, which had been compiled by one of my constituents, Mr A. Besley, on the large-scale landings in Boulogne on 1 December of herring which is alleged to have been caught illegally by French boats. On that day, 960 boxes, each weighed out to hold 50 kilos of herring, were stacked on the market, the fish having come from the stern trawler Otter Bank. Smaller boats were also unloading herring. What action has the Commission taken to investigate this specific complaint and what is the Commission doing generally to see that the herring ban is enforced by all Member States?

Answer

Immediately after receiving the dossier from the honourable Member, the Commission asked the French and Belgian authorities to supply all the relevant information on herring landings in the North Sea and Channel ports. We are awaiting their replies.

With regard to the more effective enforcement of the herring ban and other conservation measures, on 16 December 1980 the Commission sent to the Council a communication on the setting up of a supervising and enforcement body to harmonize and assist the work of its national counterparts in the Member States.

*

* *

Question No 29, by Mr Curry (H-612/80)

Subject: EEC food manufacturing industry

What plans has the Commissioner for Agriculture to meet representatives of the EEC food manufacturing industry (Commission des Industries Agricoles et Alimentaires)?

Answer

I hope that in the coming year I shall have the opportunity to meet representatives of the EEC food manufacturing industry.

*

* *

Question No 30, by Mr van Aerssen (H-614/80)

Subject: Revision of the OECD export credit scheme

What progress has been made with the reform of the export credit arrangements, and what ideas does the Commission have for reducing the serious disparities which exist between the USA and Japan on the one hand and the EEC countries on the other?

Answer

1. The Commission regrets that no progress has so far been made with the efforts to reform the export credit arrangements.
2. The Commission also regrets that the European Community's proposal for a 1 % increase (0.8 % in the case of developing countries) in the minimum interest rates for export credits has not been accepted by its OECD partners. Thus for the moment the large disparity between these rates and market and government-supported agreed interest rates remains.
3. After the breakdown of negotiations at the end of 1980, the Commission is considering how to reduce the conflicts of interest between the main exporting countries. It will submit proposals for new negotiating guidelines to the Council in time for the next meeting of OECD countries in May 1981.
4. The Commission still holds the view that it must be the aim of all the OECD States to bring to an end as soon as possible, by means of State subsidies, the race for the best terms and thus to respond to the appeal by the Heads of State and Government at their Venice conference on 22-23 June 1980 (point 32 of the statement issued after the Western Economic Summit of 22-23 June 1980).

*

* *

Question No 31, by Mrs Fullet (H-617/80): postponed

Question No 32, by Mr Cousté (H-618/80): postponed

Question No 33, by Mr Ansquer (H-620/80): postponed

Question No 34, by Mr Remilly (H-621/80): postponed

Question No 35, by Mr Enright (H-622/80): postponed

*

* *

Question No 36, by Sir Peter Vanneck (H-627/80)

Subject: Article 2(1) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2527/80

Article 2(1) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2527/80 (1) states that 'it shall be prohibited to use or to haul any trawl, etc.'. Is the Commission aware that, under this Regulation, the carriage of nets with meshes smaller than the specified minimum sizes is not rendered illegal and that therefore the enforcement of the minimum mesh sizes in this Regulation can only be effected by inspections of vessels at sea while fishing, and, in view of this, with Council Regulation (EEC) No 2527/80 having expired on 20 December 1980, will the Commission, in any Regulation which replaces it, propose to outlaw the carriage of nets with meshes smaller than the specified minimum sizes so that the enforcement of minimum mesh sizes can also be carried out on vessels in harbour or at sea while not fishing?

Answer

By Regulation 3458 of 17 December 1980 the Council extended the application of Regulation 2527/80 until 31 January 1981.

The Commission does not consider that it should include, in a proposal for any further prolongation, a prohibition to carry nets with meshes smaller than a certain size. Such a prohibition would unduly hamper the rational exercise of fishing by those Community vessels whose operations require the use of nets of different size during the same voyage.

*

* *

Question No 38, by Mrs Ewing (H-630/80): see Question No 2

Question No 39, by Mr Balfé (H-634/80): postponed

Question No 41, by Mr Vié (H-638/80): postponed

*

* *

Question No 42, by Mr Moreland (H-639/80)

Subject: Commission portfolios

Does the Commission agree that its role as a 'powerhouse of ideas' for the Community would not be well served if Commissioners hold the same portfolio for more than four years?

Answer

In reply to this question, I would refer the honourable Member to what I said on the role and composition of the Commission.¹

¹ See debates of 12 January 1981.

*

* *

Question No 43, by Mr Calvez (H-643/80)

Subject: Internal monitoring of production pursuant to Article 58 of the ECSC Treaty

The provisions of Article 58 of the ECSC Treaty have been in application within the European Community since 1 October 1980, following a Council decision on a proposal from the Commission.

This article provides for the institution of a number of procedures for the internal monitoring of production, to make the anti-crisis measures fully effective.

The firms which have been given quotas are required to provide the Commission with their production records, to enable it to analyse the statistics properly.

We should like to ask the Commission how many firms have in fact provided this information to date, and which firms?

Answer

All the iron and steel firms to which Decision 2794/80 applies are obliged to supply the Commission with statistical data in accordance with the questionnaires annexed to the said Decision.

Apart from a few small-scale firms which for technical reasons find it difficult to do so, all iron and steel firms actually provide such data.

*

* *

Question No 44, by Mr Israël (H-645/80): postponed

*

* *

Question No 45, by Mr Pearce (H-646/80)

Subject: Allocation of Community funds to butter

Will the Commission allocate Community funds to enable the retail price of butter in the United Kingdom to be cut by 33.3 % for a twelve-month period in order to establish what relationship exists there between the price of butter and its consumption, to avoid further subsidized sales of butter to the Soviet Union and to let the British people have some of the benefit of 'taxpayers' money spent on disposing of surpluses?

Answer

The Commission does not intend to use Community funds for this purpose since a subsidy equivalent to 15 % of the retail prices is already paid in the U.K. (45.94 ECU/100 kg.) and this is entirely financed by Community funds.

In operating the subsidy schemes it has been apparent that the response of butter consumption to price in the U.K. has been low, and this result is confirmed by various studies which have been made of the price elasticity of demand for butter in the U.K. This subsidy is therefore very expensive in relation to other measures in the butter sector. Indeed, it can be estimated that each additional 100 kilograms of butter sold as a result of the U.K. butter subsidy costs the Community budget 660 ECU as against only 125 ECU for the export market. This is because only 5 to 10 % of quantities subsidized on the internal market can be regarded as additional consumption whereas virtually all butter exported represents additional sales.

*

* *

Question No 46, by Mr Turcat (H-647/80): postponed

*

* *

Question No 47, by Mrs De March (H-652/80)

Subject: Sheep exports

Attempts are being made by the United Kingdom to have its exports of sheep to third countries indirectly subsidized by the European Community. The concessions demanded by the United Kingdom, which are in blatant contradiction with EEC Regulation No 1873/80, would have serious repercussions for French sheep breeders.

Will the Commission reject these demands which give an unfair advantage to British exporters?

Answer

The implementation of the common organization of the market has not brought about the price slump feared by some trade sectors. Thus market prices in all the Member States are currently above the level reached prior to the implementation of the common organization of the market, and at the beginning of January 1981 the Community average is higher than that at the same time last year.

During the first weeks following the implementation of Regulation (EEC) No 1837/80, there was a considerable drop in exports from the United Kingdom to the other Member States and an almost total halt in exports to third countries (Switzerland in particular).

The Commission therefore considered it advisable to restore the traditional pattern of trade between the Member State in question and third countries. This is why it decided, as a transitory measure, to suspend recovery of the variable premium on exports to third countries. This decision was taken on 8 December 1980 and is valid until 31 March 1981. It is agreed, however, that exports are not to exceed the quantities usual in the past, otherwise the application of this measure may be reviewed before 31 March 1981.

Consequently this measure, intended as it is to maintain traditional patterns of trade, does not affect the incomes of French producers.

*

* *

Question No 48, by Mr Pranchère (H-653/80)

Subject: Exports of beef and veal to Greece

Even before Greece officially becomes a member of the Common Market, some third countries are calling for preferential arrangements for their exports of beef and veal to Greece.

Given that the concessions granted to certain third countries for beef and veal have cost the Community budget 423 m EUA in lost levy revenue, will the Commission, in order not to penalize French breeders, ensure that the principle of Community preference is observed in the case of beef and veal exports to Greece from third countries?

Answer

1. Since 1 January 1981 the common organization of the market in beef and veal is applicable in its entirety to Greece.

In its trade with third countries Greece applies the Common Customs Tariff duty and Community levies.

In its trade with other Member States Greece is gradually phasing out intra-Community customs duties and has agreed to an additional reduction of these duties on 1 April 1981 (from 20 % to 12 % for fresh meat). Thus Community preference is fully guaranteed.

2. Some third countries are asking for a preferential system. For example, with regard to imports of beef and veal from Yugoslavia, it is planned to hold negotiations between the European Economic Community and Yugoslavia.

Once the Council of Ministers has adopted negotiating guidelines for adjusting this cooperation agreement to take account of Greece's accession to the Community, the rules governing imports of beef and veal from Yugoslavia to Greece will be drawn up.

*

* *

Question No 49, by Mrs Poirier (H-654/80)

Subject: Tobacco stocks in Greece

Greece currently has 125 000 tonnes of tobacco in stock, to which a further 30 000 tonnes will be added from the 1980 crop.

What steps does the Commission intend to take to prevent these stocks being sold on the Community market, which would have serious consequences for French tobacco producers.

Answer

On 1 January 1981 the Council adopted a regulation on the sale by the Hellenic Republic of stocks of raw tobacco held in Greece and originating from pre-adhesion crops.

This regulation lays down that each year the Commission is to determine, according to the procedure of the Management Committee, the varieties and quantities of tobacco from the Greek stocks earmarked for sale in the year in question which may be disposed of on the Community market. The Commission will base its decision on all the available data on the sale of Community varieties and the state of Community stocks.

The Commission will make every effort, as it does whenever it deals with the sale of Community tobacco stocks, to avoid any disturbance of the Community market.

*

* *

Question No 50, by Mr Frischmann (H-656/80)

Subject: Economic crisis in Europe

In view of the increasingly serious manifestations of poverty as a result of the worsening economic crisis in Europe, does the Commission intend to update the study which was conducted at its request in 1976 on poverty in Europe?

Answer

Following the Council discussions on 27 November 1980 (Employment and Social Affairs), the Council approved — on 22 December 1980 — a decision concerning a supplementary programme to combat poverty.

Under Article 1 of the Decision, within the limits of the appropriations remaining available under Article 306 of the budget of the European Communities for 1980, the Commission may, until 30 November 1981, promote, complete, finance or carry out studies and seminars intended to fill gaps in various important aspects of the fight against poverty.

The available appropriations total EUA 700 000.

The Commission will consult the representatives of the Governments of the Member States and independent experts on all matters of importance concerning the application of this Decision, in particular

as regards the conditions in which Community financial aid is granted and the way in which operations are carried out.

In this context, the Commission could indeed consider updating the above-mentioned study, but the limited time available to carry out the supplementary programme means that it would be practically impossible to revive the study. The first study in fact took more than a year to be completed. The proposal could, however, be suitably included in those that the Commission is to make in connection with the fight against poverty in its final evaluation report to be submitted to the Council in June 1981.

*

* *

Question No 51, by Mr Galland (H-658/80)

Subject: Closure of customs posts used for steel imports into Italy from other Community countries

Has the Commission been informed of the recent decision by the Italian Government to close two-thirds of the customs posts used for Italian imports of steel? Although the ostensible purpose of this measure was to monitor imports from third countries more effectively, it affects a number of the customs posts through which steel from other Community countries is exclusively or mainly imported. Has the Commission made representations to the Italian Government — or does it intend to do so — to put a stop forthwith to this administrative protectionism, which undermines one of the very foundations of the ECSC Treaty, namely the freedom of movement of steel products within the Community?

Answer

As soon as the Commission was informed of the Italian Finance Minister's decree of 14 November 1980 reducing the number of customs posts responsible for imports of iron and steel products to twelve, it made numerous representations to the Italian authorities with a view to ensuring compliance with Community rules on the free movement of goods. In doing so the Commission made special reference to the fact that this reduction in the number of authorized customs posts cannot be justified either as being measures for the monitoring of deliveries under Article 58 of the ECSC Treaty (such monitoring is carried out by their inspectors in the undertakings, not by the customs authorities) or by the need to determine the basis for assessing turnover tax, since there are other means by which the checks connected with the proper levying of this tax may be carried out.

The Commission is making further representations to the Italian Government.

*

* *

Question No 52, by Sir Frederick Warner (H-662/80): postponed

*

* *

II. Questions to the Council

Question No 55, by Mr Ansquer (H-493/80)

Subject: Hormones in feedingstuffs

Can the Council indicate whether the problem of hormones in feedingstuffs had already been raised earlier at Council level, in particular when the Directive of 23 November 1970 concerning additives in feedingstuffs was adopted.

Answer

The question of the possible use of substances with hormonal or anti-hormonal effect or of similar substances with anabolic effect was raised several times in the Council when the Directive on additives in feedingstuffs was adopted.

Each time the Council rejected the possibility of authorizing such substances, which did not seem to be in line with what this legislation was intended to achieve.

Since the Directive stipulates that the additives which it authorizes must be 'contained in feedingstuffs' and 'may not . . . be used in any other way for the purposes of animal feeding', it follows that substances with hormonal or anti-hormonal effect or similar substances with anabolic effect *are forbidden for purposes of animal feeding*, not only when added to feedingstuffs but also when administered in drinking water, by injection or by implants.

I would add that the Council has consulted Parliament on a proposal for a regulation concerning the use of hormonal or thyrostatic substances on domestic animals, and so it cannot deal with this matter until Parliament has delivered its opinion.

*

* *

Question No 67, by Mr Price (H-608/80)

Subject: EAGGF stocks

Which Member States show stocks of agricultural produce, purchased by their intervention agencies on behalf of the EAGGF, in their national accounts as assets of the Member State and what view does the Council take as to whether, in the event of such stock being destroyed by fire or similar hazard, the owners of the stock upon whom the loss would fall would be the Member State concerned or the European Community?

Answer

The Council does not possess sufficiently accurate information to reply to the first part of the question. The Honourable Member could, if necessary, address himself to the Commission in this regard.

As to the problem of the ownership of stocks and the possible consequences in case of an accident, it is not for the Council to settle this legal question, which involves not only Community legislation but also national legislation and the solution of which in the last resort depends on the judgment of the competent courts, subject to interpretation by the Court of Justice of the European Communities.

*

* *

Question No 68, by Mr Pedini (H-615/80): postponed

Question No 69, by Mr Habsburg (H-616/80): postponed

Question No 70, by Mr Berkhouwer (H-660/80): postponed

*

* *

Question No 71, by Mr Lomas (H-623/80)

Subject: Proposed British nationality law

Is the Council aware that the British Government has made proposals in a White Paper on nationality law which would deprive the children, born of British citizens living abroad, of British nationality and would also create five different forms of nationality?

As this is clearly against the Convention on Human Rights to which the British Government is a signatory and also against the principles of free movement and establishment as laid down in the EEC Treaties, is the Council prepared to ask the Government to reconsider these proposals?

Answer

It is not for the Council to ask the Government of a Member State to reconsider proposals such as those mentioned by the Honourable Member.

*

* *

Question No 72, by Mrs Lizin (H-625/80): postponed

Question No 73, by Mr Moreland (H-640/80): postponed

Question No 74, by Mr Bøgh (H-642/80): postponed

Question No 75, by Mr Turcat (H-648/80): postponed

Question No 76, by Mr Paisley (H-650/80): postponed

*

* *

Question No 77, by Mrs Le Roux (H-655/80)

Subject: The EEC's trade deficit with the United States

The EEC's trade deficit with the United States in agricultural products has worsened considerably in the recent past

Will the Council take steps to obtain the lifting of the restrictions introduced by the United States on imports of agricultural products from the EEC and also to limit exports from the United States to the EEC at preferential tariffs?

Answer

Since the beginning of the GATT multilateral trade negotiations, the EEC and the United States have made every effort within these negotiations and by means of high-level bilateral contacts to improve access for agricultural products to their respective markets. Both sides have made considerable concessions, and at the end of the multilateral negotiations in 1979 it proved possible to achieve a result which, in view of the overall economic situation, may be regarded as satisfactory.

Furthermore, the permanent high-level contacts between the EEC and the United States mean that any problems concerning the access of agricultural products to both markets can be taken up at any time.

Lastly, it should be pointed out that in the Community there are no preferential rates for American exports.

*

* *

III. Questions to the Foreign Ministers

Question No 80, by Mrs Ewing (H-632/80)

Subject: Disappearance of former Ethiopian Education Minister

Will the Foreign Ministers use their good offices to raise with the Government of Ethiopia the case of a prisoner who disappeared in July 1979, namely Seifu Mehetme Selassie, aged 53, who was the minister of education, arrested with other government officials in 1974, detained without charge or trial, of whom no trace can now be found despite enquiries made by Amnesty International?

Answer

The Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Communities have already expressed on numerous occasions their concern at violations of human rights all over the world. The violations of human rights in Ethiopia have also been followed closely in the context of European political cooperation.

Furthermore, the Member States seek individually, whenever the opportunity arises, to influence the Ethiopian Government so that it respects human rights.

*

* *

Question No 81, by Mr Paisley (H-633/80): postponed

Question No 82, by Mr Moreland (H-657/80): postponed

*

* *

Question No 83, by Mr Chambeiron (H-657/80)

Subject: Four-Power Agreement of 3 September 1971

Under the terms of the Four-Power Agreement of 3 September 1971 the Western sectors of Berlin do not constitute part of the Federal Republic of Germany. Do the Foreign Ministers consider that the holding of working meetings by the European Parliament in West Berlin is in keeping with the terms of the quadripartite agreement to which two Member States of the Community are signatories?

Answer

The President would point out to the honourable Member that the interpretation of the four-power agreement of 3 September 1971 and other agreements between the four powers concerning Berlin falls within the exclusive competence of the signatory States. This being the case, the question raised by the honourable Member is not among those discussed as part of political cooperation.

*

* *

Question No 84, by Mr Haagerup (H-651/80)

Subject: Information about the deliberations of the Foreign Ministers' meetings

Are governments of non-member States provided with special information about the deliberations of the ministers meeting in political cooperation, and what form does this information take?

Answer

In view of the confidential nature of the work done as part of political cooperation, the governments of the Ten do not, as a general rule, provide the governments of non-member States with any special information on the deliberations of the Foreign Minister meeting in political cooperation. However, in individual cases and on a pragmatic basis, the Ten may, after unanimous agreement, authorize the Presidency to supply such information during its usual diplomatic contacts with the representatives of third countries.

Furthermore, the Presidency would remind the honourable Member that there is a mutual information procedure by which the Community and Turkey may, where appropriate, obtain information on questions being dealt with by the Ten as part of European political cooperation and which concern anything which particularly affects Turkey in the international sphere.

*

* *

Question No 86, by Mr Israël (H-667/80): see Question No 79

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 15 JANUARY 1981

Contents

<i>Point of order: Mr Moreland; Mr Galland</i> . . .	183	8. Votes:	
1. <i>Approval of minutes</i>	184	• <i>Delorozoy Report (Doc. 1-638/80): Aid to shipbuilding:</i>	
2. <i>Documents received</i>	184	<i>Mr Delorozoy, rapporteur</i>	206
3. <i>Decision on urgency:</i>		<i>Point of order: Mr Rogers</i>	207
<i>Mr Sutra; Mr Davignon (Commission); Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Früh; Mr Curry; Mr Dalsass; Mr Ferri; Mr Früh; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Pranchère; Mr Louwes; Mr Davignon; Mr Davern; Mr Pranchère; Mr Gautier; Mr Früh; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Bourmias; Mr Klepsch; Mr Glinne; Mr Fergusson; Mr Haagerup; Mr Hume; Mr O'Leary; Mr Beazley; Mr Klepsch; Mr Maher; Mr Glinne; Mr Klepsch; Mr Martin; Mr Haagerup; Mr Van Minnen; Mrs Bonino; Mr von der Vring; Mr Boyes; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Coppieters; Mr Estier; Mr Baillot; Mr Galland; Mr Geronimi</i>	184	<i>Mr Delorozoy, rapporteur</i>	207
4. <i>Membership of committees — Motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne (S), Mr Klepsch (EPP), Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED), Mr Fanti (COM), Mr Bangemann (L) and Mr de la Malène (EPD) — (Doc. 1-788/80) — (vote): Adoption of the resolution</i>	194	<i>Explanation of vote: Miss Quin</i>	207
5. <i>Agenda:</i>		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	208
<i>Mr Balfour</i>	194	9. <i>Decision on urgency (continuation)</i>	208
6. <i>Decentralized energy production — Report by Mrs Walz (Committee on Energy and Research) — (Doc. 1-696/80):</i>		10. <i>Agenda:</i>	
<i>Mrs Walz, rapporteur</i>	195	<i>Mr Pedini; Mr Schwencke; Mr Schall; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Pedini; Mr Schall; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr Bersani</i>	208
<i>Mr Van Aardenne (Council); Mr Davignon (Commission)</i>	197	11. <i>Decentralized energy production (continuation):</i>	
<i>Point of order: Mr Galland</i>	199	<i>Mr Turcat; Mr Coppieters; Mrs Dekker; Mrs Charzat; Mr Sassano; Mr Beazley; Mr Delorozoy; Mr Schmid; Mr Fuchs; Mr Purvis; Mr Maher; Mrs Lizin; Mr Herman; Mr Price; Mr Moreland; Mrs Walz; Mr Davignon</i>	209
<i>Mr Adam; Mr Müller-Hermann; Mr Seligman; Mr Veronesi; Mr Galland</i>	199	12. <i>Verification of credentials</i>	226
7. <i>Documents received:</i>		13. <i>Prevention of pollution of the sea — Reports by Mr Carossino (Doc. 1-708/80), Mrs Maij-Weggen (Doc. 1-709/80 and Doc. 1-473/80) and Mrs Spaak (Doc. 1-467/80) — (continuation):</i>	
<i>Point of order: Mr Fergusson</i>	205	<i>Mr Koutsocheras; Mr Katsafados; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Collins; Mrs Maij-Weggen</i>	226
		14. <i>Research and development programme in the field of environment — Report by Mr Alber (Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection) — (Doc. 1-660/80)</i>	
		<i>Mr Alber, rapporteur</i>	231
		<i>Mrs Schleicher; Mrs Pruvoot; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	232

15. Directives on maximum levels for pesticide residues — Report by Mr Combe (Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection) — (Doc. 1-729/80): Mr Combe, rapporteur 235 Mrs Cresson; Mrs Lentz-Cornette; Mr Sherlock; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Combe; Mrs Lentz-Cornette; Mr Narjes; Mr Sherlock 236	20. Regulations concerning sugar and isoglucose — Report by Mr Delaitte (Committee on Agriculture) — (Doc. 1-792/80): Mr Louwes, deputy rapporteur 253 Mr Vernimmen; Mrs Barbarella; Mr De Keersmaeker; Mr Remilly; Mr Richard (Commission) 254
16. Greek nominations to the committees 240	21. Framework agreement for cooperation between the EEC and Brazil — Report by Mr Louwes (Committee on External Economic Relations) — (Doc. 1-529/80): Mr Louwes, rapporteur 256 Mr Seeler; Mr van Aerssen; Lord O'Hagan; Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli; Mr Andriessen (Commission) 258
17. Recovery and reuse of waste paper and board. — Report by Miss Hooper (Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection) — (Doc. 1-659/80): Miss Hooper, rapporteur 240 Mrs Fullet; Mr Purvis; Mrs Pruvot; Mr Sherlock; Mr Narjes (Commission) 241	22. Information policy of the Community — Report by Mr Schall (Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport) — (Doc. 1-596/80): Mr Schall, rapporteur 262 Mr Natali (Commission) 264 Points of order: Mr Kavanagh; Mr Pedini 265 Mr Kavanagh; Mr Brok; Mr Hutton 265 Point of order: Mr Patterson 268
18. Agenda 243	23. Urgent procedure 268 Point of order: Lady Elles 269
19. Human rights in Uruguay — Report by Mrs Van den Heuvel (Political Affairs Committee) — (Doc. 1-693/80): Mrs Van den Heuvel, rapporteur 243 Mr Lezzi; Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti 244 Sir John Stewart-Clark, draftsman of an opinion 247 Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mr Vié; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Vernimmen; Mr Koutsocheras; Mr Coppieters; Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mrs Van den Heuvel 247	24. Agenda for next sitting 269

IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

Vice-President

*(The sitting was opened at 10.00 a.m.)***President.** — The sitting is open.

I call Mr Moreland on a point of order.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, I wish to ask for your guidance on the question of the agenda. It is noticeable that the three oral questions with debate on energy are not actually down on the agenda, and this is surprising. Can we have your guidance as to whether the subjects are to be debated, whether the Commission is to comment on them and whether resolutions can be moved closing the debate? And I would make the point that, if you respond by quoting Rule

47(1), the three oral questions cover a far more comprehensive subject than Mrs Walz's report.

President. — Mr Moreland, although these three oral questions do not figure in the agenda distributed today, if you look at the minutes of yesterday's sitting, you will find that they were implicitly included in the agenda for today announced by the President at the end of the sitting, where they are specifically mentioned in a footnote as being due to be included in the debate. They will therefore be dealt with, and I understand that the Commission is prepared to deal with any points arising from them. I hope that satisfies you, Mr Moreland.

I call Mr Galland.

Mr Galland. — (F) I am not at all satisfied, Mr President, since these oral questions have been included in all the agendas which we have received until today and

Galland

have suddenly disappeared this morning. Did the Bureau decide or not to include them in the debate, and if so, how is it that they have been explicitly included in all the agendas until this morning, when they are no longer there. I would also point out that this not only concerns oral questions to the Commission but also oral questions to the Council which are due to be dealt with this morning in the energy debate.

President. — You are quite right, Mr Galland. Whether the omission is due to a printer's error or whatever, you may be assured that the agenda as adopted yesterday is authentic.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Are there any further comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Documents received*

President. — I have received various documents, details of which may be found in the minutes.

3. *Decision on urgency*

President. — The next item is a decision on five requests for urgent procedure.

We shall begin with the *request from the Commission: Proposal for a regulation on the common organization of the market in cereals (Doc. 1-701/80)*.

I call Mr Sutra on a point of order.

Mr Sutra. — (F) Mr President, I would ask you to remove this item from the agenda as inadmissible even before the vote is taken. There is more than one reason why this is so. Firstly, this matter has been urgent for seven years and the Council has been trying to bully Parliament. Secondly, directly concerning the Treaties, this request for urgent procedure is contrary to the Treaty...

President. — Mr Sutra, this is not a point of order. The item is on the agenda and must come in front of the House. It cannot be removed except by the wish of the House, which can be expressed by a vote against urgency.

I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, I should just like to explain briefly why the Commission has tabled this request for urgent procedure. As Parliament is aware, Protocol No 19 of the Treaty of Accession originally provided for the introduction by the Community of measures to facilitate the export of spirituous beverages obtained from cereals.

Two Commission proposals on the common organization of the market in alcohol have still not been approved by the Council. Since some Member States are adversely affected by the failure to implement this protocol, the Council undertook to adopt, before the end of 1980, measures to be applied under the common organization of the market in cereals. Thus, in order to be consistent with what was agreed on agricultural prices in May 1980, the Commission urges Parliament to deal with this matter by urgent procedure.

President. — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman to speak on a point of order.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — It appears that a lot of our colleagues have been trying to track this document down. I know that the Committee on Agriculture have had it but it does not appear to be commonly available to the rest of us. Could we not put this off until tomorrow until everybody has had a chance of getting hold of it?

President. — Mrs Kellett-Bowman, the document has been freely available at least since November.

I call Mr Früh to speak on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr Früh. — (D) Since I see that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture is not yet in the House, I shall have to give my opinion on the request for urgent procedure in my capacity as first vice-chairman.

On behalf of the Committee on Agriculture I should like to point out that we have discussed this document in detail this week and have decided by a large majority not to reject the document, but only to postpone it for a few weeks until February, when we shall be having a hearing on the legal situation in the agricultural alcohol sector. The fact is that, at present, no-one knows what the position really is in this field. After the hearing we shall immediately be prepared to draw the necessary consequences.

I am extremely sorry that I must contradict Mr Davignon. It is true that this problem has been pending for years, and I appreciate the pressure not only on the

Früh

Commission, but also on the Council, which has decided in the price negotiations that, if no alcohol market organization is finalized in the current year, an arrangement will be introduced before the next price round under the common organization of the market in cereals. To that extent, gentlemen of the Commission, you are under pressure, and I fully appreciate your position.

What Parliament wants, however, is a genuine and overall solution. What we do not want is a partial solution — simply because someone did not keep his word or could not meet the deadlines — followed by another partial solution, and then another, with the final result that no-one knows where we stand. For that reason, the Committee on Agriculture voted by 16 votes to 8 — and you can imagine where the 8 votes came from — not to reject a study of this question, but to postpone it. Immediately after that, i.e. once the legal position has been clarified, we are prepared to look into this problem so that there are no more delays.

Speaking of delays, there is one thing we should not forget. This problem has been pushed back and forwards for the last eight years. The Committee on Agriculture therefore does not understand why this question should now be declared urgent simply because one wants to keep a promise.

Mr President, excuse my lengthy remarks, but they were perhaps necessary because of the confusion. We are prepared to cooperate. We are willing to help, but not under these circumstances. I have given you the official view of the Committee on Agriculture, and I would ask the House to reject urgent procedure, since we want our deliberations to produce something constructive, something on which the entire House can agree.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr Curry.

Mr Curry. — Mr President, this is a proposal to pay restitution to producers of certain alcoholic beverages, notably whisky, both Scottish and Irish. The Council has requested urgency. Under the terms of British accession these restitutions were pledged under the Treaty, under an ethyl-alcohol regime. That ethyl-alcohol regime has never come into existence because, as the Commissioner has said, of opposition in the Council, not because of opposition in this Parliament.

In last year's price fixing, as part of that whole price package, it was agreed that if there was no ethyl-alcohol regime in prospect by the end of 1980, the restitutions owed since 1973 would be paid by the cereals regime. It is remarkable, Mr President, that that is the only part of the price package of last year which has not been implemented, and I would like to

see the reaction of Mr Früh and some other people had the price increase in other agricultural sectors not been implemented nine months after the date for their introduction.

There is no ethyl-alcohol regime, Mr President. The Commission has prepared the means to pay under cereals; the money is in the budget; that budget was voted by this House. In December the whole Parliament, my group included, voted against urgency on the grounds that we did not have the documents. We now have had the documents. The Committee on Agriculture had the whole of Monday and Tuesday to deliberate upon those documents. What it actually deliberated upon was whether or not it wanted to re-establish the link with ethyl alcohol.

So we now have an absolutely firm commitment made at every political level to pay this money, and the committee is trying to link it to a regime which does not exist and, according to the Commissioner, is unlikely to exist for some time. That is a manifest injustice; it has been an injustice for seven years and it is a matter of urgency to correct that injustice and to correct it immediately.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

President. — I call Mr Dalsass.

Mr Dalsass. — *(D)* Mr President, I shall be brief, since Mr Früh has already spoken on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture.

At the time, I was chosen as rapporteur on the ethyl-alcohol regime. The aim was to introduce an arrangement for the production of whisky from cereals under the alcohol market organization. The Committee on Agriculture already has a draft report on this matter, but it has decided to await clarification of the legal position. As has already been pointed out, this will be the subject of a public hearing in February, and once that has taken place, the Committee on Agriculture will decide on the further procedure.

If this Protocol 19 is to be implemented — as we all think it should — it is much better for it to be implemented under the general alcohol market organization. We are all in favour of this and have said so in the Committee on Agriculture. However, our view is that it no longer matters if a few more months are lost now, since we shall then be able to find a satisfactory solution.

For this reason — and since the regulation in question will have retrospective force — no damage will be caused. I therefore call upon Parliament to reject urgent procedure.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mr Ferri to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Ferri. — *(I)* Mr President, I am speaking to express my support, which is shared by the majority of the group, for this request for urgency which has been tabled. The reasons which I am very briefly going to outline do not refer to the substance of the matter but are concerned with the rigorous defence of the inter-institutional balance for which the Treaties make provision and, in this specific case, with Parliament's paramount role and powers of consultation.

In a recent debate Mr Prout used great kindness and charm in dubbing me, in my capacity as chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee, as a resolute defender of Parliament's rights. It is precisely because I am proud of this title that I have to warn the House, as it carries out its tasks, against the adoption of methods which, albeit legal and legitimate, may hamper the role which is our duty as well as our right. What the vice-chairman of the Committee on Agriculture said seemed to me to be an indication of a negative view.

The motion for urgency on this proposal for a regulation is based on the assumption that, because of the tremendous amount of time needed for general organization in the case of alcohol, the Commission and the Council felt that as a matter of urgency attention should be focused on the particular subject of this proposal. Now, in dealing with a request for urgency which might well be justified on more solid and better grounds — this is for the benefit of the Commission and the Council — but which is basically a request for urgency deriving from the essential nature of the proposal, in the sense that the urgency is inherent, Parliament can give a negative answer. It can say — and the justification will be relevant this time — that it is against the regulation because it is not right in its view to adopt these specific rules and that we can and must wait for general rules on alcohol. In this case consultation, which results in a negative opinion, is none the less consultation. We are duty-bound to do this if we really want to safeguard our role and the balance of the institutions. Consequently, and on behalf of the Socialist Group, I am in favour of the request for urgent procedure.

President. — I call Mr Früh on a point of order.

Mr Früh. — *(D)* Mr President, if the interpreting is correct and the chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee has addressed himself to me personally, saying that the opinion might amount to anticipating an unfavourable opinion, I should like to point out the following:...

President. — Mr Früh, you cannot speak on that point. We cannot hold a debate on that matter now.

I call Sir James to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins. — Mr President, I am grateful to Mr Ferri for the way he has spoken. I do not think I need to elaborate on what has been said by Mr Curry in favour of urgency for this particular motion. Listening to the comments which have been made, I find it difficult to believe that this House will want to go back on an agreement which was reached in the agricultural price review of 1980 and that the one issue which is outstanding should not be settled as a matter of urgency. As it was not settled before the end of 1980 it should be dealt with at the earliest opportunity. I can understand the reasons why Mr Früh and others say they want to link it to ethyl-alcohol arrangements. Perhaps they will be in place in a month or two, perhaps they will not. That is the whole point of trying to have urgency for this particular cereal request and I earnestly ask the House to honour what was agreed in the past and fulfil its obligations, which are quite clearly defined. Therefore, on behalf of my group I wish to state that we shall be supporting urgency for this matter.

President. — I call Mr Pranchère of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Pranchère. — *(F)* Mr President, I feel this is both a weighty and a serious matter as far as the issues are concerned. The Committee on Agriculture has rejected the debate. Now we are ignoring its view. Anyway, how can you justify the fact that whisky is not covered by the alcohol arrangements and so, with this stratagem, the distillers are getting subsidies of around FF 35 million?

On behalf of the entire Communist Group, and with special regard to the situation in France, I must say that this would be a tremendous blow to producers of wine-based spirits, and also to fruit producers.

It is clear that the French Government is not entirely without blame in this affair. Quite the contrary, as it has agreed to the lavish concessions granted to Mrs Thatcher and also, when matters were being discussed in France, it proposed a 50% tax hike on spirits. We are against urgent procedure today because we are basically against the measures which have been taken. Our producers are very grateful for the kind attention of the Council and the Commission, thanks to the good offices of Mr Davignon who after torpedoing the steel industry now wants to lay waste our farm production, and especially our alcohol production. They also appreciate the kind attention of Mr Ortoli and Mr Cheysson, who have just been reappointed by Mr Giscard d'Estaing.

(Cries from various quarters)

Pranchère

In speaking out here against a measure which is in no way justified — I mean the refunds — we are standing by the interests of alcohol producers in France. Fine words will not make them forget the blows they have had to put up with and which they have to suffer here thanks to the whisky producers' lobby. As a result, the French members of the Communist and Allies Group will be voting against urgency and against this debate.

(Applause from the extreme left)

President. — I call Mr Louwes to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Louwes. — *(NL)* Mr President, my group has its doubts. On the one hand there is the commitment under Protocol 19, which must of course be fulfilled. On the other hand, this involves only one alcoholic drink, exports of which are to be given special treatment, whereas there are scores of other alcoholic drinks which are produced in the EEC and partly exported, just as whisky is. My group appreciates that many people involved in this matter want this special arrangement for whisky to be incorporated into the proposed general Community arrangement for the alcohol market, and we also appreciate the views of the Committee on Agriculture, which have just been expressed by Mr Früh. We thus feel that we should vote against urgency, especially since the Commission only submitted this proposal on 20 November 1980, although it had known — or should have known — for a long time that it would take Parliament some time to form an opinion on the general alcohol arrangement, and although it must have been aware that the commitment under Protocol 19 was already seven years old. We do not at this stage want to attribute the blame for this delay in fulfilling the commitments given, but the Commission's request for urgent procedure, if approved, would prevent Parliament reaching an unhasty, reasoned opinion, particularly in this sensitive field. We find it difficult to give our approval to this procedure, and the majority of my group will therefore vote against urgent procedure.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — *(F)* Mr President, can I just say a word to Mr Pranchère? Parliament knows full well that the only reason I am speaking today is because Mr Gundelach can no longer do so. I am sure the House will appreciate Mr Pranchère's tactful criticism.

(Sustained applause)

President. — I understand Mr Davern wishes to request a roll-call vote on behalf of his group.

Mr Davern. — Yes. I think in various interests we want to know who is European and who is not.

President. — It will be a roll-call vote and therefore we shall vote electronically.

I call Mr Pranchère on a point of order.

Mr Pranchère. — *(F)* Mr President, since I have been accused in a most amazing fashion, let me pay tribute to Commissioner Gundelach. We often failed to see eye-to-eye at committee meetings but we always had the greatest respect for each other.

I cannot tolerate what Mr Davignon said just now!

(Loud cries)

President. — I am sure there was a misunderstanding. I thought I had explained this.

(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure by roll-call vote)¹

I call Mr Gautier on a point of order.

Mr Gautier. — *(D)* Mr President, I would ask you to ensure that this item — as was originally intended — remains on today's agenda after the report on isoglucose. You will have noticed that this is an extremely controversial subject, and Parliament should discuss it today — in its night sitting, if necessary — and not tomorrow morning, when most Members are already leaving. I therefore table the procedural motion that this item be inserted into the agenda after Item 315, Mr Delatte's report on isoglucose.

President. — The deadline for tabling amendments to this text could be set for two o'clock this afternoon and the item could be included on Friday's agenda.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

I call Mr Früh.

Mr Früh. — *(D)* Mr President, as vice-chairman of the Committee on Agriculture I should like to say the following: We have voted in favour of urgent procedure, but we do not yet have a report. We have voted in favour despite this mad voting system — which is what a Labour Member called it. I accept the result, although we still have to work out how the voting figures were arrived at. I therefore suggest that the Committee on Agriculture meet at 6 p.m. this evening, so that it can submit a report to Parliament tomorrow and discuss the amendments. Since the proposals also

¹ Detailed results of roll-call votes will be found in the minutes of proceedings.

Früh

have major financial implications, I also suggest that the Committee on Budgets meet and produce an opinion, so that we have a solid basis for our debate.

President. — Mr Früh, it is not our responsibility collectively to decide when committees can meet. Under Rule 39, the committee shall meet when convened by its chairman. If you are acting as chairman, then you are perfectly entitled to convene a meeting and to send out the appropriate notices to your members.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure on the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-796/80) by Mrs Van den Heuvel and others: Conscientious objector Christos Nounis.*

I call Mrs Van den Heuvel.

Mrs Van den Heuvel. — (NL) Mr President, the motion for a resolution with request for urgent debate which has been tabled by myself and some of my colleagues concerns the case of the 21-year-old Greek conscientious objector Christos Nounis. He comes from Thessaloniki and, as a result of a car accident, has suffered from a serious mental disorder since his childhood. On 21 December 1977 he was summoned to appear before the call-up board, and because of his state of health he was exempted provisionally for two years. On 27 March 1980 he was called up and assigned to a special unit for persons who had been provisionally rejected, since he obtained a mark of 14 in his test. If he had obtained a mark of 15, he would have been declared totally unsuitable for military service. He had to report to his unit on 4 April 1980 — I would ask Members to note the date — and Nounis asked for a doctor, but his request was refused. He was ordered to put on a uniform, but Nounis, who is a Jehovah's Witness, refused to do so. On 8 April — i.e. four days later — he was arrested, and the next day he was taken to a military hospital. On 19 April — i.e. 15 days later — he was released and declared unfit for military service. For those Members who are interested, I have here a photocopy of the relevant decision, numbered 597 and dated 18 April 1980. This states that Nounis is suffering from a serious and chronic psycho-neurotic disorder and is mentally retarded. As a result of this he was sent home with a mark of 15. Despite this, on 6 August 1980 — i.e. a few months later — Nounis was interrogated by the police and sent for court martial. He was again arrested and detained in a fort originally built by the Turks and now used as a civilian prison. On 13 November 1980 Nounis received a summons to

appear before the military court in Thessaloniki. His case was heard on 12 November 1980 and the judge-advocate — you will not believe this — called for a sentence of eight years' imprisonment. The final sentence was four years' imprisonment. This young man, who doctors have said has suffered from a serious psycho-neurotic disorder ever since his childhood, is still being held in this mediaeval prison. It will be obvious to Members that this is an urgent matter, and I therefore assume that everyone will vote in favour of urgent procedure for my motion.

President. — I call Mr Bournias.

Mr Bournias. — (EL) Mr President, I regret that Parliament has been given totally wrong information by gullible people such as the lady who has just spoken, and I condemn these informants, since I feel it harms our cause when we say such things as I have just heard. I can assure you that when I was looking into the matter yesterday, I asked to be put through to the responsible Greek minister, Mr Averof, the Minister of Defence, who telephoned us this morning to say that there was no-one by the name of Christos Nounis.

(Applause)

There is thus definitely a mistake! This is an important subject, and I myself was involved in getting a law in Greece — since the matter had been taken before the Council of Europe — despite the provisions of the Greek Constitution and despite the opposition of the Greek Church, which has made sacrifices on the subject of military service, since even our priests fought and were tortured and hanged in the Greek wars of independence. Despite the objections of the Church, the press and legal experts — since it would involve a law indirectly contrary to the constitution — the Greek Government passed a law allowing conscientious objectors not to bear arms. We passed a law under which they may, exceptionally, do auxiliary service. However, they then do twice the normal period of service. Many have accepted this, while others do not accept it because they do not want to do any service at all. In the latter case, they are taken to court and sentenced, but here again we have made things easier for them. They are sent to prison farms where, by law, they do half the normal period of service.

How, therefore, can such statements be made? I am also informed by the Minister that a Greek Human Rights Commission chaired by Professor Vegleri produced a list of 100 persons it was claimed had been sentenced and maltreated, and not one of the cases was genuine. This is therefore a serious matter which, in the final analysis, concerns the reputation of Greece and the Greek Government. I therefore advise against urgent procedure until we have the relevant documents confirming what I have said.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Klepsch. — (D) The great majority of Members in my group feel that, in this case as in all other similar cases, the competent committee is the only body which can study all the points which have been raised here. We fail to understand why this problem should be discussed under urgent procedure in the plenary sitting, and we shall therefore be voting against urgent procedure.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Mr President, as far as the Socialist Group is concerned, we have enough documents, in Greek and in English translation, to feel that the request for urgency is justified.

President. — I call Mr Fergusson to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Fergusson. — Mr President, it is a funny thing, after what Mr Glinne has said, that everything that I can discover about this case from independent sources shows that the facts as stated in the resolution and in the justification are either misleading or simply wrong, right down to the question of the name of the conscientious objector and the person on whom any sentence has been passed.

Of course we all, as different nations, have different attitudes towards conscientious objection, and I fully commend the attitude taken by my own country; but I would like to say this, that at a time when the trend in the matter of conscientious objection in Greece is towards liberalism, I think this motion is thoroughly unfriendly and unfortunate. We oppose urgent procedure not least because the justification in no way argues that the question, if valid, should be taken tomorrow rather than at any other time. I would add that I should have thought that in this case the Court of Justice was a more proper forum for the matter to be raised in. In the meantime we oppose urgent procedure.

President. — I call Mr Haagerup to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Haagerup. — (DK) I can be very brief, Mr President, since we feel that we cannot express an opinion on this whole question of conscientious objectors on

the basis of one single and insufficiently-investigated case. Moreover, the subject of conscientious objectors is already being studied by the Legal Affairs Committee. May I add, on behalf of my group, that this Parliament cannot set itself up as a court of justice. I therefore recommend that urgent procedure be rejected.

(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure)

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure on the *motion for a resolution by Mr Hume and others (S) and Mr Lalor and others (Doc. 1-801/80): Irish Rugby Football Union's South African tour.*

I call Mr Hume.

Mr Hume. — Mr President, I ask the House to support the request for urgent procedure on this resolution because the decision of the Irish Rugby Football Union to tour South Africa was only recently taken, and if the opinion of this House is to have any effect then it should be given immediately.

I would point out that this tour has been condemned both by the Irish Government in the Republic of Ireland, and by the British Government in Northern Ireland, and among the signatories to this resolution are all 15 Members from the Republic of Ireland: every single Member of the European Parliament from the Member State concerned has signed this resolution, thereby underlining the strength of feeling that obtains in Ireland itself on this issue.

We should be under no illusions as to the use which the regime in South Africa makes of tours such as this to bolster up their vicious system of apartheid; neither should we be under any illusions as to how that system invades sport itself in that country.

Therefore we should use all our influence as a Parliament to dissuade those who would give any sustenance whatsoever to that regime, whatever their intentions. A decision by this Parliament that this is a matter for urgent debate will be ample demonstration of the strength of European feeling on this issue and will, perhaps, have the positive effect of having this tour cancelled.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

President. — I call Mr O'Leary.

Mr O'Leary. — Mr President, the decision on the part of the Irish Rugby Football Union to accept an

O'Leary

invitation to tour South Africa is, as Mr John Hume said, in direct conflict with the Irish Government's frequently repeated condemnation of the apartheid practices of the South African regime.

The proposed visit cannot be regarded as a simple sporting event because, by going to South Africa, the Irish touring side will automatically confer approval on the general apartheid policies of the South African regime. More particularly the tour will encourage those directly responsible within South Africa for the discriminatory organization of sport within that country. Until the South African authorities banish all racial discrimination within their own borders, the athletic unions of democratic States should be vigilant in ensuring that they give no support by any action of theirs to the perpetuation of racial discrimination within the country.

Democratic States must ensure that politically, economically and culturally an international boycott should be maintained against South Africa until that country grants basic human rights to all its inhabitants.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

Finally, Mr President, it is right that the voice of this Parliament should be heard on this matter since the significance of the visit cannot be confined to Ireland alone.

President. — I call Mr Beazley to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Beazley. — Mr President, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, I would like to advise you that we shall vote that this House reject urgency on this resolution. Firstly, the tour does not start next week or even before the next session of this Parliament, so urgency is not called for. Secondly, as much as this group abhors apartheid it nevertheless notes that multiracial rugby football at national level is today normal in South Africa *(cries from the left)*. Finally, it considers that the resolution as presented is misleading because the Irish Rugby Football Union comprises players both from the Republic of Ireland and from Northern Ireland.

(Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)

President. — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Mr President, on behalf of my group I should like to oppose the request for urgent procedure, and that for a very simple reason. We are

outraged at the way in which the gentlemen's agreement between the groups in this House is being broken so blatantly this week.

(Applause from various quarters in the centre and on the right)

We have a gentlemen's agreement not to hinder Parliament's work with a flood of requests for urgency which are no more than propaganda. It is time we spoke frankly — and I say that to those who have submitted the many requests for urgency this week. If every group followed the example of what one particular group has done this week, we would have 40 requests for urgent procedure and would be able to debate urgency and nothing else. This is why we reached this gentlemen's agreement. However, if one particular group feels it can no longer abide by it, it is no longer binding on all the other groups either. Up till now, we have not heard any real justification for urgent procedure for this motion — the President also implied as much himself. I can only say that, if we go on like this — it is now 11 a.m. — we will be talking about urgent procedure and not be able to get down to our real work.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Finally, let me point out that one typical case — this Parliament's stance on South Africa and racial discrimination — has already been agreed and clarified in numerous resolutions and debates in this House. I cannot imagine what further clarification is necessary. Nobody can therefore convince me of the point of this request for urgency, except for certain propaganda aims, and I believe these to be beneath the dignity of this House.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — I call Mr Maher to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Maher. — While I personally supported this motion, as far as the Liberal Group is concerned there is a free vote. However, I should like to make the point very strongly that racial discrimination is not the only kind of discrimination. I remember last year, when we debated the question of the participation of our countries in the Olympic Games in Moscow, the Socialists appeared to support the idea of going to Moscow.

(Cries from the left)

Frankly, whatever the South Africans may have done in infringing human rights — and I am opposed to all infringements of human rights — it is nothing compared with what the Russians have done and continue to do.

Maher

(Loud applause from the European Democratic Group — Protests from the left)

I think that this House should be consistent in condemning infringements of human rights, whether it is on racial grounds or on any other grounds whatsoever.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

President. — I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Mr President, the Socialist Group is very anxious to abide by the gentlemen's agreement which seeks to restrict the welter of motions tabled under Rule 14. I do wish, however, that people would take an objective look at how all the groups are behaving on this matter before tossing accusations in our direction. Be that as it may, I should like to ask any Members of this Parliament who harbour doubts about the urgency of this matter to read the extracts from the South African press which are already available. They show that the idea of a tour by the Irish Rugby Football Union is already being exploited for political ends by the régime in South Africa. In these circumstances we feel that urgent procedure is entirely justified.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure)

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure on the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-803/80) by Mr Van Minnen und others: Situation in El Salvador.*

I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the primary reason for urgency in our view is the dramatic and intensely distressing turn in the violent events occurring in El Salvador. The new American administration is taking office and that, coupled with the fact that US military aid to the junta — which had been suspended for a while after the murder of some American nuns by a rightwing terrorist group — at the beginning of December was running at a level of at least five million dollars per year, means that there is a

pressing need in our view to speak out against any foreign military interference in this conflict which is destroying the country.

Likewise, we need to make a statement on the political background to the events, at a time when Parliament is about to send off a delegation to a meeting in Bogotá and when Mr Ungo, with the approval and even the welcome of the Archbishop of San Salvador, has just taken over as president of the Revolutionary Democratic Front, a multi-party organization opposed to the junta. For all these reasons, Mr President, we think there can be no argument against urgency, particularly as we feel that each group in the House should make clear right away exactly where it stands with regard to the problems of Latin America.

In closing, may I say that our group wants a roll-call vote on this request for urgency?

President. — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Mr President, I should like to make a procedural point. We have referred two motions for resolutions on El Salvador to the Political Affairs Committee, which is currently drawing up a report on the basis of these and of the motions currently under discussion. We can see no grounds for particular urgency. The argument that the forthcoming change-over in the US Administration justifies the urgency in fact speaks against urgency, since we all know that everybody is waiting to see what action the new American Government will take. No other argument in favour of urgency is indicated. My group feels that the report of the Political Affairs Committee should give an objective view of the matter. As far as the visit by our interparliamentary delegation to Latin America is concerned, our colleagues will have an opportunity to gather further information on the spot. Moreover, my group has proposed that an inter-group delegation should go to El Salvador to compile information. In view of all this, we see no grounds for urgent procedure.

President. — There has been a request from a political group for a roll-call vote. Explanations of vote are not permitted in the case of requests for urgent procedure.

I call Mr Martin of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Martin. — *(F)* Mr President, there are just three things I want to say very quickly by way of explaining the vote of the French Communists.

The first point is that El Salvador is in the grips of a bloody struggle. A whole nation is rising up in arms to

Martin

bring down an evil dictatorship which caused the death of thousands of men, women and children in 1980. We stand by the people of El Salvador in their struggle against the tyrants. These tyrants must move aside and let the people of El Salvador choose their destiny in freedom. We stand shoulder-to-shoulder with the Revolutionary Democratic Front which is the rallying point for all opposition forces in the country. We stand by the *Farabundo Marti* National Liberation Front which has taken up arms for freedom and for the motherland. We insist that all foreign aid to the dictatorship of Napoleon Duarte be ended. The US military aid to the junta must be stopped. There has to be an end to military interference and invasion from Guatemala and Honduras.

Second point: we do not think that the text as it stands is strong enough in its criticism of the United States, the champion of the so-called free world, and its plans for El Salvador, which are to turn the country into a bloodbath, just as the United States has done in Guatemala. To say that we are perturbed, which is how the document puts it, is not enough. There has to be strong condemnation of the American position and their threats of interference.

(Cries of 'What about Afghanistan!' in the centre and on the right)

My third and final point: we note that not a single government voice in the various Community capitals has been heard in response to this exceptional situation.

Having said all that, and in view of this exceptional situation which I have just described, we shall be voting in favour of urgency.

President. — I call Mr Haagerup to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Haagerup. — *(DK)* Mr President, my group in no way denies that there is a serious situation in El Salvador because of the civil war there. However, as Mr Klepsch has just said, this matter is being studied by the Political Affairs Committee — and it is a typical case for study by that committee. My group has in fact been looking into this situation in some detail, and we will gladly cooperate in efforts to establish whether there is anything we can do in the way of humanitarian aid, or whether there is any other way we can help to alleviate the difficult situation in El Salvador. I might also say that I do not consider it particularly appropriate that this Parliament should be assuming the role of an advisor on United States policy towards Latin America only a few days before a new American President and administration are due to be installed. Let us have a detailed report from the Political Affairs Committee on the situation in El Salvador. On behalf of my group, I therefore recommend that urgent procedure be rejected.

President. — I call Mr Van Minnen on a point of order.

Mr Van Minnen. — *(NL)* Mr President, Mr Klepsch has either not read the motion properly or he did not want to read it properly — at any rate he has given a wrong interpretation of the arguments. It does not — and this is not the reason for the motion — refer to the forthcoming American presidential elections, but rather to . . .

President. — Mr Van Minnen, that is not a point of order. If you correctly or incorrectly interpret what other people say, or if people say something that you agree or do not agree with . . .

Mr Van Minnen. — *(NL)* You have to put things right if someone is misleading Parliament!

President. — That can be done during the debate. We are now dealing with reasons for urgency.

I call Mrs Bonino of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mrs Bonino. — *(I)* Ladies and gentlemen, I think this request for urgency is really justified — and I am talking about the actual urgency of the matter rather than the content of the motion, because as we all know that can be changed tomorrow — because there is a war going on and American military aid is starting up again.

There is just one brief remark I want to make to the House. We are all ready and willing — thank heavens — to adopt motions of urgency on the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. I should like our friends on the right to remember this fact. If you ask me, all military invasions are to be condemned, both in the East and the West. This Parliament took a stand on Vietnam and Cambodia. That is all very well, but it is no use criticizing only one kind of interference and imperialism. This Parliament must have the courage to take a stand on the other kind of imperialism. I would hope that the readiness the House showed in the cases of Vietnam, Cambodia and Afghanistan will be repeated again today in the case of El Salvador. The situation is the same. I should like Parliament to be consistent.

We have always stood for the respect of human rights and the independence of individual nations against military intervention from outside. The least we can do, I feel, is to adopt a consistent position on events which may occur in the East and the West. I therefore think that it is vital for the European Parliament to express at least a preliminary view.

Bonino

(Parliament took a roll-call vote using the electronic system which failed to function correctly)

President. — I call Mr von der Vring on a point of order.

Mr von der Vring. — *(D)* Mr President, in view of this situation, could you not postpone the vote by roll-call until 3 p. m.? If the electronic system is not working, a vote by roll-call would take a full hour.

(Mixed reactions)

President. — That is an eminently good suggestion, but we shall make one further attempt to use the electronic voting system.

(A third attempt also proved unsuccessful)

I call Mr Boyes to speak on a point of order.

Mr Boyes. — My point of order, Mr President, concerns this crazy electronic system. On four occasions now I have asked the President to investigate what is going wrong and report back to the Parliament. It looks as though we are never going to get a report, because we are always being reassured. It is always OK, until the next time we use it. It is absolutely crazy that we are wasting time on sophisticated machinery like this when all other Parliaments and other concerns that use it can get it working properly.

I am going to demand once again that the President report to Parliament on what is wrong with this system so that Parliament can help to get it put right.

(Applause)

President. — I could not agree with you more, Mr Boyes. If you were sitting up here you would feel even more strongly about this.

I call Mr Van Minnen.

Mr Van Minnen. — *(NL)* Mr President, we cannot accept this state of affairs in the voting. I urgently request you to announce when the next votes will be taken, i. e. at three o'clock this afternoon, otherwise Parliament will be making a fool of itself.

President. — Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution *(Doc. 1-806/80)* by Mr Coppieters and others: *Fate of six Corsican prisoners.*

Although it has not been translated, there is another text on this same issue. It will be considered at the same time as Mr Coppieters' text if the House votes for urgent procedure.

I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — *(NL)* Mr President, I think that, firstly, this motion for a resolution fully satisfies the requirement for urgency under this procedure. It is of an urgent nature and concerns people who are on a hunger strike, which for some of them has already lasted more than fifty days, so that they may well die very soon. Secondly, the motion for a resolution concerns human rights, on which we have heard resounding statements from Mr Thorn and Mr Van der Klaauw, the President-in-Office of the Council, who said that we champion human rights all over the world, because we are a democratic Community.

I hope everyone knows where these hunger strikers are, since you can visit them if you so wish. Contrary to Article 309 of the French penal code, six of them are bound to their beds for six hours per day so that they can be given food and blood transfusions against their wishes.

The matter is even more sensitive because, as you may know, legal experts all over Europe consider the court which started hearing this case yesterday — the *Cour de Sureté Générale* — to be a special court. It is not terrorists that are involved, but people who were imprisoned after one event which did not involve a single terrorist act, and some of those involved were set free provisionally while others were not.

I believe that, for all these reasons, and particularly the fact — you should read the text of the motion itself and form your opinion on the basis of that alone — that this involves people on hunger strike who may well die, and if we want to prevent this as a democratic Europe in which each country should set an example as regards the upholding of human rights, we should not let this opportunity to intervene pass untaken. The matter cannot be referred to committee, since the court hearing started yesterday, Mr President, and the prison doctors found that four of the prisoners were too weak to be taken to the courtroom. For all these reasons, ladies and gentlemen, I would ask you to support the request for urgent procedure.

President. — I call Mr Estier to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Estier. — *(F)* Mr President, as you said earlier, there are two texts on this subject. The Socialist Group

Estier

has tabled a motion for a resolution which is specifically concerned with the fate of six hunger strikers whose lives are at risk. We hope that urgency will be adopted in respect of both texts. This is the view of the Socialist Group.

President. — I call Mr Baillot of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Baillot. — (*F*) We have said many times that we want infringements of human rights and freedoms, infringements affecting the citizens of the ten Member States, to be discussed here in this Assembly. Mr Marchais in fact tabled a motion but it has not yet come up for debate. Just now we voted for urgency in the case of Christos Nounis and we shall therefore vote the same way with regard to these six Corsican prisoners.

President. — I call Mr Galland to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Galland. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Liberal and Democratic Group will vote against Mr Coppieters' request for urgent procedure.

Mr Coppieters, it is about time you realized that France is a great democracy with an excellent and independent system of justice. France is a model of freedom in the world and human rights are safeguarded there in exemplary fashion. It opens its arms to political refugees from all over the world, and all prisoners receive excellent medical treatment, contrary to the false accusations you have made.

The tenor of this motion for a resolution is therefore unacceptable. It is amazing how confused matters are here. In five minutes we have jumped from South Africa to El Salvador and now to France.

(Cries from the left)

There is another point which is even more serious. Corsica is part of France and this Parliament has no right to interfere in French domestic matters. The House has always had the good sense to adopt this approach and not so long ago it rejected a request for urgency concerning a similar problem in Ireland.

Mr Coppieters and his colleagues want to lead this institution down a slippery and suicidal path. The Members here have a sense of responsibility and it is for this reason, ladies and gentlemen, that the Liberal and Democratic Group urges you to vote with us in rejecting this request for urgency.

(Applause from various quarters on the right)

President. — I call Mr Geronimi to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Geronimi. — (*F*) I shall not speak for long. I am surprised at Mr Coppieters' eager enthusiasm on the subject of Corsica. He is perhaps forgetting that Corsica has a representative here in this Parliament — and I am he. Until we have any proof to the contrary, Corsica is part of France and apart from myself there are plenty of French MPs here who are capable of speaking about a French department instead of Mr Coppieters.

With that said, it is clear that on humanitarian grounds the transfer of the prisoners in Bastelica back to an island prison could have been considered. Mr Coppieters, however, is probably unaware of the independence of the judiciary in France. It goes without saying that every prisoner must be in a good enough state of health to be able to conduct a lucid defence. I appreciate the concern of these prisoners' families and I have faith in the good sense of the judges in France. If you ask me, the purpose of Mr Coppieters' motion for a resolution was purely political, and as a result I do not think it is a matter for this Parliament.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure)

4. Membership of committees (vote)

President. — The next item is the vote on the *motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne (S), Mr Klepsch (PPE), Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED), Mr Fanti (COM), Mr Bangemann (L) and Mr de la Malène (DEP): Membership of the committees (Doc. 1-788/80).*

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

5. Agenda

President. — I call Mr Balfour.

Mr Balfour. — Mr President, I rise as rapporteur for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on convergence and budgetary matters. And I would like to submit under Rule 32 a motion that this debate be postponed until the next part-session in protest, on the one hand, against the fact that the report (Doc. 1-136/80 rev.) from our committee, which was completed last April, should have been subordinated to the Spinelli Report, and secondly, in protest against the management of the agendas of this House both on Wednesday and today. It is impossible for this extremely important debate to be given the prime time of Parliament if the sort of shambles we have witnessed this morning is allowed to continue.

President. — It is remarkable to see how, when talking about the organization of agendas, it is quite possible to blame someone else. Quite frankly, the way Members have behaved this morning, wishing to speak on every possible issue, is also to be deplored, and I suggest that Members themselves take this point to heart.

On Mr Balfour's motion, submitted under Rule 32(1)(d), does anyone wish to speak?

The motion is adopted.

6. Decentralized energy production

President. — The next item is the report by Mrs Walz, on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on the possibilities and limits of decentralized energy production (soft technologies) (Doc. 1-696/80).

I call Mrs Walz.

Mrs Walz, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, my report is entitled 'Soft technologies', and let us hope for a 'softening up' of the harsh tones we have just been hearing.

The report you have before you today is no more than a first attempt to examine the scope for, and limitations on, the decentralization of energy production. As finite systems do not allow for infinite growth, there is no getting away from the increased use of renewable energy sources, although there is no need to make this a philosophical issue. For several years now, discussion has been going on on this apparently new form of energy production with the watchword 'soft technologies'. In particular, the process has been given a boost by the publication of Amory B. Lovins's book *Soft Energy Paths. Towards a Durable Peace* and F. E. Schumacher's book *Small is beautiful*, although both authors have made this into a philosophical issue and have made a considerable impression on some of our people — especially the young — in America and Europe. For these people, the whole thing amounts to a reorganization of our society from the point of view of energy and industrial policy.

All in all, then, the debate on soft technologies involves far more than just energy. What we are talking about is a change in the economic and social structures which have emerged since the first industrial revolution, the aim being the introduction of soft — in other words, decentralized — energies to give people a meaningful and less complicated life in our society in harmony with nature and the environment. Karl Marx's classless society is thus transformed into the liberation of man by virtue of a 'return to nature' and

the free development of all man's creative talents, thus guaranteeing peace and liberty. But is this not the road to emancipation, missing out solidarity? According to those who take this view, we must set out along this road immediately so that, in 50 years' time, we shall be using only renewable energy sources and simple technology. Is this a practical utopian vision or is it not simply a gross miscalculation of the way world population will grow, especially in the developing countries, the increasing need for raw materials, the greater need for finance and — in the industrial countries — the scarcity of land, which is essential to any 'back to nature' movement? The importance of developing strategies for energy-saving, energy conservation and every form of energy production was shown clearly by the eleventh World Energy Conference held in Munich in September 1980, where it was estimated that, in the year 2020, energy consumption will be something like three times the present level, and then only assuming that the industrialized countries maintain their present standard and the developing countries catch up slowly. The World Energy Conference thereby confirmed virtually all the findings of the study entitled 'World Energy: Looking Ahead to 2020', which assumes global energy needs of 10.6 thousand million tonnes coal equivalent in 1980, 19.2 thousand million tonnes in the year 2000 and 34.1 thousand million tonnes in 2020, even assuming savings of 30% by virtue of technological improvements and 17% by virtue of structural changes. That would mean achieving energy growth amounting to 1% of GNP from less than 0.6% energy input, and if this target is to be reached, there will have to be a worldwide effort on an enormous scale.

Firstly, the production of coal will have to double by 1990 and increase fivefold by the year 2000. To achieve this aim, enormous amounts of money will have to be spent in mining, especially on infrastructure, transport, ports and shipbuilding. Special resources will be needed to develop the high-temperature reactor for coal gasification and liquefaction.

Secondly, nuclear energy — including the fast-breeder reactor, which will increase our uranium reserves to 200 years — must be developed with all due speed, something which the developing countries pointed out again recently in Lisbon with the utmost severity.

Thirdly, oil must be replaced in power-stations by coal and in oil-intensive households by heat pumps and solar energy.

Fourthly, the alternative energy sources — solar energy, wind, water, tides, geothermal and biomass energy — must be the subjects of far more research and development aid than has been the case so far, even though only between 5 and 10% of world energy consumption can come from these sources by the year 2000. The fact is, though, that they are absolutely vital to the developing countries.

Walz

Fifthly, the finance needed for these enormous investment projects will have to be raised jointly by industry and the oil-producing countries. All the projects will have to be tackled without any further delay to ensure that the energy is available when needed. In view of these future prospects, discussion on 'soft energy' will have to be both realistic and objective. The first point worthy of note here is that, in most cases, exploitation of renewable energy sources is at best at the research and development stage. It will take dozens of years of effort before they have been refined to the point where they can be used economically on a large scale. One vitally important characteristic of these soft technologies should on no account be ignored. Large-scale solar energy power-stations are just as much soft technologies as nuclear power-stations or coal liquefaction plants — at least from the point of view of their protagonists.

What is more, there should be virtually no transportation and distribution losses — at least only very little — if construction time is to be kept short and the operating technicalities kept simple enough for everyone to understand. At the moment, only hydroelectric power is being used to any significant extent, while other sources — for instance the potential geothermal sources such as solar power, wind, waves and tides — are being exploited in only very few experimental installations, and then only on a predominantly small scale. It is true that experts regard geothermal energy potential as practically unlimited, but the fact is that there are considerable technological problems. The current installed power of all geothermal power-stations — all of which are to be found in the volcanic regions of the earth — is some 1 800 megawatts, so no significant contribution can be expected from this source in the next few years. Solar radiation can be subjected to various transformation stages to generate heat or electricity. There are a large number of methods under discussion, concentrating on the degree of transformation efficiency. Photo-voltaic generators, for instance, can convert solar radiation directly to electricity at an efficiency rating of between 10 and 20%. The drawback is that conventional generators can only be used for smallish power-stations with a capacity of between 10 and 100 kilowatts. However, there can be no doubt that future prospects for the use of heat pumps in conjunction with solar energy for space heating and water heating in houses are promising. In the developing countries, solar energy could represent a vital alternative to oil, especially in largish-scale power-stations.

Wind energy could come into its own in particular in coastal and mountainous regions where the wind speed needed for the economic exploitation of this energy source — four miles per hour — is exceeded. A battery of wind generators with high-speed rotors have an efficiency rating of more than 40%. However, here again, as with solar energy, we have the same problems regarding availability, storage and transport. We would need something like 350 wind-

powered installations with rotors of a diameter of 100 m to replace just a single nuclear power-station. That would create a dreadful environmental problem, apart from which the electricity generated would be twice as expensive as that produced in a coal-fired power-station. These were the findings of a study carried out recently by the British firm Taywood Engineering, quoted in *Nature* (Volume 284, page 65).

A larger share of renewable energy sources could come from bioenergy — at least, in the vicinity of smallish units and developing countries covering a large geographical area — by virtue of the production of ethyl alcohol and methanol or of oil from plants such as rape. This form of energy has a long tradition, but the scientists warn us not to attach too much hope to biomass — at least not in our part of the world. The American National Research Council published a study in 1981 warning of the ecological repercussions which have by no means been fully researched. The Coastal Ecology Laboratory attached to the Louisiana State University (*Science*, Volume 7, page 302) speaks of a high level of expenditure, low yield and the loss of agricultural land which could be used for the production of food. The picture is rosier only in the developing countries — an outstanding example being Brazil.

However attractive it may sound, then, the soft technology alternative will require an enormous research effort to yield the anticipated 5 to 10% of world energy supplies. The population explosion and world hunger make it incumbent on us to utilize every available source of energy and to switch from those resources which are now running out to non-exhaustible resources, which include coal and uranium. All this will cost a fantastic amount of money, money which will therefore not be available to boost consumption, although we shall then be presented with a means of tackling the unemployment problem.

What is more, decentralized energy production requires not only more capital but also more raw materials. It is all very well, ladies and gentlemen, to dream of a world on a human scale, as in Greek philosophy, but for that we need a world population as it was in the 17th century and not as it is in the latter part of the 20th century. The industrialized countries have a duty to utilize their high technologies and to leave as much oil as possible for the developing countries. Utopian visions may well give us useful food for thought, but the realities of an overpopulated world are bound to turn our thoughts in other directions. There is no alternative to coal and nuclear energy. I would ask you to approve this report, which was passed by twenty-three votes to one in the committee.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Van Aardenne.

Mr Van Aardenne, *President-in-Office of the Council.*
— (NL) Mr President, I am pleased to be able to present to this House an outline of the Council's activities in the energy sector. Mr Galland and Mr Müller-Hermann have tabled searching questions to the Council on this subject. I shall try to reply to these while outlining the Council's work.

With regard to Mr Galland's question, the Council is aware of the great importance of the problems affecting the energy sector and has done its utmost to ensure that the objectives defined on various occasions by the Council are turned into positive Community action, and it is determined to continue the work so urgently needed in this field. Many of the Council's decisions on energy should be regarded as steps on the way to achieving these objectives as part of a general and coherent Community policy. At the sitting of 13 May last year the Council noted the Commission's intention to draft a report on energy policy and on the Member States' energy investment programmes. The Council understands that the Commission will be submitting this report — which is thus an appraisal of national efforts — early this year. I think this should provide a sound basis for further harmonization in energy policy.

In addition, the Council has taken various decisions to contribute towards national investment in energy. I would also point out that a large proportion of the available funds of, in particular, the European Investment Bank is used for energy purposes. In this connection I would like to discuss the activities which the Dutch presidency intends to embark on in the first half of 1981. This naturally gives me the opportunity to answer the questions put by Mr Müller-Hermann concerning, in particular, the Council's reaction to the problem of oil supplies in the Middle East. I would remind you, however, that in outlining this I am not implying that we expect all the measures which I shall be mentioning to be completed in the first half of 1981; indeed, I should think that subsequent presidencies will also have to concern themselves with energy problems.

When we consider oil supplies, and in particular the Middle East problem, it becomes apparent that the fear which we had some months ago that the war between Iran and Iraq would seriously disrupt the Community's oil supplies was unfounded. In fact, Iraq has resumed its exports in part, with some interruptions; other oil-producing countries have increased their production, and there were also the large stocks which my predecessor mentioned during a meeting of the Committee on Energy and Research. These make it possible to limit the effects of the hostilities in the Middle East for the time being. Fortunately, therefore, there is no acute crisis at present. But prices are under pressure, and we should do our utmost to combat this, especially in view of the general economic consequences of energy price rises. Because of this the Council

of Energy Ministers, as you know, decided on 27 November of last year to concentrate on combating these pressures. The Member States have taken on the task of requesting the oil companies to use their substantial stocks to avoid further imbalance between supply and demand on the open market, with all their repercussions, including those affecting price formation. They also made it clear that they are trying to prevent disruptions in supplies to individual countries and companies. We believe, moreover, that we shall need more lasting international agreements on problems like those which have now emerged in connection with crude oil, and these should not have to be preceded in every case by lengthy negotiations. Each crisis and mini-crisis will have its own peculiarities, but it should be possible to react swiftly according to general rules. OPEC has meanwhile decided on further price increases which will worsen the economic situation, which, as we daily see, is already precarious in all industrialized countries, but this will also exacerbate the problems of the non-oil-producing developing countries to a dramatic degree. World trade is no longer growing as it should for the benefit of the developing countries and of the structural reorganization of world relations in the light of changing roles. We should therefore try to become much less dependent on oil as a source of energy. On 20 November of last year Parliament adopted a resolution on this, and I don't think there is any difference of opinion. The resolution also contains a number of subsections, which I shall discuss in a moment. It should be possible, therefore, to implement it in the foreseeable future.

As I have said, I cannot at the moment predict whether this will happen in March or later in the year. To return to the matter under discussion, considerable efforts have already been made to reduce our dependence on oil, and here and there tangible results have been achieved in energy conservation. Such efforts must be continued at all levels — Community, national and in the home. The Council calls upon you to cooperate in making the people of Europe even more aware of this major issue. But these efforts cannot be sufficient to resolve the problems we are facing.

Merely by replacing oil with other sources of energy it will be possible, both in the public and in the private sectors, to achieve substantial savings in oil consumption, and as I said, this is also extremely important.

I would like first to discuss electricity production: the Community has now taken the decisions which will result in substantially reduced oil consumption in that sector by 1990. Coal and nuclear energy are the first to be considered as replacements for oil. Obviously, however, their use will depend on the situations in the individual Member States. Many new nuclear power-stations are to be built in the next few years. Some of these — and this is a subject with which Parliament is rightly concerned — will be located in frontier areas

Van Aardenne

within the Community. This could lead to problems, which will have to be overcome. The question of fuel supplies — in this case uranium and coal — to these power plants is another important matter for the Community. In this context I would mention the talks which we are having with a number of non-Community countries which supply uranium. These are about to be brought to a successful conclusion, which will increase the security and diversity of energy supplies.

I now turn to the problem of coal. The Commission will shortly be publishing a report on the use of coal in electric power-stations. We are therefore ready to examine together the prospects for the future and to compare them with the agreed objectives in this field in which a serious effort is called for. But while we appreciate the need in the Community to generate electricity using fuels other than oil, we should bear in mind that such a measure, however necessary, would be insufficient. The oil used for electricity generation in the Community as a whole accounts for only 13% of total oil consumption: it would undoubtedly be a major step forward if we could do without oil for the generation of electricity, but this would only be a first step towards reducing oil consumption. Oil consumption in industry in general should also be reduced. There too, coal is the most suitable substitute. The potential for the coupling of thermal energy should also be exploited in order to increase energy efficiency.

The Council intends, on the basis of another Commission report, to initiate discussions on the replacement of oil by coal in industry. This is a highly important project, which will require extensive research and determination on the part of all concerned if decisions are to be reached. In such a situation we should — as I have just said — make every effort to increase coal consumption. The procedure for importing and re-importing coal and for increasing coal consumption should be made easier and less time-consuming. Community coal and imported coal should both play a part, and we should obviously try to keep the relationship between the two as good as possible.

In the short term coal will be used as a solid fuel, but in the longer term it will probably be used to a substantial degree as a raw material for the manufacture of liquid and gas fuels. It is up to the Community to play its part in renewed industrial activity, which could prosper considerably in the not too distant future. The Council should also examine positive proposals from the Commission concerning demonstration projects on the liquefaction and gasification of coal.

To turn from the subject of coal, Mr President, the Council also intends, during my country's presidency, to study the measures which the Commission wishes to see adopted in connection with natural gas supplies. Their objectives are the development of domestic production, the diversification of natural gas imports from third countries and the development of substitute

gases. In addition the Council will soon be required to take a decision on Commission proposals to increase the Community's financial assistance for demonstration projects on solar and geothermal energy — I think this is in line with the report just presented by Mrs Walz.

Mr President, after that brief survey of the work which the Council expects to carry out in the various fields connected with energy supplies, I would like to comment briefly on the general situation as regards energy policy, to which the Council must and, indeed, shall devote its attention in the near future. The Commission was intensely active in compiling information in 1980 and is now drafting a report on the national energy programmes. I alluded to these a moment ago. So we shall soon be able to gain an impression of the energy prospects of the Community as a whole up to the 1990 and we shall be in a position to attempt a general appraisal of these. On the basis of its own observations it is claimed that the Commission will make the proposed investment aid available and will examine the possibility of additional national or Community investment and the form which this could take. We anticipate that this will all take place against the background of the Council meeting of 27 November last held on the initiative of Commissioner Davignon, who was then, and still is, responsible for energy. The purpose of this meeting was to clarify the objectives of the Community energy policy. I think this question has been discussed by this House on several occasions. At the Council meeting we agreed to a large extent that Community energy policy can assume many forms; it can be co-ordinated or cohesive, or be tightly organized, or if you prefer, centralized. We were wise in concluding that as far as the future development of Community energy policy is concerned, each of these forms has its own merits, and one of the most important criteria for deciding which form to adopt in a given situation is its effect on the Community as an economic unit. The energy price policy, which is closely related to competition and economic integration, is just one example in this sector which has hitherto been sadly neglected. I feel that greater co-ordination is called for here, in other words a Community system must be developed for taxation and charges levied. If we understood the discussion in November correctly, the Commission will be guided in the longer term by considerations like those I have just mentioned. We welcome this.

We should not forget how vital it is for the Community to make progress in achieving an energy policy in the way I have just indicated, and the Members of the Council should pass on this message to their national parliaments just as such matters are discussed here, and clearly stress the world-wide significance of energy problems. No power on earth, including the Community, can solve them alone, and for this reason the Community should continue to make an active contribution towards the work of the various international organizations dealing with energy matters, for

Van Aardenne

example the United Nations and in particular, the Economic Commission for Europe and the OECD. I feel it is essential that we continue the dialogue with other countries which are important — and basically they are all important — for overcoming our energy problem in order to seek joint solutions to the difficulties we are facing in the world.

These difficulties are not all connected with energy, but as I said just now, energy lies at the root of many of the economic problems confronting us today.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR BRUNO FRIEDRICH

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, can I just say that I think it would be more useful if Parliament could speak directly to the Council while the President-in-Office, who has other commitments, is still with us. As for myself, I shall comment on everything I have heard at the end of the debate. I am saying this by way of apology in connection with the Walz report. There are some comments I should like to make — all of them favourable, for that matter — but as I said I think it would be better, since I am going to be here this afternoon, to make way for the Council this morning.

President. — I call Mr Galland on a point of order.

Mr Galland. — (F) As a follow-up to what Mr Davignon has just said, Mr President, I should like to point out that the Council has had the kindness, on this occasion, to turn up on a Thursday, which is not normally its day. I think the Council is here basically because an oral question, mine, has been put to it. In the circumstances, I think it would be better if I could address the Council in my capacity as author of the question while its representative is still here.

President. — According to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure, Mr Galland, oral questions with debate shall not be included in the agenda if that agenda already provides for the subject to be discussed. The Rules of Procedure do not state that the author of the question should be given any privileged position in the debate. This would create a precedent, for which I cannot be responsible, for the future business of the House. I am supposed to call the group spokesmen first.

I call Mr Adam to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Adam. — Mr President, this report by Mrs Walz is a brisk response to those who believe that the energy problem can be solved by a few windmills, solar cells or wave-energy machines. Not that I am in any sense against those sources of energy, nor is the Socialist Group.

It is a pity that this report was not taken on its own, because it brings very sharply into focus the urgency with which alternative and smaller-scale energy sources need to be developed. The other resolutions which have been coupled with the report dilute this emphasis.

Within our older advanced-technology societies, there are some strands of thought that our living standards can be maintained, or even improved, without any great effort. Nothing could be further from the truth, and this report before Parliament today should shatter any such complacency. It is perhaps a pity that in English the word 'soft' can be taken to mean easy: the application of new technologies or the revival of almost obsolete sources is far from easy.

Within the time span that encompasses the planning, design, construction and working life of a power station, the world population will double. Unless there is a vast expansion in the energy available there can be no improvement in living standards for a great many people in the world. That is a prospect which I find unacceptable. Mrs Walz referred to the World Energy Conference and the suggestion that there would need to be a threefold increase in energy resources by the year 2025. If, however, the *per capita* consumption of energy in the world at that time were to reach the present level in the United States, the need would in fact be something like nine times the present availability of energy. It is therefore right that we should stress in this debate the demand there will be for energy in the future.

We know that oil is being used at a faster rate than new resources are being found. As recently as last April, a Commission document showed that the trends in the Community current at that time would cause an increase in ten years' time of 100 million tonnes in the demand for oil. More immediately, we know that Saudi Arabia, which supplies 20 %, or thereabouts, of the Community's imported oil, is now reviewing its output on a monthly basis, and I understand that the economy of that country is geared to a daily output of 3 million barrels of oil, whereas it actually produces 10 million barrels per day. There is in fact within the Saudi economy ample scope for a reduction in output. Price reviews, too, may become much more frequent.

The world thus faces a huge increase in the demand for energy with a very uncertain supply situation. As

Adam

we know in this Parliament, there is a clear strategy to be followed and one which commands widespread agreement. The more efficient use of energy and energy-saving schemes can make an important contribution to ease the increase in demand. These schemes must be tackled very much more vigorously than they have been hitherto. Dependence on oil must be reduced. About 25 % of the electricity we generate is oil-fired: coal should take its place. In terms of price per therm, United Kingdom coal, which is virtually unsubsidized, is only half the price of oil-generated electricity. In industry too, there are big possibilities. Last year in the United Kingdom 14 million tonnes of fuel oil, which is equivalent to 23 million tonnes of coal, were used for heat-raising, and these are only the more obvious ways. The technical problems are not as great as the President-in-Office of the Council seemed to indicate when he spoke. But of course the potential coal output is limited as well, and this means that every other possible source of energy must be investigated both as to type and as to scale and pilot projects set up to ensure that energy programmes for the future can be planned on a secure technical basis.

Mrs Walz has admirably surveyed the possibilities and limitations this morning, and I need not add to this. She has had understandable difficulties of definition, which she has dealt with in paragraph 5 of her explanatory statement. I broadly agree with the views expressed. My main reservation concerns some of the economic aspects. At this stage, the technology is more important than economic assessments. The motion for a resolution in the report sets out the problems and indicates the strategies that I have outlined very briefly. It will have the support of the Socialist Group.

We have, however, tabled an amendment to delete the source references in paragraph 5 because the list is incomplete and includes sources whose viability has not yet been determined. To that extent the phrase confuses an otherwise logical resolution.

The resolution calls for a comprehensive energy policy and programmes. I am quite certain it will have the support of the Parliament. The Community is in a very strong position to give a lead. We have mapped out the strategy. What we now need are the policies to implement that strategy, because we need to demonstrate to the people of the developing world that we share their aspirations and that our policies will be specifically geared to their needs. I do not believe that there is, or needs to be, a shortage of energy, or that we are anywhere near the limit of possible technical developments. Today, politicians are much more aware of the trends than they were a hundred years ago, but we have yet to prove that we have a greater ability to shape our policies to this knowledge. The Parliament has made its views known on the energy question very frequently. We continually ask the Council of Ministers for a positive response. I would

ask that we have an even more vigorous response than we have had so far this morning.

President. — I call Mr Müller-Hermann to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Müller-Hermann. — (*D*) Mr President, I should like to begin by thanking Mrs Walz for her excellent report, which received a very broad measure of support in the Committee on Energy and Research. I should also like to take this opportunity of addressing a word to the Council. I should like to thank the Council not only for being here today, but also — and I might say, for virtually the first time — for going into more detail on the problems of energy policy and the matters we have raised over and over again in the past.

(*Applause*)

However, I cannot share Mr Van Aardenne's somewhat over-optimistic assessment of the situation. His reference to the brim-full oil tanks is something we have heard often enough in the past. Let us not forget that these are strategic reserves which may be full to capacity at the moment, but which in a serious crisis — which I would admit is not the case right now — would disappear as quickly as butter left out in the sun. The fact that oil consumption has fallen — in all Member States of the Community, as far as I am aware — is due in part to the worrying fact that a direct result of the energy situation has been a general economic downturn. That is the main reason why our energy and oil consumption has fallen. The situation is enough to give us the jitters. Our main suppliers are in the region whose instability is brought home to us day by day. Production is being systematically cut by the oil-producing countries, and at the same time, the price of oil is increasing. Let me say with all due candour that it is just not enough to curse the oil-producing countries or the multinationals and bemoan the situation. We should put ourselves in the position of the oil-producing countries, whose arguments cannot be dismissed just like that. We also think it unfortunate and worrying that practically every national government is trying somehow to come to terms with its own problems. A really joint effort on the part of the Community is evident only in very vague outline. You pointed out yourself, Mr Van Aardenne, that this is a worldwide problem. It is also a problem which affects the Third World in particular, and we — as one of the strongest economic regions — have a very definite responsibility in this respect. Given the magnitude and the worldwide importance of this problem, we cannot just go on as we have been doing, whereby one government may think it will be in a rather better position if it indulges in arms sales, while another may turn a blind eye when something happens in an oil-producing country which we cannot really approve of. And let us not forget that a country which

Müller-Hermann

has its own oil reserves is busily turning the price rises to its own advantage.

What we have had so far is an uncoordinated policy which, far from being persevered with, should be replaced by a joint effort and responsibility and more solidarity. Only then shall we be in a stronger position *vis-à-vis* the oil-producing countries, and only then shall we be facing up to our own responsibilities, to our own peoples and to the Third World.

I have already referred to the fall in the level of oil consumption, which is something we welcome. Let me point out, though, that — with the exception of France — the efforts being made to introduce nuclear energy vary greatly. I think it is high time the Socialist Group abandoned its ideological reservations with regard to nuclear energy. However great an effort we make to find alternative sources of energy, nuclear energy is the only thing we shall effectively have for the next 10 or 20 years. That does not mean to say — as Mrs Walz's report brings out — that we should not make a great effort to develop new energy systems. I can see only very limited scope for increasing coal production in the Community to the level we have been trying to achieve for a long time. There are many reasons for this shortfall, not least of them the shortage of manpower. We shall have to try to buy in a lot of imported coal if we want to make greater use of coal, and we shall then be faced with enormous problems with regard to shipping capacity and port, storage, handling and processing facilities. The European Council came up with wonderful-sounding statements in Venice, but when, pray, will the necessary conclusions be drawn from these fine promises? The Council is the guilty part. The Commission is at least making an effort. There are two more things I should like to mention. Firstly, we shall have to find a fantastic amount of capital if we are to solve the energy problems. All the political groups are discussing these problems, and I hope it will not be very long before we can come up with a plan of our own for directing and channelling the capital accumulated 'in the wrong places' — that is to say, by the oil-producing countries — with their help to where the money is needed most urgently. That will be a matter of fundamental importance for us over the next ten years if we are to avoid stagnation, unemployment and economic collapse.

The other point I wanted to mention is the need for decisions to be taken urgently. Anyone who is acquainted with the subject will know that a political decision taken today or tomorrow will take eight, ten, fifteen or more years to come to fruition. Every decision the Commission and, especially, the Council fails to take today will exacerbate the problem in ten years' time. All our questions are designed to make the Council and other parties concerned aware of their responsibilities. It is high time the Council did something and convinced itself of the need to take the decision which are essential if we are to have guaranteed future energy supplies without undue complications.

President. — I call Mr Seligman to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Seligman. — Mr President, I also welcome the presence of the Minister at this debate.

Since the Energy Council in May instructed the Commission to examine energy investment programmes in each Member State, we have heard almost nothing. I am glad to hear from the Minister that we shall soon be having a report on this investment programme. With the new Commission, which we welcome, we must regain momentum. We have lost eight months since last May, and time is short. We must stabilize energy prices and we need energy investments in cheaper energy and more energy as a way out of recession and unemployment.

Governments, however, seem to think that the price of all energy should be tied to and move up along with the artificial price of oil. This policy needs a rethink. A high-price policy will certainly encourage more efficient use of fuel by industry and the general public and it will also encourage a search for new sources of energy. But the problem is that high energy prices also cause high unemployment. They make it difficult for industry to compete with American industry, and that applies particularly to the energy-intensive industries. So we must find a way to untie the price of electricity, coal and gas from the ever-escalating price of oil, and we must base the price instead on the cost of production in the broadest sense and on a fair and non-monopoly market price. We must then get the cost of production down by investment in new and better energy production methods, and this investment itself will provide jobs. Investment in more efficient use of energy will also provide more jobs.

Mr President, the best way to reduce dependence on oil is through the use of electricity, and the cheapest electricity comes from nuclear power. It can be, as you know, three times cheaper than oil-fired electricity. The French realize this and they are going flat out on nuclear power: one new nuclear power station every three months. 22 % of their electricity will come from nuclear power this year and by 1990 it will be 75 %.

So what is stopping the rest of us? The answer is scare-mongering by the environmentalists. Do they realize what they are doing? Every time they prevent the building of a new nuclear power station they are destroying thousands of jobs for the construction and equipment workers who will build that factory. They are also destroying many more future jobs which will come from industrial revival based on cheaper energy and more stable energy prices. Nuclear scare-mongering is a luxury that the West cannot afford. The answer must be firm courageous action by governments coupled with complete frankness when incidents occur.

Seligman

Priority number two is investment in the modernization of Community coal production. Why has Italy continued to block Community expenditure on coal modernization? We all agreed to support Italy's Super Sara project, why can't Italy reciprocate by agreeing to the proposal that 250 million ECUs be invested in modernizing the Community's coal production, which would then help all member nations by reducing oil consumption?

Priority number three is Frau Walz's soft energies; not as an alternative to hard energies but in addition to hard energies. We support her proposals wholeheartedly.

Concerning finance for energy investment to cure stagnation and unemployment, if the ECSC, Euratom, Ortolí facilities and the European Investment Bank loans are not enough, and if Member States fear to increase their borrowing, why not bring private enterprise into energy investment and create some competition for the State monopolies? Let us bring the oil companies into all energy supplies including gas particularly.

To conclude, Mr President, it is not only the powerful members of the Community who need investment in cheaper non-oil energy and nuclear power; all members of the Community and the Lomé Convention need it to reduce their dependence on imported oil. That is what the Community energy policy should be: larger nations helping smaller nations to reduce their dependence on imported oil. That is why we want to hear from the Commission about this new energy investment programme which was launched on May 13.

President. — I call Mr Veronesi of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Veronesi. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in view of the time allotted to my Group, in the context of a general reduction in speaking time for all the subjects to be debated today, I now only have a few minutes in which to give an explanation of the vote of the Italian Communists and their Allies on the motion for a resolution and report submitted by Mrs Walz.

For this reason I shall not deal at length with specific problems but restrict myself to giving some general views which I nonetheless consider to be relevant to all the problems raised in the report. The first general remark I should like to make is that we should be grateful to Mrs Walz for having assumed the task of dealing with such a complex and burning problem. I think that I can state without fear of exaggeration that the topics under discussion here are the ones which have fuelled the energy debate the most fiercely and to the greatest extent from all points of view. This means both the rational and responsible subjects which have a

firm foundation in objective assessments of energy problems, and other more passionate and less realistic topics.

Torrents of ink and words without number have been spent in supporting the various views which are now opposed. Mrs Walz's report places in opposition, in a way which in my opinion is perfectly justifiable, the fundamental characteristics of soft and hard energy technologies, as they are called. Here it is a question of establishing the true meaning of these words, a point which is open to debate. It is my humble opinion that these two adjectives are inappropriate. However, Mrs Walz made this contrast whilst placing the energy question against the background of the basic need for survival and development which both industrialized and developing regions experience.

This method of approach corresponds precisely to the queries raised in the three main questions included in the Walz report. These three points cover the whole range of the true requirements, priorities and risks in this field, which should neither be ignored nor minimized.

The second remark I should like to make is that it seems clear, from the analysis of the problems carried out, that the energy question cannot and should not be approached via a single solution. By this I mean that the ways and means for meeting the problem and solving it depend on a very large number of variables. These are not always very simple to separate. They cannot be given an absolute and identical weighting in any specific set of circumstances. Systems analysis has, on the other hand, reached a very advanced state of progress and highlighted that in any specific situation tests must be carried out. The factors which influence any decision are the general social context, the level of industrial and economic development, the initial cultural and technological background, environmental conditions — both climatic and of own energy resources — the status of infrastructures etc. and this list is not an exhaustive one. Therefore we must in all cases carry out a rational assessment of the factors which permit us to judge the question, whilst shaking off prejudices and beliefs, and not taking refuge behind a palisade of irrational and dogmatic creeds. It seems to me that Mrs Walz's report draws our attention to this point. The wealth of bibliographical references for and against soft and hard energy sources, and the unbiased quotation of differing opinions help us to understand the problem better,

My third remark is the following. There is no doubt — as the report shows — that side by side with some certain facts there are also some fuzzy areas both economically, ecologically and socially speaking, and these are part of all — and I repeat all — the options and paths we might follow in energy policy. There is no one ideal, trouble-free route. Side by side with the need to re-orient industrialized societies towards a

Veronesi

pattern of development which is not so staccato and uneven, a pattern which places man as an individual and as a community made up of individuals at the centre of its interests, the requirement for a conscious change in the approach, the time schedule and the means to achieve these objectives still remains. Similarly, faced with the need for speedy economic, social and cultural development of the Third World countries, options must be taken which are not based on a view of countries as second or third rate societies. The fact that they try to avoid the mistakes and inequalities of developed countries, which sometimes have extremely serious consequences, should not mean that they are permanently allotted a subordinate role in world affairs.

What conclusions should we then draw from the document we are now examining? They seem to me to be quite clearly expressed in the motion for a resolution. We shall vote in favour of the motion with certain qualifying remarks which I shall now undertake to make by way of a conclusion.

I should like to sum up our opinion in the following way. We are faced with a historic challenge which mankind must meet if it is to survive. In order to meet this requirement, mankind must take every occasion which arises to use the resources it has in a balanced manner. This leads us, and in my opinion this is the meaning behind the questions included in Mrs Walz's report, to undertake top priority measures and to recognize the absolute need for a united effort by the Community in this field. We must take urgent measures and have shared intentions. These are the two basic points which the Council ought to bear in mind. The worst possible choice would be to wait and not do anything.

During the budget debate, Mr Tugendhat bemoaned the fact that the major statements on steps to be taken, on a determination to act, issued at summit conferences of the Council of Ministers or of the European Council rarely had any specific, practical or administrative repercussions in the Community. The new Commission will therefore have to face these problems with greater energy than has been displayed in the past.

On the subject of the amendments tabled — I do not know if this is being somewhat impolite to the rapporteur, and I apologize if it seems that way — we cannot approve the amendments to Paragraph 5. These deal with the possibility of blocking the production of nuclear energy and breeder reactors. We have already had occasion, at meetings of the Committee, to voice our doubts on this matter, because we noted that the wording itself of the paragraph was not to our satisfaction. We believe, from the experience acquired in experiments conducted up to now, that breeders are not yet commercially viable. (I should however, like to see the normal term used becoming the one I have just used and that all other expressions, such as fast

breeder reactors and descriptions of this kind be done away with because they do not correspond to the meaning and essence of the operation of such installations.)

We are not in favour of the sale of such installations today, but we are in favour — and I have supported this point of view on many occasions — of intensive research and study projects in order to achieve the safe operation of these complexes. We have, if we multiply the number of reactors by their years of operation, several thousand years of experience with tried and tested reactors and this fact is our guarantee: this is precisely the definition of tried and tested. For breeder reactors however, the situation is not the same and we must proceed with caution.

Having made these points, we shall vote in favour of the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Walz and already approved by the Committee on Energy.

President. — I call Mr Galland to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Galland. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, first of all I should like to address the Minister. Our energy debate, Mrs Walz's excellent report, my own question to you are all taking place on a Thursday, a day on which there is no Council meeting. However, you, Mr van Aardenne, are prepared to be present and it is with men such as you that we can hope for better consultation between and better functioning of our institutions. May I also say 'bravo' and thank you, Minister.

It goes without saying that my question was addressed to the Council, because I thought that the Council would participate in our debate, however, Mr Davignon, you realize of course that in principle it is also addressed to the Commission.

Ladies and gentlemen when speaking of energy, one speaks of crisis, recession, price increases, unemployment, war; this is vocabulary regularly associated with the word 'energy'. There is no point in repeating here — because those in the Chamber at present are all energy specialists — the problem facing us. We all know the principal facts. It is now more important than ever to come to grips with the remedy that the situation calls for, and I am well aware of the fact that the energy issue is going to be a pioneer in Europe. In my view it is the best symbol of the new vistas opening up for renewed European construction, and before we go on to the actual substance of the debate, I should like to make it clear that I am in no way a fanatical advocate of European unity. It is clear that in very many sectors it is not the Community's vocation to replace the Member States. But as a responsible politician I am convinced that in areas where the Community can be more effective, we must act through its

Galland

intermediary. We have done this in the agricultural sphere by investing together to make Europe self sufficient and a bigger exporter of foodstuffs. When we introduced the Common Agricultural Policy it was to support our agricultural sector, and this was also in the best interests of our taxpayers, for whom a common agricultural policy is far less costly than ten national policies. I claim that today the time has come for a Community energy policy in certain well defined sectors. This can only be to our advantage, Minister, whether from the point of view of Europe's political independence, the revival of our economies or the budgetary cost, that is to say it is in the financial interest of our taxpayers. Obviously, what is needed is a political determination on the part of the Council which goes beyond declarations of intent; in addition, the new Commission must draw up the indispensable comprehensive proposal. The subject is a complex one and I admit that the present political climate of the Community is unfavourable. That is why each person must, more than ever, shoulder his responsibility. In this spirit I am going to define for you the basis of the Community energy policy as we in the Liberal Group see it.

The first aspect concerns the need for a Community purchasing policy. If one day there is a shortage for whatever causes, nobody will escape. However, in the present situation, with more or less normal supplies, there is at least one step which is essential. Europe must have a united policy with regard to the Rotterdam market, so that it does not itself put pressure on prices, thus providing an alibi for the increases decided by OPEC. I dare not elaborate, Minister, on this purchasing policy, though more could be done; let us begin with Rotterdam.

The second aspect concerns the need for a selective Community investment policy. Such a policy is justified especially in the light of the substantial budgets allocated for research into new energy sources and new technologies. We are all working separately to achieve the same end. It is time to pool our budgets and our scientists in European research centres where we will save money and be able to progress more rapidly. The time factor is of primary importance and the present moment is propitious. A study would demonstrate that, for the moment, in the sphere of new energies which Mrs Walz speaks of, the Community Member States have invested in complementary areas. Thus it is still possible to introduce a Community policy without requiring distressing revision at national level; tomorrow it will undoubtedly be too late.

Take, for example, a European centre which would be the main centre for research into solar energy and biomass. Today its most obvious location would be France, because in the past France has accounted for 50 % of all Community investments in this field. However, the United Kingdom is now beginning to

invest in research into photovoltaic processes in the solar sphere; it is thus duplicating French research, and neither the United Kingdom nor France are making the most efficient use of their investments. In this very promising sphere we can make faster progress if we work together.

For the same reason, Minister, the principal research centre into geothermal energy should be established in Italy, wind energy should be studied in the Federal Republic of Germany and Denmark, and the principal centre for research on tidal energy should be set up in the United Kingdom, because it is these countries which have made the greatest progress in these fields. Only under these conditions can we hope to exceed the maximum potential of 5 % of energy consumption currently forecast for new energies by the year 2000.

We must combine our investments in the indispensable new technologies which require massive investment. This is a case of nuclear fusion and coal gasification, which you mentioned and which promises to provide coal with a new lease of competitiveness. The same is true of drilling at great depth which offers so much hope.

After these joint investments, our third point concerns the search for increased market unity. Market unity is a fundamental principle of the Community and it should be applied more strictly, at least where energy is concerned. The gap between the countries with the highest and lowest prices for energy amongst the ten Member States is too large at present: 41.5 % difference for premium grade petrol; 63.2 % for electricity for a standard industrial consumer; 41.7 % for domestic fuel oil. From these figures it is evident that a gradual effort at harmonization is called for.

The fourth aspect concerns a common energy policy which is the natural complement to the Common Agricultural Policy. None so blind as those that will not see! Tomorrow our agriculture will be a decisive sector contributing to our energy independence. Green energy is the link between agricultural policy and energy policy. It is a solution which, in the medium term, must not be neglected as a means of reducing our dairy surpluses.

Green energy is also a vital factor in reducing our energy dependence. It is urgent, Minister, that the Ten adopt a concerted plan to study and launch a motor spirit product which could be mixed in a proportion of 15 % with petrol. The respective advantages of beet and Jerusalem artichoke must be studied. Already, with the constant increases in the price of oil, we are almost becoming competitive. One might also consider studying ways of converting into alcohol the 1 300 000 tonnes of suagr which we purchase from ACP countries under the Lomé Agreement. May I remind you that the distillation of sugar cane is extremely easy and competitive. An initial European motor spirit plan

Galland

would, as you know, enable us to reduce our oil imports by 3 %; moreover, in the event of a conflict, it would provide us with a strategic reserve of motor spirit for agricultural machinery which is indispensable for our independence during a conflict of long duration. It is time also to rationalize the use of the secondary products of the biomass. For example, the energy capacity and the volume of straw and brushwoods make transport inconceivable. However, they could very easily be utilized on the spot with the possibility of adapted plant which could make the rural throughout the Community partially self-sufficient in energy.

The fifth problem of a Community policy, Minister, is of course that of financing it, and not to broach this problem would obviously be to evade the immense difficulties which this raises. If a Community policy is introduced, then it must obviously be financed. If there is a political consensus as to the usefulness of such a policy, various methods of financing it must be studied: increasing the VAT rate is obviously the simplest solution, but the financing of a large Community loan which will recycle the petrodollars should also be looked into. Before concluding, I should like to call to mind Mr Mansholt, a great European. When he was drawing up the initial guidelines for the agricultural policy he was regarded as Utopian, unrealistic, an irresponsible financier, an incompetent supranational politician. Undoubtedly, his first project contained errors and thus had to be changed. But events have vindicated this pioneer; today nobody questions the advantages of the Common Agricultural Policy; I say that we must be disciples of such pioneers and we must launch a Community energy policy. To make this possible the Commission must use its powers, its talent, the means at its disposal to draw up a coherent and realistic proposal. Mr Davignon, may I say very honestly that this Parliament is expecting a lot of you. To succeed — and this is the most difficult part — the Council must renounce its static vision of the Community and have the will to conceive a dynamic Europe, a Europe in evolution, a Europe adapted to the requirements of the modern world. The political courage of our Parliament is needed to disregard the widespread demagoguery which tends to criticize Europe rather than emphasizing its positive sides. It must be stated publicly that a Community energy policy is more necessary than ever in a period of budgetary restriction, because it is in this way that our taxpayers' contributions can be most effective and will be put to the best use. Supranationalism is not conceivable, but hypernationalism is to be condemned just as much. Between the two there is the happy medium which is that of a Europe united politically, and of a European Economic Community playing its role in the light of the economic situation. It is in this spirit that we must draw up a Community energy policy. This is the conviction of the Liberal Group and I believe, Minister, it is the conviction held by a very large majority of this House. It is time for the Council to share it and for the Commission to finally make the proposal through which it can be translated into fact.

7. Documents received

President. — I have received from Mr Gautier and others a motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-813/80) on the proposal from the Commission for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2727/75 on the common organization of the market in cereals (Doc. 1-701/80).

Without prejudice to the application of Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, the motion for a resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p. m.

The House will rise.

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

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

I call Mr Fergusson on a point of order.

Mr Fergusson. — Mr President, on a point of order while people are taking their places, because what I have to say is really addressed to the chair. On the third day of the Luxembourg session Sir Frederick Warner and I put down a resolution for Parliament to consider dealing with matters of considerable importance like world peace and that sort of thing and we still have not seen any paper coming out of the machinery relating to what we put in. We have enquired everywhere we can — it took one of my assistants two hours even to track down the area where she ought to be searching in order to find out the necessary information. All we have found out is that whatever document we put in is still in Luxembourg and that, as far as we know, the process of translating this particular resolution has not even begun.

Now I protest vigorously. It is very hard to find out from anywhere or anyone what has gone wrong and I would like an investigation to be started at once into what has happened to this particular resolution, which now will not be distributed to Members this week at all and presumably will not be seen until February.

I am prepared to give the details to anybody you like but I think by this time somebody in the secretariat of Parliament will know what we are talking about. May I register therefore my protest and hope that something will be done about this kind of matter.

President. — Mr Fergusson, as far as I understood your resolution on world peace was a resolution under Article 25, and I hear from the *Grefte* that it has been sent to the competent committee. Whether it is in the secretariat of that committee or in the hands of Members I do not know, so perhaps you can check with the competent committee or its secretariat on the present state of affairs.

8. Votes

President. — The next item is the vote on the *motion for a resolution contained in the Delorozoy report (Doc. 1-638/80): Directive on aid to shipbuilding.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraph 1)

On paragraph 2, Mr Caborn has tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Points out that the future of several firms in the Community's shipbuilding industry and the jobs of tens of thousands of people are still constantly under threat (remainder deleted)

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Delorozoy, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the effect of this amendment would be the deletion of the second part of paragraph 2, which I am sure you have in front of you at the moment. I appreciate that it may not be very nice for the Member States where there has been least effort to see themselves, if not actually named, at least called to order by the Commission, which is calling on them to bear their fair share of the burden. Consequently — and here I am not speaking for myself but basing my opinion on what I have gathered from the discussions of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs — I do not find this amendment acceptable.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted paragraphs 2 and 3)

President. — On paragraph 4, Mr Caborn has tabled Amendment No 2 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Reiterates how urgent and important it is for the Community to develop a sectoral structural policy covering the interdependent sectors of shipping, shipbuilding, ship-repair and trade policy; believes, therefore, that the rules governing Member States' aid to shipbuilding should be seen as part of such a structural policy; furthermore, calls on the Commission not to proceed on any further reductions in manpower until adequate provisions are available to deal with regional and social consequences; calls on the Commission to draw up specific proposals for implementing the scrap-and-build programme which it elaborated in 1979.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Delorozoy, rapporteur. — (F) This amendment is unacceptable because there is a technical error in it. It calls on the Commission not to proceed on any further reductions in manpower. Is it not the Commission which can do this, but each of the Member States. The Commission simply ensures that the aid comes into the appropriate category.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 2 and adopted paragraph 4)

President. — On paragraph 5, Mr Caborn has tabled Amendment No 3 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Regrets that the Community policy regarding shipbuilding does not comprehensively cover the many different ways in which national assistance or preference can distort competition and therefore the rational restructuring of the industry (remainder deleted).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Delorozoy, rapporteur. — (F) Against, Mr President. The amendment seeks to delete half of paragraph 5, which simply outlines the facts as they emerged during the committee's work.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 3 and adopted paragraph 5)

President. — On paragraph 6, Mr Caborn has tabled Amendment No 4 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Notes that the various means of providing support for shipbuilding in the Community have increased in number; accepts that this is a result of the persistent conjunctural crisis in the shipbuilding market, exacerbated during 1980 by irresponsible Japanese expansion of their market share in breach of burden-sharing agreements; urges that while the long-term aim must be to allow the industry to support itself without State aid, nonetheless so long as the present market situation persists, then support in various ways will continue to be required, subject to Community regulation.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Delorozoy, rapporteur. — (F) This amendment is rather a tricky one in the sense that it seeks to replace the existing paragraph. What Mr Caborn's amendment says is quite true, but if it is adopted and takes the place of the other paragraph in the motion, this will mean that the idea of uniform systems of aid will have to go. I shall let the House decide which is the more appropriate course. As I see it, the ideal solution would be to have both the existing paragraph and this amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 4)

President. — I call Mr Rogers on a point of order.

Mr Rogers. — I am sorry, Mr President, but I think if you check with Mr Delorozoy he was quite happy to accept the amendment as an addition to the paragraph, and if an amendment in the view of the rapporteur was to be helpful, then it could have been accepted.

President. — No, Mr Rogers, the rapporteur said he was open to the verdict of the Assembly, which means that he was ready to accept the amendment but he was also ready not to accept it. The Assembly has pronounced against and that means the amendment has been rejected and I have to act like that.

(Parliament adopted paragraphs 6 and 7)

On paragraph 8, Mr Caborn has tabled Amendment No 5 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Recalls that in most Member States the limit for cutbacks in capacity (i.e. restructuring) has been reached; calls on the Commission, in the light of this fact, of the current depressed state of the shipbuilding market and of the irresponsible marketing behaviour of the Japanese, to allow production aid to be granted under Article 6 in order to sustain a viable level of capacity in the shipbuilding industry, given its strategic, economic and social importance in the Community, while pursuing the aim of degressivity in aid on a practical basis.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Delorozoy, rapporteur. — (F) With Amendment No 5 Mr Caborn wants production aid to be granted in order to sustain a viable level of capacity in the shipbuilding industry. It is clear from the committee's findings, however, that production aid to sustain capacity without a lasting market is simply economic folly and results in social problems which can be even worse. I am therefore against the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 5 and adopted paragraph 8)

President. — On paragraph 9, Mr Caborn has tabled Amendment No 6 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Notes that, in the absence of Council agreement on the draft of the directive and with the advent of Greek entry, there is an opportunity for assessing the whole situation in shipbuilding and associated industries in order to argue the approach recommended by the committee in paragraph 4 above.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Delorozoy, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, the amendment speaks about 'assessing the whole situation in shipbuilding'. There is an annual report on this by the Commission. Furthermore, at this particular time, we cannot jump to conclusions about the Council's possible agreement to the draft directive. I am very sorry but I am therefore bound to reject the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 6 and adopted paragraph 9)

President. — On paragraph 10, Mr Caborn has tabled Amendment No 7 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Urges the Commission to submit proposals to the Member States creating a dynamic framework for this industry such as will make the sector competitive in the long term without resorting to permanent subsidization.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Delorozoy, rapporteur. — (F) I am against the amendment because it calls for the creation of a dynamic framework for this industry. Throughout its work the committee felt that before anything was created we had to reorganize and restructure what was already there.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 7 and adopted paragraphs 10 and 11)

President. — I call Miss Quin for an explanation of vote.

Miss Quin. — Mr President, I would like very briefly to explain my vote. I shall vote against the Delorozoy report because I am disappointed that so few — in fact, I think none — of the amendments put forward by my colleague Mr Caborn were accepted. As a result I feel that the document is a totally inadequate response to the needs of the Community shipbuilding industry at the present time. It does nothing. In fact, it is even a continuation or a weakening of an already feeble policy which has done little to help European yards in the face of Japanese competition. The accent is very much on the reduction of State aids, rather than recognizing the large amount of help that is needed for the shipbuilding industry. This will no doubt be welcomed by those of our governments who are very niggardly about public expenditure.

I feel strongly that the Community will largely stand or fall by the response that it makes to industries in crisis, such as shipbuilding, and I do not feel that this report will really do anything to reassure workers in the shipbuilding industry that the EEC cares about their future.

(Parliament adopted the resolution as a whole)

9. Decision on urgency continuation

President. — The next item is the roll-call vote on the urgency of the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-803/80) by Mr Van Minnen and others: Situation in El Salvador*.

(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure)

Pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, the motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

10. Agenda

President. — I call Mr Pedini to speak on the agenda.

Mr Pedini, Chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport. — *(I)* Mr President, thank you for letting me speak on this point of order. Item 320 on the agenda is the report on information which Mr Schall prepared on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport. It is a subject which has been gone into with a great deal of care and attention and which is of interest to the general public and especially our esteemed guests up in the press gallery. It is somewhat difficult to have a debate on information and the press if the press is not there, and I imagine that there are going to be few reporters present this evening when this report is down to be debated.

In view of the importance of this subject and for the sake of the press and the general public, I should like to invoke Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure and adjourn the debate. There is one condition, however, in view of the urgent nature of the subject. When the Bureau considers my request, could it please put the debate at the beginning of the next part-session in Luxembourg next month, perhaps even on the Monday afternoon? I hope my plea will be heard.

President. — There are 49 amendments. In order to avoid a lengthy vote, I propose that the report and the amendments be referred to committee and included on the agenda for the next part-session.

I call Mr Pedini.

Mr Pedini. — *(I)* Thank you for your cooperation, Mr President. I am sorry if I have to insist on the straightforward adjournment of the debate.

The amendments which have been tabled are so simple and cosmetic that there is already a basic feeling of agreement among us. If the report were sent back to committee, it would be practically impossible for us to present it in the House at the February part-session. This is why I am asking you, along with a plea to be as speedy as possible in finding an agreement with those who have tabled amendments, simply to adjourn the debate without referring the report to committee.

President. — I call Mr Schwenke.

Mr Schwenke. — *(D)* Mr President, I should like to interpret your constructive proposal as asking those of us who have tabled very similar amendments to present one single version. This would avoid the need for referral to committee. This would only delay our work, since what is involved here is after all Parliament's information policy as well, and not just that of the Commission.

I therefore ask for this information report to be debated on the Monday, i.e. at the start of the part-session in Luxembourg.

President. — It is not for me to determine a time for the debate. This is something which the Enlarged Bureau will be discussing this afternoon. My proposal was to refer the report back to committee — this is the official procedure — but there are naturally other ways of achieving the same thing. The report is thus removed from today's agenda.

I call Mr Schall.

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — *(D)* Mr President, our Rules of Procedure lay down that both the chairman of the committee and the rapporteur have the right to move that a report be postponed. With my full agreement, Mr Pedini, the chairman of our committee, has moved that this report be postponed until the February part-session — but only on condition that we have, by the end of today, an assurance that this report will be put on the agenda for Monday evening, or Tuesday morning at the latest, of the next part-session. Without such an assurance from the Bureau, neither of us is prepared to accept any postponement. In that case we shall insist that the report be debated today. The measure of agreement that has been reached on the 48 amendments is already so great that it will not take long to vote on them tomorrow.

President. — The Chairman and rapporteur of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport have asked both for a postponement of the debate *and* for an assurance that the debate will be held on the Monday of the next part-session. The postponement is a matter for Parliament to decide. As

President

far as putting the debate on the agenda for the Monday of the next part-session is concerned, the most I can say is that I will do my best. I therefore ask Parliament to vote now on whether the Schall report should be removed from today's agenda.

I call Mrs Viehoff.

Mrs Viehoff. — *(NL)* Mr President, you just asked whether one supporter and one opponent of Mr Pedini's motion wished to speak. I put up my hand because I wish to oppose the motion. We have been working on the Schall report for more than a year now, and I think it should be debated as soon as possible. It is true that there are 49 amendments, but they are not very complicated and many of them even have the same wording. I think the best thing would be to have the debate now, especially since we cannot be given any assurance that the report can be placed on the agenda for the Monday of the next part-session. I would ask the House to stop constantly changing the agenda and removing items from it. The argument that there are no young people in the House this evening is in my view not valid, and presumably the journalists will also be staying here, since they will have to cover the votes tomorrow. If they are genuinely interested in providing information about this Parliament, they will hardly disappear this evening.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pedini.

Mr Pedini. — *(I)* On behalf of Mr Schall as well, Mr President, I asked for the debate to be adjourned to the next part-session on condition that my request be accepted. I do not know whether there is provision in the Rules of Procedure for a qualified request of this kind.

Since I get the impression that with all the will in the world you are not in a position to give an assurance on this, we should prefer to carry on according to schedule with the debate during the present sitting, unless of course you can guarantee that the debate will be held on the Monday or Tuesday of the next part-session in Luxembourg.

Thank you for your cooperation, Mr President, and I am sorry that we have had to raise this point of order out of courtesy towards the official information organs.

President. — I cannot speak for the enlarged Bureau, Mr Pedini. I can speak only for myself and for no one else. The only thing the Rules of Procedure allow me to decide is to remove your committee's report from this week's agenda. If you withdraw your request, I must ask Mr Schall if he stands by his proposal.

I call Mr Schall.

Mr Schall. — *(D)* I withdraw my request.

President. — This means that the debate on the Schall report will be held this evening.

I call Mr Beyer de Ryke on a point of order.

Mr Beyer de Ryke. — *(F)* Mr President, I request that this debate be postponed until the next part-session.

(Parliament rejected the request)

President. — I call Mr Bersani.

Mr Bersani. — *(I)* Mr President, again on the agenda, Mrs Castellina — author of the report under Item 324, which is the last item on today's agenda, on a Commission communication on STABEX and two special reports by the Court of Auditors on the operation of STABEX — has asked Mrs Veil to postpone discussion of the report until the February part-session, because neither she nor Commissioner Cheysson can be present. This is a very important subject, one of the essential factors for the proper operation of the Lomé Convention, and like Mrs Castellina I should like to see the debate postponed.

(Parliament agreed to the request)

11. *Decentralized energy production* (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the report (Doc. 1-696/80), drawn up by Mrs Walz on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on the possibilities and limits of decentralized energy production (soft technologies).

I call Mr Turcat to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Turcat. — *(F)* Mr President, like the previous speakers I will not confine myself to Mrs Walz's very interesting report but will discuss the whole of the energy question, and try avoiding repeating what has already been said very convincingly by others.

One Member said yesterday that the Venice Summit had defined a Community energy policy without providing the financial resources. Is this really true? In reality, the Venice Summit defined nothing of the sort. It merely made a declaration expressing its satisfaction at the decisions taken and the approaches adopted by

Turcat

the Member States. As regards the Council of May 1980, by defining both energy objectives for 1990 and new so-called Community measures in the area of energy savings, it would appear to be proposing in reality nothing of a Community nature, but simply common measures, that is that each Member State must fix objectives and take measures which are in line with the common approach. Thus it is necessary to differentiate between a 'common' and a 'Community' approach. However, in spite of today's statements, the very absence of any reference to an energy policy in yesterday's speech by the President of the Council is an indication of the lack of seriousness of such propositions.

It is therefore with every right that our fellow Member Mr Galland asks why nothing concrete is proposed to implement the objectives defined at Community level. And since our fellow Member is far from naive, he is asking this question not to throw light on a mystery, because there is nothing very much concealed behind the cloud of smoke, but to arouse a new awareness in our institutions. What straightforward reply is he likely to receive? He will be told that the situation in our institutions. What straight forward reply is he energy dependence, to allow a European energy policy to be defined, or rather that since energy is as it were the life blood of a country the instinct of self-preservation dictates the approach 'every man for himself'. I could add more on the subject of one country's uranium, another's oil and a third country's gas.

However I do not want to continue on this pessimistic note but wish solely to arouse awareness of this reality, and the aim of my speech on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, is not to ask for appropriations without policies, but to join other Members in appealing for such a policy. Is it really not possible, not only to define common, even multinational, multilateral objectives, but also to take jointly much more determined measures which transcend divergent interests? It was obviously an exaggeration on my part to assert that there were no Community measures and that the appropriations called for had no target. Apart from the long-term Community thermonuclear fusion project, one concrete example of measures undertaken is that of energy saving, since the programmes set up by the Commission, with a view to research and pilot projects in this field, are experiencing rapid success, indeed too rapid from the point of view of the abnormally low ceiling on appropriations, a subject to which we will return in this Chamber. We approve of course Mrs Walz's clear report on the so-called soft energies and technologies but we all know the limitations of such ambitions. I therefore take the liberty, very modestly, of suggesting that the range of possible measures has not been entirely exhausted and to mention, by way of example, three technical approaches, which are in fact much more than this, which are public knowledge and on which we would like the Council and the Commission to

develop and outline objectives and proposed programmes.

First technical point concerns heat discharges, which you all know are colossal — two or three times greater than the energy actually transformed in the electrical power stations — but which are difficult to exploit by the Carnot principle. However, in addition to heat pumps, there are two methods which merit major research programmes and pilot projects. One is recovery at source for urban heating networks, the other direct agricultural utilization — this would, incidentally, involve the possibility of producing proteins for animal consumption which could greatly help our trade balance.

The second technical point concerns certain higher-risk methods of extracting oil which would make it possible to at least double the quantity extracted from wells, though at a higher price of course. I leave you to contemplate the consequences of such an advance.

The third technical point is to consider the energy content of the most common materials — paper, cement, metals — so as to encourage transition to materials and processes which are more economical in their use of energy, requiring obviously new or greater investments. After these technical points allow me, before concluding, to pose two political problems.

The first is already raised in a written question by our fellow member Mr Berkhouwer: it concerns the new dependence towards which we are moving unwittingly through our use of Soviet gas. In this context we must correct here the information provided by governments claiming a reduction in our dependence by the replacement of oil with gas. Will the Community pronounce on this?

The second political problem was called to mind by the recent proposal of a Member State, made at international level, for the setting up of a 'oil storage bank' to which each State would contribute and on which it could call in the event of a supply crisis affecting it. Would it not even be possible to enter into a form of association, providing closer mutual assurance at European level, which would give us greater strength in the event of crisis and would enable us to join together to better resist the blackmail of the oil cartel, which in 1980 had a balance of payments surplus of 120 000 million dollars whereas the developing countries had a deficit of 50 000 million?

Ladies and gentlemen, those are a few unpretentious and in no way exhaustive suggestions which I offer with the sole objective of showing that, while being aware of the realities and the inviolable egoism of each of our countries in the face of the energy supply problem, there are channels open for a Community policy and we are now waiting for it to be defined, made public and put into practice.

President. — I call Mr Coppieters of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, Mrs Walz's report, for which we warmly thank her, is by nature not an adequate basis for an in-depth debate on 'soft' energy. The decision to hold such a debate was taken at the first meeting of the Enlarged Bureau in 1979, and in preparation for it a number of committees have drafted reports and organized meetings. Half a day was also to have been earmarked for it during the plenary sitting, whenever this was held. It was our group which asked for this debate, but reluctance has delayed it. Also, Mrs Walz's report is now long out of date. It is a long time since she first undertook it, and it is no longer sufficiently abreast of the latest scientific developments. Our main reason for seeking an in-depth debate is the key question asked by millions of people, including those in economic and industrial circles: how far and how soon can sources of 'soft' energy meet our energy requirements, assuming that the *status quo* on nuclear energy continues temporarily and that the nuclear industry is totally abandoned in the longer term? This is the burning question, and it ought to have been discussed today. A wide variety of reports on the subject are available, and given the general reluctance to tackle the question, I shall myself see to it that a report by internationally recognized experts is submitted to you. However, I shall arrange this outside the framework of Parliament, in view of the lack of good will and comprehension shown by most of the members on this subject.

At first sight the Walz report is extremely positive on the question of soft energy, but it then presses for maximum exploitation of *all* energy sources without indicating the consequences for health, employment, etc. Nuclear energy is even referred to in the report as vitally important, which we dispute, and I have tabled amendments accordingly. So once again today we find ourselves powerless, obliged to hold just one fragment of an energy debate, since the majority in Parliament, the Commission and the Council have long since decided to give priority to nuclear energy, against the will of the general public and the elected political bodies at regional, municipal and village level, as, for example, in France. Hence the importance of the fact that yesterday two mayors (of Plogoff and Golfesc) had the opportunity of handing in their petition to the President of this House and telling of the resistance they had had to put up to the siting of nuclear power plants in their areas, despite President Giscard d'Estaing's assurance that *les centrales ne seront pas imposées contre la volonté des populations!* The facts gave the lie to his promise, and they took the form of forced occupation by gendarmes and soldiers, of tear gas, intimidation and months of provocation in the areas I have just mentioned. Yes, and these very high capacity power stations are not even necessary to cover

France's energy requirements, since it is a fact that the same amount of capital spending would have permitted soft energy sources to be developed on a scale never seen before.

What is the Community's attitude on the matter? One of refusal to investigate openly and thoroughly the potential of soft energy and provide adequate resources for it. Not only is there defiance of the will of the people, but also a refusal to provide urgently required information on the dangers of the nuclear policy being followed. This policy is based on plutonium. It rests on the grand illusion of the fast breeder reactors, which are really thermal reactors using fast neutrons, and on the technology of reprocessing highly irradiated spent fuels, a technology which in the past meant heavy capital spending for military purposes. Even today this technology has not been perfected; this has become apparent in the United States and has been officially admitted. So, thank God, it will not yet be possible in the near future to produce the plutonium necessary for the plutonium cycle. Not only is the reprocessing technology imperfect; it is extremely dangerous, as the repeated accidents in La Hague prove — first accident in January 1980, a near-disaster in April 1980, more accidents in May, September and October 1980 and finally last week the fire in a spent fuels depot, which subjected a number of workers to severe exposure and threatened the entire area. This is why we asked for an in-depth debate on soft energy and a thorough investigation, which has not yet been possible, apparently, in this House.

In conclusion a few more questions to the Commission. Viscount Davignon is the Commissioner for energy policy. Is he prepared to clarify and perhaps revise the Commission's thinking on reprocessing and fast breeder reactors? Commissioner Richards is responsible for social affairs. Is he willing to go to La Hague for an on-the-spot enquiry with the workers? Is Commissioner Narjes prepared to make a serious start on an active industrial policy in the field of soft energy?

Briefly, on the whole subject of energy policy we are hoping to see a Commission which is open and ready to listen, a Commission which will not meekly bow to previous decisions and the views of the nuclear lobby.

President. — I call Mrs Dekker, non-attached.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Mr President, this afternoon we are to conclude the debate on urgent measures to prevent and deal with pollution of the sea by hydrocarbons. In this connection Parliament has expressed its great concern at the enormous direct damage inflicted on our aquatic environment by oil. But this is only one of the many alarming consequences of our current energy policy. In addition to considerations of safety and the environment there are also serious

Dekker

economic and social, strategic and even military risks attached to our energy policy as it has been pursued to date. All the more reason, therefore — more, alas, than in the past — to give priority to alternative sources of energy and use the opportunities and instruments offered by the Community, our collective ingenuity and resources, to coordinate the development and use of energy sources which firstly, and unlike oil, gas, coal and nuclear energy too, are renewable or permanent; which, secondly, do not create the dependence on outside suppliers which is currently causing us so much concern and which, thirdly, do not bring the far-reaching and undesirable consequences to which I have just alluded. Anyone expecting a well-reasoned report on the importance of possible uses of alternative sources of energy and the concrete proposals for policy and action which these imply has been sold short. The Walz report is downright disappointing. For a start it quite unnecessarily begins with polemics between advocates and opponents of 'hard' and 'soft' energy and the rapporteur's own rendering of the views of Amery B. Lovins. It is a great shame that Mrs Walz did not apply her considerable talents more constructively here. The preparation of her report was prompted by colleagues who are not proponents of nuclear energy. Plenty of 'energy' has already been wasted on simple pro and con discussions on nuclear energy. The rapporteur's shifting of these pro and con discussions to the question 'for or against alternative sources of energy?', thus implicitly making the issue one of 'for nuclear energy and against alternative sources' versus 'for alternative sources and against nuclear energy', must be energetically repudiated, together with the association made in paragraph 5 of the resolution between programmes for the development of new energy sources and further uses of coal and nuclear power. In any case the view taken in this paragraph regarding the use of fast breeder reactors and high temperature reactors is unacceptable to us, and I shall certainly support any amendments which reflect our view.

Naturally, alternative energy sources cannot be dismissed as a kind of catchword which has recently been gaining popularity with public opinion or as a sort of exotic cult preached mainly by idealists. There is no panacea for the energy problem and any socially acceptable further source must be welcomed. Certainly in the long term alternative energy sources will have to play a major role in replacing conventional sources which are likely to run out. Mr Veronesi is right in talking here of a historic challenge, and we could do with a little vision ourselves as regards the future! I emphatically do not share the view that alternative energy sources can only be an addition: I think new energy sources really can replace conventional ones.

Not least, there is as yet no special EEC programme on this subject, in sharp contrast to the great efforts being made on behalf of conventional energy sources and above all for nuclear energy. Energy debates in this House have dealt with the following programmes:

nuclear waste, plutonium cycle, siting of nuclear power stations, energy saving and energy objectives for the next ten years. Scant consideration has been given to alternative energy sources. The rapporteur says in her conclusion that a final judgment on how far 'soft' energy can be used can be made only after a full and democratic debate. The Netherlands Government is currently preparing a so-called 'broad social discussion' specifically on nuclear energy. My party is a firm advocate of this. It seems to me a good idea to hold a broad social discussion in the wider European context too, but such a discussion should cover all forms of energy. If the rapporteur's proposal is meant along these lines, I gladly support it. As regards her conclusion that alternative energy sources may in 20 years' time account for 5 to 8 % of total consumption, I would add the following point in the interests of clarity: despite the enormous financial and other efforts made to develop nuclear energy, this source still provides not more than 3 % of our total energy needs.

The true debate on the significance and further development of alternative forms of energy is yet to be held, and it will require careful preparation. The Commission will have to give us concrete data and proposals and more information on measures which have already been taken. In a document going back to 1979 the Commission stated that the gap between successful development of new energy sources and laboratory testing of energy-saving techniques on the one hand and full commercial exploitation of them on the other hand was often attributable to difficulties in obtaining credits in the initial phase. The Commission has repeatedly declared that progress in the development of new energy technologies is a matter of urgency, but not until 1978 — and then only on a very modest scale — did it make a first financial contribution by aiding projects for new sources and energy-saving techniques. The first calls for projects in 1978 and 1979 straightaway brought more than 600 applications for projects on energy-saving technology. Only 60 projects received financial assistance to a total of 27 million units of account. The others, although meriting assistance, received none because there was not enough money. According to the Commission, the projects received were extremely numerous and of high quality, clearly reflecting the need for this kind of assistance and the degree to which the Commission can provide it. In 1978 the Council earmarked a maximum of 55 million units of account in research aid, to be spread over four years, i.e. an average of 13 million units of account per year. Quite apart from the fact that this was non-compulsory expenditure, so that the Council had absolutely no right to stipulate a maximum — indeed the Commission quite rightly protested against this — the funds earmarked are clearly far too limited. This is true also of financial assistance for the exploitation of alternative energy sources, particularly since the recent budget debates have shown that only 9 % of the other funds set aside for energy are actually spent.

Dekker

Up to now no adequate programme for alternative energy utilization and new forms of energy has been forthcoming. The Commission does not even have statistics on the subject, let alone concrete forecasts and objectives.

Mr President, my contribution to this debate has focussed deliberately on the matter in hand, that is, the development of alternative sources of energy. A number of oral questions on this point have been added, which naturally are important, but which are really only incidental to the subject proper. So far this has meant a fairly wide-ranging debate, a touch of 'something for everyone', which certainly does not make for effective handling of the subject. In any case these questions are no longer listed on today's agenda.

Regarding the presence of the Council, we must welcome the fact that Minister Van Aardenne has attended this debate, at least the first part of it. It is a pity that his detailed statement contained (literally) only one sentence on alternative and new energy sources and that he merely mentioned the possibility of more funds for demonstration projects, solely for solar and geothermal energy. This shows very well how little attention the subject has received so far at EEC level. My questions to the Council which I was holding in reserve I shall keep for another time.

I shall end, Mr President, with the hope that the outcome of this debate will, before too long, be a discussion — extremely desirable and a matter of urgency — on alternative energy sources. However, the substance of this discussion should be properly prepared, and there should be not exchange of pointless polemics.

President. — I call Mrs Charzat.

Mrs Charzat. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on 18 November 1980 the Commissioner, Mr Davignon, appeared before the European Parliament and defined the Commission's major and urgent task, namely to ensure that the Council of Ministers of 27 November take the necessary steps to ensure that the shortage of two million barrels per day did not lead to additional pressure on the market. To this end the Commission had made proposals to the Council, for procedures to be adopted and objectives to be fixed.

Almost two months have passed since the Council meeting. While the conflict between Iran and Iraq rages, the Member States of the Community have simply agreed to discourage oil purchases at abnormal prices and to introduce levies on stocks. In the present situation one cannot but emphasize the absurdity of the measures proposed for the coming months.

In reality, the Member States' current policy of holding excessively high oil stocks runs counter to the

Community's objectives of attaining energy independence.

On the one hand the measures designed to reduce pressure on prices and to lower stocks will not enable Europe to cope with a critical economic situation in the event of a heightening of tension in the Middle East. The facts are clear: the Member States of the Community are incapable of making an act of will to achieve energy independence and solidarity. The International Energy Agency reflects an absence of the will to act in concert rather than submit.

Secondly the end result of the Community's current policy of overstocking is in fact to increase the Member States' economic and energy vulnerability. Overstocking is the worst possible response to the artificial energy crisis, for the four following main reasons:

Firstly, overstocking increases the Community's dependence *vis-à-vis* the multinational oil companies. Since the Iran-Iraq conflict is continuing, the multinational companies reserve the right to invoke the *force majeure* clause in order not to meet obligations to supply, or to reduce supplies of, crude oil. Since the bulk of supplies comes from Saudi Arabia, which has greatly stepped up production to mitigate the Iraqi deficit, the additional tonnage comes, principally from the consortium of American companies. Multinational companies control the markets and the oil trade without being obliged to submit supply plans to the Member States, with the result that the national oil companies of the Nine find themselves under increasing pressure to join the big multinational cartels. Their only strategy and logic is that of maximum profit. It is becoming more and more evident that such action undermines the effort to arrive at a stable and balanced relationship with the countries of the Third World.

Secondly, Mr Davignon, overstocking only heightens the antagonism between the crude producing countries and the consumer countries. The last OPEC ministers' conference demonstrated convincingly the link which exists between price development and the state of the market. The multinationals are regarded as bearing the main responsibility for the runaway prices which they pass on to consumers. This speculative leap in prices is linked to policies of overstocking which make it possible, in the wording of the Algerian Minister, to transfer part of the producing countries' deposits to the consumer countries. Such attitudes accelerate inflation and deflation, unemployment and recession in the Community countries. Faced with the growing awareness of the States and continents which are rich in energy resources and in raw materials, the European Economic Community, despite its economic potential, appears as the big loser in the restructuring of the world economy.

Charzat

Thirdly, overstocking is very costly for the Community countries. Instead of relying on the short-sighted policy of the multinationals or remaining under the influence of the International Energy Agency, a better approach would be to adopt economic management of energy resources to encourage the best use of investments. So far the Community Member States have not really made a voluntary decision to take steps to plan resources, research and energy investments.

To conclude — and this is my fourth and last point — the Community could form a coherent and innovatory diplomatic centre to meet the aspirations of the Third World, of which the Middle East is the most developed part. A foolish alliance of the United States and the Soviet Union makes the world into a prison for the Third World. If the European Economic Community is to speak the language of peace and reason, it must first ensure the optimum conditions for its own energy independence. As long as the Community weakens its own institutions by recourse to the International Energy Agency, the chances for an Euro-Arab dialogue, the chances for new North-South relations remain flimsy. In reply to a question by a French Sunday newspaper, the new President of the Commission, Mr Thorn, stated that there would have to be a readiness to speak together on the question of defence. Instead of continuing along the path of error, it would be better to lay the basis for energy independence.

President. — I call Mr Sassano.

Mr Sassano. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mrs Walz's speech is undoubtedly logical and strictly rational in giving soft technologies their proper place.

There is no doubt that the essential task before us is that of continuing with great commitment, the development of nuclear energy and the use of coal in order to reduce our dependence on oil, bearing in mind the economic reasons for this.

Meanwhile we cannot and must not neglect the programme of research, experimentation and above all development of new sources of soft technology energy. While we are convinced that by the year 2000 we can rely on renewable energy sources for about 7 % of the total energy consumption, we cannot fail to bear in mind that a more forceful commitment on the part of the Community could increase the share of the total available through soft technology by the year 2000.

But, of course, it is not possible to obtain significant results as long as we have to rely on the investments so far provided. Indeed, investments in the nuclear field and for liquefaction of coal are equally limited. I know this from experience, because I was rapporteur for a rather restrictive regulation on the subject.

Unfortunately, it is clear that there is little confidence in Europe, and each Member State, in the misguided belief that it can do better with its not enormous — indeed extremely modest — resources, is opposed to a Community energy policy which is the only thing which, instead of our dispersing our resources, would put us on a par with the Soviet Union and the United States.

I feel obliged to remind you once more that the short-sightedness of our energy 'non-policy' does not even give us the opportunity — I am addressing these remarks particularly to Mr Davignon — to have Community standards for the building and operation of nuclear plant. Europe will, unfortunately, bitterly regret the absence of such standards in the near future.

With regard to soft technology energy, we are running the same risk! Once again sectoral initiatives are proliferating in the various Member States, with few if any initiatives undertaken by the Community.

In a few years action by the Community will appear more necessary and then, as is now happening for nuclear energy or initiatives in the field of coal liquefaction, we shall meet the same difficulties caused by the divergent policies of the Member States.

Today we have the opportunity to promote an effective energy policy, at least in the field of soft technology, provided that the Commission finds the strength and capacity to create one, although I must admit that personally I am beginning to have serious doubts, because of the reluctance shown by the Commission to propose bold Community energy programmes with clear expenditure estimates which would have to be considerably greater than the present modest sums.

Of course we shall not be able to take account of economic questions — and Mrs Walz does well to mention them — but we shall have the opportunity to promote initiatives which could give us advantages of every kind, and which above all could help to bring the Member States closer together.

I must tell you that the esteem which I have for Mr Davignon, to whom I wish every success in his work, leads me to hope that it will be possible, bearing in mind the difficulties we shall have to overcome in order to free ourselves from the trammels of the restricted possibilities allowed by the budget, for the Commission at long last to let us know the policy outlines, time-scales and above all costs of a Community energy programme.

We must ask ourselves whether it is acceptable for the Community to continue to take action in dribs and drabs, when it is well known that adequate investments and substantial development programmes could give us very different results.

Sassano

In particular, while it is true that the potential of soft technology and solar energy is considerable, we must not neglect to give adequate support to the development of biomass energy. The use of biomass could lead to a new productive orientation of Community agriculture with the specific aim of developing energy-yielding crops. I hope Mr Galland will not mind my saying that I regard it as more useful for any biomass energy centre to be located in France and any solar energy centre in Italy. I say this because I greatly appreciate his proposal for these centres, and I therefore wished to draw attention to it.

During the last Parliament part-session a resolution was approved to provide aid to the victims of the earthquake in southern Italy, and I am particularly grateful to Parliament for this. I would like to quote paragraph 9 of this resolution, which I proposed:

Requests also a study to be made of an energy plan which must then be implemented to supply energy to newly constructed public and private buildings in the affected zone, including solar energy and remote heating installations.

I therefore urge the Commission to study as rapidly as possible the measures which need to be taken in order to provide adequate solar energy and district heating for the houses and public buildings which need to be reconstructed.

Of course it is not easy to solve the problem, but it is a way of beginning to create operational programmes run by the Commission.

President. — I call Mr Beazley.

Mr Beazley. — Mr President, on behalf of my Group, I wish to deal with two aspects of today's debate: firstly, Mrs Walz's report and, secondly, the conservation aspect of our own resolution.

I must say that I was most surprised and disappointed by the quite unsubstantiated assertions made by Mr Coppieters, because I had hoped that he would use his time to provide a serious defence of his views and those of his Group. However, he appears to have treated this opportunity merely as one to drop in and make a speech and then leave the Chamber again.

I cannot accept that the Walz report does not provide a sufficient basis for a proper debate on soft technologies. I believe it is for Mr Coppieters and his Group to show how soft energy can completely replace nuclear energy, because that is his assertion and because nobody in this group and, I believe, in the majority of this House believes it to be the case. Certainly the governments of the ten Member States in their forecasts do not show this to be the case.

I also utterly reject his statement that the use of nuclear power is not the will of the people of Europe. I

agree that there is a very voluble minority who would like to make the people of Europe imagine it to be the case, but democracy as we know it is the will of the majority and not, as sometimes appears to be the case in this House, the will of the minority.

To get back to Mrs Walz's report, I should like to congratulate her on her initiative and compliment her on the objective way in which she has addressed herself to the subject of so-called soft energy technologies. Her objectivity has enabled her to consider the subject in unprejudiced fashion, and her good judgment has enabled her to analyse the problem raised by these propositions by thinkers like Amery B. Lovings and Mr F. E. Schumacher. I further strongly support the determination of the Committee on Energy and Research to have this subject debated, because the arguments for and against must be clearly stated in the open and not only in the Committee on Energy and Research but what is even more important, in the European Community and the West as a whole. We must really get to grips with the most serious threat to our economy and our society that man has known since the days of pest and world war. Hence my great regret that Mr Coppieters and his Group have not accepted their challenge. Lovings's proposition would reject not only the use of nuclear energy, which is the only new source of energy of sufficient size and cheapness to alter the balance, but also centralized energy production from the current sources — oil, coal, gas and water-power — which represent some 95 % of today's total production. Mr Lovings does not suggest that the replacement should be achieved immediately, but over a period of from forty to fifty years; but he does propose that these soft and decentralized energy sources are alternative forms of energy. His criterion would in fact result in the remarkable situation where the most decentralized and mobile forms of power for irrigation in impoverished Indian and African communities — that is, the diesel engine and the tractor — would fall outside the desirable mechanical aids because they were based on oil and because they were produced on mass-production centralized systems. Similarly, as communities in developing countries grow into townships, it is thought undesirable to connect them up with national grid systems based on large-scale coal-fired power-stations.

Now I think that the soft-technology proposition is in fact more concerned with a new form of society than with alternative sources of energy. Meanwhile, there is no indication that either developing or developed nations want that form of society which the proposition would imply. Nor is it at all clear that the forms of energy proposed do really offer an alternative. I consider that such energy forms are not substitutional but additional forms of energy. On present calculations, they would not supply more than approximately 10 % of our energy requirements over the next two decades, and present estimates of the cost in terms of capital and revenue show them to be the most uneconomical forms of producing energy even if it were

Beazley

possible to exploit them on a large scale. There is, furthermore, no likelihood of its being possible to exploit them in that way for a considerable number of years. The proposition of a zero-growth or even a low-growth economy is most unlikely to find favour anywhere in the Western world and naturally not in the newly industrialized world or in lesser developed countries. Nevertheless, our Group is in favour of research into these forms of energy and their proper evaluation and development as appropriate.

What, however, is most important about these proposals is the need for energy conservation. Not only does this offer the main chance of solving our problems in the short term but, once the opportunities which conservation presents are fully realized, they will have very considerable medium and long-term effects on energy consumption. They will not change the nature of society but will make it more efficient.

The two main sectors of energy consumption are transport and housing, which consume approximately 30 % each of oil-based energy. In the short term we can deal with the housing situation, but in the medium and long term transport is by far the most important section. We shall be dealing with this matter in the report on the energy and transport hearings, so I will not go into details here. I will merely say that the opportunities which they present are very satisfactory, and I bear in mind that they will need time and money to exploit them.

President. — I call Mr Delorozoy.

Mr Delorozoy. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is my belief that we have reached broad agreement in this House on the need for a common energy policy. And I should like to draw your attention to the great difficulties which arise from the present state of the energy question, which is that the systems in operation vary greatly according to the main energy source. For oil and gas there is a free market system. For coal, the free market system is often warped by grants from certain States. For uranium, the Euratom Treaty imposes a stringent system.

It is therefore our duty to achieve a certain degree of harmonization of the ways in which various energy sources are treated in order to make it possible to set up a real common policy.

World energy consumption is increasing inexorably for several different reasons which I do not wish to go into here and which you are all perfectly aware of.

Oil producers are able increasingly to restrict their supplies for political motives as well as others. Oil has become an effective lever, as we are now learning. Under these circumstances, providing energy for the Community will doubtless become more and more difficult.

Naturally, we should not ignore the potential of renewable or new energy sources, but all the specialists in the international conferences dealing with energy, and in particular at the last World Energy Conference held in September 1980 in Munich, have shown that, at best, these renewable energy sources will account in the year 2 000 for from 3 to 5 % of total world energy consumption. Thus, leaving aside energy savings, which are only too dear to be wished for we must turn towards those energy sources which are real and effective alternatives: coal and nuclear power.

In the Community, the fact that our domestic coal is difficult to extract increasingly forces us to resort to imports. This is a good thing in that it spreads supplies over several sources, but the possibilities are of necessity restricted both by reason of the large volumes which must be transported and handled, and of the difficulties in using such imports.

The hard fact is that a shift towards nuclear power is thus more than ever necessary, as the latest energy forecasts for the end of this century prove. This is because, in addition to the problem of guaranteeing supplies, we cannot continue to pay for energy at any price without running the risk of a recession.

Recently, Sheik Yamani, stated in an interview, that the price of oil might well reach 50 dollars a barrel by spring 1981. Even if they have not gone that far, the latest price increases decided on by OPEC in Bali have completely reshuffled prices for 1 kilowatt-hour produced from various energy sources.

Far be it from me to contradict Mr Coppieters, but in France we know how to add up. I have here the latest price estimates — expressed in French francs at current rates — for 1 kilowatt produced by various types of power station, for plant commissioned between 1985 and 1990, allowance being made for the latest decisions taken by OPEC in Bali. Nuclear power comes to 16.61 centimes per kilowatt-hour, coal 25.65 centimes and fuel oil 53.5 centimes, and if proper consideration were given to the environment, and the sulphur removed from the coal and the oil used, then these prices would be much higher, 28.63 centimes for coal and 57.10 centimes for oil. It is clear that as a result it is quite unreasonable to burn fuel oil in boilers and that we should keep this precious substance for higher things, as a raw material in the petrochemical industry and for land and air transport. Therefore, we should use coal, and electricity produced from coal and from nuclear power, to the full.

In addition, and for some time to come, the countries of the Fourth World will have little access to advanced nuclear technology. Therefore the developed countries have a duty to use nuclear power to the full in order to make the oil available first and foremost to developing countries who will not easily be able to use other fuels. The Community must provide support for this and not make the task of member countries more difficult

Delorozoy

through regulations enabling minorities to block the installation or operation of the equipment needed to provide an alternative to oil. It is true that one of the difficulties in setting up new industrial installations lies in the scale of the investment to be made. This is why we feel that over and above the resources already available a large Community energy loan should be floated which would help to solve these problems. The Community is a large financial entity and could have quite easy access to the market in petro-dollars in particular, which must be recycled in order to encourage producers not to reduce their output. Private investors or public bodies ought to be able to pay back in the normal manner the annual payments on Community loans. In addition, the Community could grant reduced interest rates to the most promising projects. The Liberal and Democratic Group places special emphasis on this point, which it feels to be essential, in order to give new impetus to the common energy policy. Lastly, we feel that a superlevy on petroleum products, which has already been suggested several times, would be difficult to apply for several different reasons. Firstly because European countries who are producers of oil or gas would stand to gain more from it, and secondly because this would give the OPEC producers the idea that oil is not expensive enough yet because the industrialized countries would themselves be adding a superlevy to the price. For these reasons, we await with great interest the specific proposals the Commission and Council will make on these subjects.

Mr Coppieters, as Mr Beazley has already mentioned, often talks — and I hope he will not mind my being so frank — about anything and everything! In his speech just now he appealed to our humanitarian feelings, feelings of which he doubtless shares, towards workers said to have been contaminated, and he quoted incorrect data on an accident at the La Hague reprocessing plant. I have here incontrovertible evidence, and this is not mere idle talk, Mr Coppieters. I should like to state here and now that the very low level and type of localized contamination which occurred after the accident bears no risk at all for the workers of this plant. Since you have no precise information and are therefore saying whatever you like, please allow me to tell you that on 7 January supplementary checks were carried out, at the staff's request, on the staff and vehicles. At the same time, a special meeting of the site Safety and Health Committee was called for the morning of 8 January. Further checks were carried out at the request of this Committee on the premises which were open on 1 January and all these checks proved negative. The same is true for the vehicle pool. I have before me a report from the central department for protection against ionizing radiation of the Ministry of Labour and Public Health, which states that checks are continuing, samples are being taken of the air, the grass and milk in the whole risk area and analysis shows that the levels of radioactivity have in no case reached even the lowest of the regulation levels. Also none of the integrating dosimeters in the

region has detected radiation of any magnitude whatever.

The situation is, therefore, totally under control, workers' safety is totally guaranteed and the people living around the plant are in complete safety. If you acted and spoke out of humanitarian motives, I hope this has reassured you. If your speech had a different aim, then we will have to return to this subject in a later debate.

(Applause from the right)

President. — I call Mr Schmid.

Mr Schmid. — *(D)* Mr President, we are talking today about the need for a common energy policy. I am very pleased that we are gradually feeling our way towards more joint action in this House and not simply reading out set pieces we have drawn up at national level. I was very interested to hear what Mr Müller-Hermann had to say about our relations with the OPEC countries. I was also very interested to hear Mr Galland's views, most of which I share. In my opinion, we are on the right road. It is a good thing that the Commission has now desisted from sending isolated papers on isolated problems to the national governments, but that — at least, this is the impression I get — Mr Davignon is now trying to establish common guidelines as a first step. As a result of the process we have followed so far, energy policy is like a net which is very fine-meshed in a number of places, but which is riddled with holes in others. Any fisherman will tell you that you are not going to catch any fish with a net like that, and we are in the same kind of boat as regards energy policy. The Council of Ministers has still not changed. The national ministries house the strategists of national self-seeking, and the ministers are simply packed off to the Council meetings with ready-made prompt cards.

We must make progress if we are to get what we all need. You cannot, on the one hand, talk about the bonus of achieving a European solution and at the same time think this benefit is going to accrue for free. That is just not on. If one thing is clear, it is — as the debates here have shown — that government intervention is essential in the energy sector because energy sources cannot be created at will, because demand cannot be cut as and when required — indeed, to some extent it cannot be manipulated at all — and because what we are faced with is a market — like the oil market — with very few suppliers, and which is governed by forces we can read about in economics text-books under the heading 'Oligopolies'. The mechanics of such a market include price-fixing. As we do not have the resources ourselves, we are bound to import them with all the problems that entails.

To some extent, these problems simply cannot be solved at national level, and there are problems which

Schmid

— given the existence of the Common Market — it would be sensible to solve at European level, because that is the most economic way. This applies, for instance, to the problem of the current account balance, on which the European People's Party has now submitted a proposal which I would comment to your attention. Energy is a cost factor in production. At the same time, we have the Common Market; and the two together add up to competition distortion, because we have different energy prices. That kind of thing can only be solved at European level.

Likewise, the problem of concentration and the creation of oligopolies in the energy market can only be tackled by a market surveillance system organized at European level, precisely because we have a Common Market.

The European Community maintains external trade relations with many countries, including those which supply us with energy. However, these relations are not being used in a coordinated and consistent way to the benefit of energy policy. At the moment, the bonus we have by virtue of our trade relations is simply being cast to the winds. Here again, a purely national solution is impossible.

One final remark: many people seem to insist that, as far as they are concerned, the problem is solved by the fact that they themselves have access to oil or gas reserves. They forget, though, that the bulk of their trade relations are nowadays with the Member States of the European Community. If the other Member States get into trouble, they will suffer the economic consequences.

What, then, is the significance of all this in terms of oil policy? I believe that we must do more to make uncontrolled speculation on the open markets more transparent and more controllable. We must do something about the balance of payments problems. As regards market clout and the exploitation of the external trade bonus, the Committee on External Economic Relations are now discussing the very interesting proposal aimed at creating, alongside the existing oil companies, a public-benefit oil company organized at European level, with the aim of exploiting the additional advantages we have. I deliberately use the word 'additional' to make sure that there is no misunderstanding here.

I should like to address one final remark to the Member of the Commission responsible for energy questions. In my view, the biggest gap we have at the moment is in relations between the European Community and the OPEC countries. On the occasion of your last appearance before the Committee on Energy and Research, you said, Mr Davignon, that the time was not right, in your opinion, for discussions with the OPEC countries. I do not share that view. Whoever thought that price decisions would be affected by the

fact that two of the OPEC countries are at war with each other has been taught a lesson.

I believe — nay, I know — that the Community does not at present have any proper plans for actively indulging in oil-diplomacy. That is something that must change. So far, the Community has adopted a passive role within the terms of classic trade policy. The agreements we have reached so far with the Mediterranean countries are not enough. Whatever contact there is with the OPEC countries is at best informal and irregular. I was astonished to hear that the Commission's Head of Directorate responsible for hydrocarbons has never spoken to Mr Ortiz of OPEC. We therefore call for the establishment of regular contacts with OPEC. The Community's office in Vienna can be used for this purpose, so long as well-versed energy experts and diplomats are posted there with the aim of establishing a running dialogue. I also believe that thought should be given to establishing regular contacts at high level between OPEC and the Community. We must make sure that this matter does not get clogged up somewhere within the various departments of the Commission. Whenever you ask an official, the only reply you get is that cooperation is taking place. I know for a fact that, as in every national ministry, this is not so. The only way out, Mr Davignon, is to set up a task force — for instance, a Community-OPEC task force — which is not subject to hierarchical or bureaucratic constraints and which can tackle this problem and forge links. These are the essential problems which we could solve quickly and without any substantial budgetary resources.

President. — I call Mr Fuchs.

Mr Fuchs. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, today's energy debate has, all things considered, been an encouraging one insofar as it has become clear that the problem is being taken extremely seriously and that there is a certain consensus of opinion. One other encouraging aspect, to my mind, is the fact that the President-in-Office of the Council gave at least some definite indication of what he intends to do. I trust this will turn out to be more than just a flash in the pan.

The new Member of the Commission responsible for energy, Mr Davignon, is well known to us, and of course he has a stronger foundation to work on thanks to his connections with industry. We are placing great hopes in him and in the gentleman sitting next to him, Mr Narjes, who will be closely involved in the security issue.

There is no need to panic, then; nor do we have any cause to get discouraged. But I believe that we must draw certain conclusions and build our political activities around them. I am almost tempted to declaim:

Fuchs

Enough of words — the time has now come for action!

That advice is addressed first and foremost to the Council. We hope that, in this report, things will improve in the future, and on this point, I should like to address an appeal to you, Mr Davignon. In February last year, the European Parliament adopted a resolution on energy policy aims for 1990 in which the House called for regular information on developments. A year has now passed since then, and I would ask you to ensure that this information is forthcoming in the near future.

Let me now move on to deal with the conclusions I feel should be drawn. We should recognize realities, and for that reason, I am very grateful to Mrs Walz for having done just that in her admittedly very attractive report on soft technologies, and for rightly referring to nuclear energy and the most advanced types of reactor in point 5 of her motion for a resolution. That of course is the point we shall have to decide on. Mr Adam of the Socialist Group side-stepped the issue very elegantly by claiming that the amendment had been tabled because the list was incomplete. I beg his pardon, but I rather doubt whether that is the real reason. In my opinion, the real reason is that you want to avoid having to make a decision. That will just not do, and in that respect, Mr Coppieters has followed a more logical line. The only problem, Mr Coppieters, is that you do not recognize realities — that is your basic failing. As far as I can see, there are three groups who are against nuclear energy. The largest of these consists of people who harbour indefinable fears. They require far more enlightening information than has so far been available. The second group is one we know very well in the Federal Republic of Germany. It is a small group, but capable of anything. These people have appropriated the fight against nuclear energy as a weapon to be used in a revolution aimed at overthrowing society as we know it. These people must be put in their place by legal and democratic means. The third group consists of people who yearn for a paradise lost. These are often young, idealistic people whose attitude — which finds expression in the soft technologies — I understand, although I am sure it will lead us down a blind alley. I am afraid that when these people wake up and emerge from their dreamworld, they will be plunged into a world of which they had no conception, a world of poverty and also perhaps of social chaos.

I think it dangerous here to talk about alternative energy, although people are doing it all the time. The fact is that we have no alternative energy. All we have is a range of energy sources available to us. This, I think, is something we must appreciate at all costs if we are ever to make any progress. The real alternative we have is to develop all these energy sources for all we are worth or to capitulate. The latter course would mean a falling standard of living and — if I may be so

brutal — a signed and sealed death sentence for the poorest peoples of this world.

That will be the consequence; that is the real alternative, but I hope that no one would advocate it.

Very briefly, the second conclusion must be to take a clear decision to give priority to energy policy. That is easier said than done. It is true that the proponents of energy policy are now in a strong position, because without a successful energy policy, all the other political problems will become insoluble. Let me just remind you of such things as employment policy and development policy. This way, other sectors of politics can be made to take an interest in energy policy, and this is an aspect which should be stressed in the future.

Thirdly, we need immediate action. Someone has already said that major investments will involve a time lag of between 10 and 15 years. Let me remind you that the time bomb is primed and is ticking away, that with every passing day we are being cut off from our oil supplies and that the available resources will be exhausted in the foreseeable future. For that reason, the time factor is far more important in energy policy than in any other policy. That is something we must always bear in mind.

Fourthly — and very briefly — energy policy must be recognized as a Community policy. I was pleased to hear many Members take this line, especially Mr Galland, whose words I found most impressive and convincing, and for which I should like to thank him most sincerely.

Let us remind ourselves of the magnitude of the problems we are grappling with. Let us bear in mind the way they are linked to general policy considerations. It is then surely obvious that, without a Community policy, there can be no progress, and I believe — fifthly — that this energy policy can and must give a lead for the development of the Community into an Economic and Monetary Union, and finally to political union. I would therefore urge that all the powers available to us under the terms of the Treaties — including in particular Article 235 — be used to the full. If energy policy founders, how are we to safeguard the future Common Market and how are we to go about developing the Community in the direction of Economic and Monetary Union? I believe this House has a lever to apply here and it is prepared to use that lever. Let the other two institutions be in no doubt about that.

Let me up by saying that there is no need for despair, but we must act decisively, and I should like to address an urgent appeal to Mr Davignon in particular — and to all the other Members of the Commission here today — to act in this spirit. I am convinced that, if we do so, we shall not be found to have been wanting, because posterity will judge us by what we do rather

Fuchs

than by what we say. I hope posterity will have a good word to say about us.

President. — I call Mr Purvis.

Mr Purvis. — Mr President, this is a rather strangely constructed debate. The centre-piece is Mrs Walz's very interesting and useful report on soft technologies, but onto to that have been hung various elaborate pieces of costume jewellery which expand the debate really into one of world energy policy — at the very least Community energy policy. However, that may be just as well as it is the first occasion on which we have the new Commissioner for Energy in the House and I hope he will be telling us where he intends to go and what the role of the Community is going to be in energy policy, if I may conceivably widen the scope as has already been done by my various predecessors speaking this afternoon.

Certainly the Council can be castigated and has been castigated as recently as a few minutes ago by Mr Fuchs for fine words, little action, much procrastination, a sort of delaying policy which leaves the solution of our energy problems at worst to change, at best to market forces. But I think this House itself could just as well be criticized for indicating that governments, whether national or supranational, can solve all the problems by rushing in with a heavy dose of intervention, with central direction of investment, with massive central funding, in short by obliterating the market forces.

If I might put forward a calming word for a proper balance between these contrasting attitudes. It is theoretically possible to make the Community self-sufficient in energy. Every farm, every suburban villa, every block of flats could have its own windmill or its hydroelectric plant, though grids would still be essential if we were to assure reasonable security of supply. We could provide massive aids to the European coal industry or to nuclear industry. We could provide subsidies for everything from biomass to fusion research. We could put prohibitive taxes on fuel use. We could provide grants for hermetically sealing our factories and houses. We could exploit every conceivable indigenous resource regardless of cost or we could impose legal fiat or rationing.

But what in the process would we do to our industry's costs and taxes, industry that depends on competing in the world markets for its livelihood? What would we do to our people's standard of living and the cost of living?

On the other hand, if we disregard the political implications of a *laissez-faire* policy, this would be just as dangerous for the opposite reasons. If we do not attempt to free ourselves from the political bondage that dependence on others entails we will leave

ourselves, our industry and the people of Europe with a permanent crick in the neck as every move, economic or political, would have to consider the implications for our energy supplies.

Now food is just as fundamental — the fundamental justification for the CAP is self-sufficiency in food. A very similar justification can be made for some positive form of energy policy, but there is a limit. It cannot be at any cost, whether financial or in its beggar-my-neighbour attitudes to other economic blocs and countries. Or in its economic impact on the competitiveness of our industry or on our people through its inflationary effects. We have to achieve a balance between these extremes. We have to take a macroeconomic view. We have to take a responsible world view. We have to take a practical and political view and we have to take a practical financial and technical view.

Take coal for example. The Council stressed this morning that this was our first line of defence. That was where we were going. That was where the hope was, and we are scared at the moment about a 50 % dependence on imported oil. Imported largely from a bloc of countries who can combine and have combined to squeeze our economies and constrain our political initiatives. Yet the programme proposed by the Commission, as a result of requests from the Council and exhortations from this House, will leave us on their own reckoning more than 50 % dependent on imported coal, importing over three hundred million tonnes by the end of the century, consuming six hundred million tonnes, twice what we consume at the moment. Imagine the environmental and logistical problems.

Certainly it will not come from the Middle East. But it will come from two or three major suppliers, the USA and Australia above all. Certainly they are very good friends at the moment and long may they be so. But private, commercial and national interests are bound to loom large. Do we want to tie our politics and our economics irrevocably to these economic blocs or suppliers of our raw materials?

The advocates of indigenous European coal industry will say we have boundless supplies right here if only we invest massively or provide a protected market. But someone has to pay, the taxpayer or the energy consumer. We have energy-consuming industries which compete with our American competitors, who will have cheaper energy stocks, feed stocks. Surely the present state of our petrochemical industry is only fair warning of what can happen.

It is a matter therefore of finding a balance, not massive amounts of money necessarily, though in some cases this may be useful. It is resolution and common sense, community of interest within Europe and in our dealings with others that will ensure our economic well-being, the quality of life and political freedom.

IN THE CHAIR: MR JAQUET

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Maher.

Mr Maher. — Mr President, my congratulations to the rapporteur and those who helped so much to provide a sound basis for the exchange of views we are having on this important topic here this afternoon.

May I say at the outset, Mr President, that we should draw some comfort from the fact that at least in relation to one form of energy we do not have to worry; there is plenty. It is the most important source of energy, because without it none of us could get on for very long. Indeed, had we had an energy policy in this Community at the same time as we had an agricultural policy it could well be that today we should be debating how to reduce the resources going into that energy policy so as to eliminate the cost of the surpluses that have to be exported. Well, I would argue, of course, that that would be a far more healthy position to be in than the one we are in today where we are extremely vulnerable because we have to import large quantities of energy from sources that are not very reliable, politically or otherwise. So I think it is well to remind this House that we have plenty of food for human beings. In fact I wonder whether the figures compiled by the experts for the proportion of soft energies that we are using, include food. I think it should be included because it is a source of energy.

Having said that, Mr President, I accept, of course, that we must have adequate supplies of other sources of energy; and while I am not against nuclear energy I would have to say that there is a danger that, because of the polarization between the pro-nuclear club and the anti-nuclear club, we could get into difficulties on this argument. In that argument we could lose sight of some of the fundamentals and of the fact that we should not neglect to make use of any possible source of indigenous energy in our various countries.

Mr President, I do not think any single source of energy is going to meet all our needs. But on the other hand, every time we can replace oil with whatever source of energy that we have that is indigenous to us, or replace nuclear energy if we can do without it — I am not arguing that we can — I believe we must do so. Surely, we should try to exploit the others, and for some communities these are very important.

For instance, the whole question of timber production is one that has been hanging fire in the Community for many years. We still do not have a forestry policy, in which I would include the whole question of biomass.

Mr Gundelach, God rest his soul, the other night here in this House said he would like to see a full debate on forestry. The Council has refused to accept the Commission's proposals and has done nothing about it. They are there on the shelf gathering dust for years. Yet we have in the Community vast regions that could be planted, that could be producing timber, that could replace some of the imported energy that we use, both directly and indirectly. In addition to replacing it directly as fuel, timber could replace high energy-consuming materials like brick and concrete for building, plastics, etc. We now know how to fireproof, pestproof and weatherproof timber. We could therefore use timber for buildings materials and that would save a lot of energy.

Moreover, Mr President, forestry provides employment. It is an alternative use for land. If we are producing too much food, we could divert some land to timber production. In my own country, for instance, we are using peat as a fuel for electricity production. That is going to run out in a few decades. We must find some way of fuelling these power stations, otherwise we will have to build new power stations. We are beginning to plant with scrub and bamboo the areas where the peat has been taken out. This is the way in which we can use these power stations on a continuous basis with a renewable energy source — one that will not run out as long as the present climate in this Community persists.

Hydroelectric power: in all our countries we have mountain areas where continuous streams of water could be tapped to supply a few farmhouses, small villages or towns. All this would be a contribution to the saving of energy. After all, the Dutch used wind power to keep the water out of the farmlands won back from the North Sea for many years before electricity was introduced. There are possibilities here.

Mr President, I should not like to see this argument polarized. I think we should look at all these sources for their worth and try to concentrate our energies on developing them and using them, particularly the ones that we have directly under our own control.

My final point, Mr President, is that we often talk about the failure of common policies in the European Community and we often talk about why we cannot afford the common policies because they cost too much money. Yet, why is it that the countries of this Community have not taken a common approach towards oil purchases? Immediately oil got scarce we were in disarray. We ran off in all directions, trying to buy from here, there and everywhere and in fact pushed up the price of the oil we have to buy. It would have cost us nothing, it would have saved the peoples of the Community money, if we had adopted a common approach to the oil exporting countries. I hope we can do this in future, because in this way we shall demonstrate that we are a community and that we can act collectively.

President. — I call Mrs Lizin.

Mrs Lizin. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as the last Socialist speaker I should like, on behalf of my Group, to lay special emphasis on one aspect of the conclusions given in Mrs Walz's report, and that is the financial side of the question. This in no way prevents me from sharing Mr Purvis' opinion that this debate is strangely conducted, and an example is the fact that this report puts forward, in a seemingly innocent phrase, an opinion in favour of breeder reactors. I have tabled an amendment on this subject.

Let us, however, keep to the financial side of the question. It seems to us that if we support Mrs Walz's report this decision to choose decentralized methods of energy production must have immediate and large-scale effects in terms of directing the financial resources available and in dividing them up between the various energy sources.

This would require some rearrangement of present practice and regulations. Firstly, Euratom loans, whose size was recently trebled, can no longer be strictly reserved for financing investment in nuclear plant. Those loans should be available for other investments in energy such as the ones put forward in Mrs Walz's report.

Secondly, the budget debate was unsatisfactory because it produced a refusal to make the Ortolí facilities available to investments aimed at energy savings. None the less, we hope that the Commission will very soon present a regulation to make this change in policy possible.

Thirdly, the policies of the European Investment Bank ought to be more closely controlled where energy is concerned. To give an example, in Belgium the Bank's funds have been centred on Dool and Tihange, which goes against one of the Bank's own rules laying down that it can only take part in investments which cannot be financed through the normal capital market. If there is one type of investment which today flouts this criterion then it is definitely investment in nuclear energy. Conversely, the measures recommended in Mrs Walz's report do need financial support and public guarantees.

My fourth and last point is that one change the Commission could undoubtedly make is to make its investment policy subject to specific terms and conditions. For example, it could make financial support in the form of Euratom loans for nuclear facilities dependent upon the observance of the consultation procedure laid down in the Regulation on the siting of nuclear power stations in frontier regions. There is nothing to stop the Commission from doing this without waiting for the Council to amend this Regulation. If this were the case, there would be no money for the EDF power stations at Chooz unless the procedure

laid down in the regulation was followed to the satisfaction of both parties.

Without financial support, Mrs Walz's conclusions in support of soft and renewable energy sources have no real hope of becoming facts. The imbalance between the amount of European money set aside for the nuclear option and the crumbs which are left for other energy sources is quite unacceptable. So, Mr Davignon — because the fact is that once more the Commission is the only interlocutor we have in this debate — in Belgium and elsewhere it has been said that you have an important portfolio and this is certainly the case where energy is concerned, but perhaps you actually lack one responsibility, that is responsibility for coordinating all the financial side of this problem. We in the Socialist Group would like you to set out the broad lines of the action you intend to take in this respect.

President. — I call Mr Herman.

Mr Herman. — (*F*) Mr President, I should like to make four very brief points.

If we want to see progress made in the acceptance by Member States of a better coordinated and more systematic common energy policy than we have at present, then the Commission must respond to a plea I made, which is that the Commission should rapidly make an inventory of all the budget allocations and all the policies which are, at national level, aimed at or set aside for energy policy, and that it should then eliminate any overlaps and calculate the true cost-effect ratio of such policies, in order to show how much the European taxpayer would stand to gain from a better coordinated and more systematic approach to energy policy. In my opinion, a study of this nature would be very convincing.

My second point is that the Commission ought to take rapid steps to standardize the terms of oil supply, in particular where contracts between governments are concerned. At the moment, because of political pressures and depending on how submissive the various governments are towards the oil exporting countries, we are accepting wildly different terms regarding price and supply, which means that the already unstable oil market is becoming more and more difficult to analyse and getting quite out of control. We must, therefore, make an effort to standardize terms of supply.

Thirdly, I should like to support the views of Messrs Galland and Turcat who, you will recall, made several suggestions regarding the pooling of storage capacity in Europe. As you know, because of extremely nationalistic regulations, in particular the ones which allow one State to commandeer stocks which are on its national territory even when such stocks belong to companies from other countries, storage capacity is

Herman

used irrationally from an overall Community viewpoint. This is another piece of work for the Commission.

My fourth and final point is that I should like to see the Commission, which is due to carry out an in-depth reappraisal of the common agricultural policy and also to set up an energy policy, try to unite the two. The fact is — Mr Galland made this clear and Mr d'Ormesson will very shortly be tabling a motion for a resolution along these lines — that we could make Europe's agricultural sector, which is at the moment a large consumer of energy, virtually self-sufficient in energy if we could stimulate and extend investment in methods of producing gas from biomass. Such methods are today quite workable and economically viable, but meet with a whole range of traditional attitudes and difficulties, with a lack of investment and encouragement, even though they could make a substantial contribution not just to reducing our dependence on others for energy, but also to exploiting agricultural produce of which we have a surplus. We could therefore kill two birds with one stone. I think that the Commission has a chance in this matter to take an original and extremely effective step by uniting and harmonizing these two policies to which it should be devoting all its attention.

President. — I call Mr Price.

Mr Price. — Mr President, nowhere in the world is there an energy-importing country which has managed to isolate itself from the economic aftermath of the oil price rises. So clearly we face common problems, and the interplay of demand and supply means that the only way in which we can find a real solution is through common action. If the European Community did not exist, we might now have to invent such an organization. This is a great opportunity to exploit the advantages of our Community.

Furthermore, the problem results from the success of collective action by the oil-producing countries themselves. Our relationship with those countries is at the moment one of competition, and in that competition the negotiating strength is almost all on the other side. Our objective should be to change that relationship to one of cooperation, and I do not believe that that is an impossibility. But we will achieve it only if we can identify the objectives we have in common with the OPEC countries.

The chief one is that we all want to see a reduction in the demand for oil. The producers want to avoid a fast rate of depletion so that they can have this source of wealth for a longer period. We have a similar interest in reducing demand, partly because of the risk that it will not be met, the security of supply aspect, and partly because it forces up the price with all the economic consequences. So having identified a possible common interest what can we do about it?

Well, first of all we must take conservation seriously in Europe and also persuade the United States to do so. If we can cut wastage and find technical ways to use energy more efficiently, we can reduce demand for energy without harming economic growth rates. Secondly, we must develop all the practicable non-oil sources of energy — nuclear, coal, renewable kinds and decentralized forms — as Mr Fuchs and others have pointed out earlier.

Now part of this programme can be achieved by using the same resources differently and better, but much of it can be achieved only by large-scale investment. The focal point of cooperation between the oil consumers and the oil producers should be in the provision of the necessary investment funds. We talk a lot about recycling oil surpluses, but there has been very little action. I believe this is because action has not been focused on a clear common interest. This common interest should now be directed into energy — orientated investment, which would reduce the demand for oil. This would help the consumers both in the industrialized world and in the Third World. It would also help the oil-producing countries.

Europe, particularly after its Middle Eastern peace initiatives, has the political strength to launch a new initiative of this kind. It would need to use, in my view, a world organization such as the World Bank as the forum for both an agreement and for a large part of the work of selecting projects. But it is only if Europe speaks with one voice that we really stand any chance of solving the world's most basic economic problem of the last part of the 20th century.

President. — I call Mr Moreland.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, I should like to congratulate Mrs Walz on her resolution and also the proposers of the Oral Questions with debate, who have raised very pertinent questions.

I want to concentrate on one aspect, namely energy conservation and in particular pricing policy, for I believe there is a specific need for a Community approach to the pricing of energy sources.

All of us know that the United States and Canada have squandered energy resources as a result of low prices for gas, oil and electricity. In this context we should all welcome the speech by the designated American Secretary of Energy, Mr Edwards, on Monday to the Senate Energy Committee in which he advocated deregulation, an increase in nuclear output and an energy conservation policy based on the market place. North America, of course, is highly inefficient relative to Europe and Japan in its use of energy. A fact borne out by statistics.

This situation adds to the pressure on the OPEC countries; it leads to unfair competition in terms of the

Moreland

price of goods from North America, particularly in chemicals and products where energy costs are significant. Consequently I urge the Commission to discuss this subject with the new United States Administration, and indeed also with the Canadian Administration, as soon as possible and perhaps to bring pressure to bear through the Economic Summit in Ottawa.

But North America is not the only squanderer. Energy price must reflect its scarcity. To use the economists' jargon: a selling price must reflect the long-run marginal costs. Does this happen in the Community?

I need only refer to the Dutch gas-for-agriculture case for the answer. Did the Commission act swiftly? The Commission acted like a dancer — slow, slow, slow-slow-slow was the response. I hope the Commission will act a little more swiftly on these issues. If I might appeal to the Dutch presidency: I think it would certainly help their image if they were to take action because there is a growth of ill-feeling towards Holland on this particular issue although of course there is overwhelming goodwill on many other issues.

But there are, of course, other cases: there is wide concern amongst industry in my own country that it pays higher charges than some of its Continental competitors for energy. The problem is not one of standard charges but of charges made for bulk use and for off-peak pricing. This appears to be what happens in certain Member States — for example in West Germany. Indeed, in the past, my own country has not been without sin in this respect.

We know that in 20 years we will have little natural gas in the Community. Is it really desirable to have a situation in which the more you use the less you pay? Does this not encourage waste? Consequently I would suggest that the Commission must work on a common approach to energy pricing. Indeed it is essential for a common market and of course it is essential for energy conservation. I hope that over the period of the coming Commission it will give leadership on this particular issue.

President. — I call Mrs Walz.

Mrs Walz, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, I should like to begin by thanking all the Members who have contributed so expertly to this debate. I think we have discussed all the aspects of soft energies. Despite the fact that the motion for a resolution was approved by twenty-three votes to one in committee, the House is certainly not in agreement on all the aspects and especially the extent to which soft technologies can replace other energy sources. I myself regard them not so much as alternative energy sources — more as additional sources which we urgently need because the energy shortage means that we must utilize every last drop. The first step, though, must be to decide which

of these soft technologies will be of use to us and which will not. I should like to point out to Mr Coppieters that I think I was bang up to date in quoting from 1980 issues of 'Nature' and 'Science'. No more up to date scientific reports are available. The articles in 'Nature' and 'Science' claimed that wind-energy was a highly dubious business, characterized by a high level of investment and inadequate yield. I do not think, Mr Galland, that Germany would be particularly well advised to invest in wind-energy although it does have some coastline. The articles also pointed out — and this is a point I would commend to the attention of all those who rely too heavily on biomass — that in the USA, of all places, government research institutes had come to the conclusion that the repercussions of exploiting biomass were as yet inadequately researched, so that no-one knows how much of the biomass can be used without disrupting the ecological cycle. This is something which must be cleared up at all costs. Of course, as rapporteur, I must take issue at the idea that nuclear energy should be discarded. As I said, the soft technologies are additional sources of energy, but they cannot possibly replace the main sources. We shall see about that at tomorrow's vote. At any rate, I should like to thank all those who have taken part in this debate.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, I should like to speak on two separate subjects. The first is the theme of this debate, that is Mrs Walz's report. The second topic is the Commission's general policy on energy and in this context I shall refer to the questions which have been put, and in particular to the ones put to the Council rather than to the Commission.

Mr President, I should like to state how much we in the Commission appreciate the quality of the text presented by the Committee on Energy and drawn up by Mrs Walz. This is because it places the problem in its true perspective. I have been following all of today's debate attentively and am forced to admit that I was sometimes very surprised to note that some speakers when referring to Mrs Walz's report put forward different arguments from those which are contained in it, and I must say that all these alternative arguments were inferior to those in the report, if I may speak quite frankly in this matter.

It is my belief that this report in fact places the problem in its true perspective. In order to further technological progress, for reasons of security and quite simply in order to obtain energy supplies, we need to look into what can be done in the field of renewable energy sources. Naturally, it is possible that some of these technologies will not be economically viable in Europe but they will be viable in other countries, and

Davignon

by furthering them we can improve the overall energy situation. This is all in Mrs Walz's report and that is why I shall try not to do what I just criticized, that is I shall not put forward arguments which are not in the report, since we in the Commission feel that the views in the report are admirable.

Our problem is to decide what means may be used for incorporating these renewable energy sources into an overall Community approach, since renewable energy, even though not a decisive factor in the short term, will later become indispensable. For the fact is that we cannot do without renewable energy sources. There is a whole series of reasons for this. We must, therefore, incorporate them into the Commission's overall approach to energy, and in this respect I should like to tell Parliament that I am unable at the present time to foresee the broad lines of this approach for the next four years. The new Commission has been in office for less than a week and it would be unreasonable of me at this juncture to paint a broad picture of our policy, as this would surprise my fellow Members of the Commission as much as anyone else, because I have not had a chance to discuss it with them.

However, I can give two undertakings. In the declaration which the Commission's President, Mr Thorn, will deliver in February, we shall make perfectly clear what role energy will play in the political priorities the Commission has set itself for the next four years. I suggest, therefore, if this suits the Chairman of the Committee on Energy, that at its meeting of 29 January, which is still before Mr Thorn makes his speech, we should have an exchange of views on various topics, many of which have been brought up in one way or another today. I think this is the best we can do.

My second promise is that, once the political priorities of the Commission have been mapped out in its overall programme, we shall supplement a document which was drawn up by the old Commission for the Committee on Energy concerning the various approaches to the problem, so as to present a work programme for energy. I also feel that the own-initiative report which the Committee on Energy intends to draw up will enable us to return to Parliament with a broad view of the various problems involved. At such time, Mr President, we will also need the help of the enlarged Bureau.

I should like here to make two procedural remarks. Firstly, I say enough bad things about the Council to be able from time to time to say some good of it. I feel sure that the President of the Council came here today without having as much time as he would have liked to discuss this matter with Parliament, mainly because of his work schedule, because today is not the day on which Parliament normally holds a debate with the Council.

Secondly, I think that it is very difficult in a single debate to have to discuss a specific problem on the basis of a specific text — in this case Mrs Walz's report — and to try at the same time to deal with the huge problem of relations between the Community and the OPEC countries. I should now like to tell Mr Schmid that I will answer all his other questions during the general debate and in Committee. For the moment, I should simply like to tell him that if he thinks that we have no relations with OPEC, then he thinks we are even sillier than we really are . . . here I am speaking for myself, naturally!

(Laughter)

I should like to point out to him that we have even had a trainee from OPEC in the Commission, thus he at least found his way here, even if we are unable to find our way to them. But we will talk about all this and all the other points raised at a later date.

I should like to say to Mr Coppieters, on the subject of nuclear power, that I cannot make a snap statement on breeder reactors and on the role they play within the general framework of nuclear policy. This would not be right.

As for those of you who asked excellent questions, and who would like to have an organized debate which might lead to some conclusions, I think that in order to do this we would once again need the help of the Bureau in order to establish a framework for our discussion. At first sight, it might seem a good idea to deal with all energy problems together, but in fact they are far too varied to be put together in one basket.

I should like to make two more points, this time to Mr Seligman. I did answer questions on oil supplies, albeit somewhat vaguely, in November, because we were on the eve of difficult negotiations. But I am sure you all noted that in the ensuing negotiations for the first time the Community actually adopted a firm stance. We adopted a stance aimed at using our oil stocks in a determined way to prevent prices from soaring. Once we had adopted this stance, we managed to persuade our partners in other industrialized countries, particularly the United States and Japan, to follow suit. I believe, therefore, that we did something useful in this respect.

This, Mr President, is the point we have now reached. I should now like to sum up the feelings of the Commission. We are fully behind Mrs Walz's report. It should not be pushed to one side, and we must think of ways of incorporating it into the general energy debate.

I also noted, Mr Fuchs, your request that, during the debate on the Commission's priorities in energy policy, we should include what I might call the list of topics in last February's resolution, and to look into how the various points made should be inserted.

As for the amendments to Mrs Walz's report, I think I can say that the Commission is in favour of the various amendments, but that there are two on which the Commission has reservations. Firstly, amendment No 3 by Mr Adam, which automatically removes the problem of breeder or high-temperature reactors, simply by excluding them from the report. The Commission has no difficulty in approving Mrs Lizin's amendment, which is less categorical. Parliament will decide. However, Mr Coppieters will not be surprised when I tell him that his amendment to paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution is not in line with Commission thinking.

In conclusion, if Parliament permits, I should like to make two dates with it concerning energy policy. The first is to establish in Committee a specific work programme on the various topics we will have to cover. The other date is of a political nature, for a debate on the energy priorities which the Commission will be presenting to the House in February. Lastly, I must reassure Parliament that this is the last time that my answers to its questions will be this vague.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution and the amendments which have been tabled will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

12. *Verification of credentials*

President. — At its meeting today the Bureau verified the credentials of the 24 Greek Members whose appointment had been announced earlier. Pursuant to Rule 3 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau found that these appointments conformed with the provisions of the Treaty. It therefore asks the House to ratify these appointments.

Since there are no objections, these appointments are ratified.

13. *Prevention of pollution of the sea (continuation)*

President. — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on the reports by Mr Carossino (Doc. 1-708/80), Mrs Maij-Weggen (Docs. 1-709/80 and 1-473/80) and Mrs Spaak (Doc. 1-467/80) on prevention of pollution of the sea.¹

I call Mr Koutsocheras.

Mr Koutsocheras. — (*EL*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have often had occasion to speak in this chamber as a member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe to protest strongly about

pollution of the sea, the effects of which are more serious and more destructive in the seas of my own country because of the passing tankers carrying oil to the industrialized countries.

As I have often said elsewhere, the history of my country, which is surrounded by the sea, lashed by its waves and born along on its breezes, is liquid history. Our Aegean islands and the Aegean civilization are synonymous with the civilization of Greece as a whole. It was from the clear waters of Cyprus that Aphrodite emerged. We Greeks have our roots in the realm of the sea and it is from the sea that we draw our traditions. It is in our seas that we find a refuge for both our minds and our hearts. You will therefore understand what it means for us if the seas of Greece become lifeless. You will understand what an enormous loss we suffer, especially if you remember not only what our seas, our islands and our beaches bring us from tourism but also, since the bottom of the sea is littered with archeological treasures, what we suffer from the point of view of our ancient heritage. Unfortunately the Mediterranean, which has rightly gained the title of the cradle of civilization, is being polluted by the oil carried in tankers on their way to where it is needed in other countries. Large numbers of these tankers pass through the Mediterranean. You may have heard that Pilos too has suffered from oil shipments of this kind to other countries — Pilos, the place with the magnificent harbour whose beauty was sung by Homer.

Apart from these shipments, however, the Mediterranean is also plagued by all the waste carried down to the sea by the rivers in the industrialized countries. This is perhaps much the same situation as that suffered by the Netherlands with the Rhine, which pollutes the sea with waste from the chemical works in Switzerland, the potash works in Alsace, IG Farben in Germany and so many other industries.

The protests of my Dutch colleagues in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe are still fresh in my mind and I am sure they will remember our strong protests at the harm being done to our waters by waste of this kind. In making these brief observations, which I mention only by way of example, I should like to express my profound sympathy with the crews of the ships, with the workers toiling away and with our seamen at the mercy of the waves, who are themselves in no way to blame.

I would ask you to take what I have said as a strong protest at what is happening, not only in the waters of Greece but everywhere, and also as a strong protest marking the need for radical measures to protect our seas from the modern monster called pollution of the environment. I would ask those of you who represent more particularly the industrialized countries which consume large amounts of oil to call for a directive on this question and furthermore to call on your governments to put a stop to this thoughtless mechanism of

¹ See debates of 13 January 1981.

Koutsocheras

pollution, which is fuelled by the insatiable appetite for profit of the monopolies and multinational companies. I should like to remind you in conclusion of a great truth expressed by Jean Paulhan, who said *gagner sa vie c'est quelquefois la perdre*.

President. — I call Mr Katsafados.

Mr Katsafados. — (EL) Mr President; ladies and gentlemen, the problem of protecting the environment, which also covers the more particular problem of the pollution of the sea, is not simply a serious problem, it is a question of life and death. Destroying or damaging the environment means upsetting the conditions for the existence both of man and of all living creatures, with incalculable consequences for all forms of life on our planet. Although this aspect of the problem applies to the whole world, it is of even greater significance for Europe, for it is here that we find the combination of two factors which threaten the environment: the greatest population density and the highest level of technological development. As a new Member of the European Parliament, I am not in a position to know whether and in what way measures have been taken to deal with this problem. I am, however, in a position to know that even if such measures have been taken they have not been effective, and this is a view shared by 400 million Western Europeans whose lives are plagued by this enormous problem.

I am sorry to have to conclude that there has been either a failure to recognize the importance of the problem or a lack of the necessary sense of responsibility on the part of the relevant Community authorities, and this situation can clearly not be allowed to continue. We must call on all those who are in a position to initiate action in the various Community institutions to take immediate and effective steps to tackle this situation. Accordingly, I am glad that the problem of environmental protection, with particular regard to the pollution of the sea, has been made the subject of a debate here in Parliament. It is a cause for regret, however, that we have not faced up to the problem either in all its aspects nor with the necessary impartiality. It has not been tackled in all its aspects because just one aspect, pollution of the sea from ships, has been given particular attention, whereas everyone knows that the main factor contributing to increasing destruction of the sea is the release of industrial waste. According to data from international organizations, it is indisputable that the seas around large cities and large industrial complexes have been turned into lifeless seas. And the reason the problem has not been tackled on an impartial basis is that, contrary to what should have happened, it has been linked with a particular category of ships and shipowners, whereas it is self-evident that all without exception must be subject to the measures which have been taken or will be taken.

Finally, I should like to say how sorry I am that a number of Members have been irresponsible in invoking data to support their views which conflict with official, irrefutable data from international organizations. I do not think, ladies and gentlemen, that this helps to raise the level of debate in this Parliament. In conclusion, I propose that the relevant Community institutions should draw up a programme for the eradication of the sources of environmental pollution within ten years and for the raising of special revenue to be used to help the Member States of the Community in implementing this programme.

President. — I call Mr Narjes.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like first of all to thank the four rapporteurs for their excellent, thorough and constructive reports on the various forms and aspects of hydrocarbon pollution of the sea. I very much hope that these reports and the comprehensive debate we have had in this House — which has provided the Commission with a large number of suggestions for which it is very grateful — will help convince the Council of Ministers of the enormous backlog of decisions, the enormous need for action that has built up in the past few years and of the amount of time that has been wasted. For me personally, one welcome result of the distribution of portfolios in the Commission is the fact that I have been given responsibility for this sector, since for a number of years I held political responsibility for a coastal region on the North Sea. Furthermore — to take a very specific example — I have for years pleaded in the Bundestag for a qualitative jump in improving the mechanical facilities for combating oil pollution by coordinating as far as possible at European level the construction of special ships. The danger of the ecosystem in Europe's coastal waters being irreversibly destroyed for a long time has indeed become so great that I cannot imagine how anyone holding public office in the coastal States could continue to accept responsibility for failing to take the necessary action and thereby contributing to or even accelerating this trend. The Commission therefore regards the measures discussed in this debate as only a first step, as a move to join the struggle against hydrocarbon pollution of the sea, which is a task for the Community. I am particularly pleased that all the Committees involved in this House are agreed on this and that in all quarters approval has been given to this interpretation of the responsibilities. It is not the Commission's intention to seek or encourage overlapping and duplication with international treaties. In our view, however, the Community's policy can and must go beyond the lowest common denominator of possible solutions. This applies in particular when wider international agreements are not sufficiently effective. Still less is it the Commission's intention to stir up inter-portfolio conflicts between, for example, environmen-

Narjes

tal and transport policy. Within the Commission such conflicts are in any case prevented from the start by the collegiate principle reiterated by Mr Thorn and all the Members of the Commission. It must also, however, be recognized that in all the Community institutions conflicts can arise between objectives which can only be resolved rationally and with any chance of lasting success if adequate attention is paid in this dialogue to the arguments for environmental protection and the interests of the environment and if these interests are backed by organizational measures.

I should like to start with two general observations before going on to discuss the three reports. First of all I should like to point out that however good a Community decision or directive is it cannot fulfil its purpose if it is implemented only half-heartedly, too late or not at all, or if infringements do not lead to any perceptible consequences or sanctions on those responsible.

A European environment policy can in the long run be effective only in so far as it proves possible actually to implement its provisions in everyday matters. I should like secondly to say that it will not do that for five or six weeks after each major accident public declarations are made and solemn promises of improvement given which are never, however, followed by concrete decisions. One aim of this policy will have to be to change the attitudes and established procedures of the national bureaucracies, institutions and organizations of all kinds involved by applying the priorities of preventive environmental protection. I should now like to comment on the individual reports.

The Commission, as you know, has for a long time been working on the dangers of serious pollution of the Community's coasts and seas caused by the large releases of oil. This concern was first expressed in a communication to the Council in 1977, following the accident on the Bravo platform in the Ekofisk field. The urgency of far-reaching Community action was then once again brought to the fore by the Amoco Cadiz disaster off Brittany. It was not, however, until April 1978 that the European Council expressed the view that the Community should make the prevention and combating of sea pollution, particularly pollution from hydrocarbons, one of its major objectives. Two months later, in June 1978, the Council adopted, on a proposal from the Commission, an action programme for the monitoring and reduction of oil pollution in the sea. I should like to recall the six headings in this programme.

Firstly, setting up an information system for existing data on means of combating pollution. Secondly, ensuring the availability of essential data on tankers. Thirdly, increasing cooperation between and the effectiveness of emergency teams in the case of an accident. Fourthly, Community participation in the design and construction of clean-up vessels. Fifthly, necessary changes in the legal system regarding cover

for unforeseen pollution risks. Sixthly, research on new measures to combat pollution.

The results of the studies drawn up under this programme have served as the basis for the Commission's proposal for the introduction of a Community information system. This system provides for a permanent inventory of all means for combating pollution in the Member States, details of the properties of hydrocarbons with regard to the suitability of the various means of control and in particular details of the design features of tankers and of past infringements of international regulations.

The Commission has also decided to set up an Advisory Committee on the control and reduction of hydrocarbon pollution in the sea. These two proposals are dealt with in the — as I have already said — excellent report which Mrs Maij-Weggen presented to us on Tuesday. The Commission shares the rapporteur's view that the data fed into the proposed system should be made available to interested non-member countries and in particular to the signatories to the Bonn Agreement on the North Sea and the Barcelona Convention on the Mediterranean. The Commission also agrees that once this system is adopted by the Council non-member countries should participate, on the basis of separate protocols, in implementing it. If these countries are actually to participate in the proposed system it would be only natural for them also to take part in the work of the Advisory Committee I mentioned just now. The Commission accordingly proposes to make appropriate changes in the statutes of the Advisory Committee when the time comes.

I also welcome the rapporteur's proposal to incorporate into the proposed information system the offshore hydrocarbon extraction industry operating in Community waters. I can tell you now that initial contacts have already taken place between the Commission's departments and representatives of the industry.

Mrs Maij-Weggen rightly points out that the Commission proposal is only a first step. As I said at the beginning, other specific proposals for implementing the June 1978 action programme are in preparation.

These further proposals relate specifically to the following points. Firstly, the preparation by the Member States of emergency plans for action against massive pollution; secondly, specifications for the physical and chemical means applied to combat pollution, in order to ensure greater compatibility and make these methods more effective; thirdly, support from the Commission for certain pilot projects, particularly with regard to the training of personnel.

The Commission is also having studies carried out on mechanical means of combating oil pollution, which brings me on to Mrs Spaak's report.

I should firstly like to recall that the Commission has carried out a study on possible Community participa-

Narjes

tion in the design and development of suction recovery vessels. The study showed that views on this solution are still divided. Discussions with experts from the Member States are still in progress and will be continued in the Advisory Committee.

The Commission is also investigating the possibility firstly of Community certification of chemical products and secondly of standardizing mechanical oil control equipment. As soon as the results of these studies are available the Commission will put forward proposals as to how the equipment can be improved and made more effective. The prime aim of these proposals will be to ensure compatibility between mechanical devices and thus enable them to be used in all Member States.

Mrs Spaak also mentioned the problem of research. Here I can confirm that the research work on chemical dispersants under the Second Research Programme is already under way; as for mechanical means of control, these are included in the draft Third Programme, and this is the subject of the report by Mr Alber which we shall be dealing with in a few moments.

I now come to the problem Mr Muntingh raised in his motion for a resolution on marine deposits of oil and gas and the problem dealt with in Mrs Maij-Weggen's report. As the rapporteur rightly said, important work has been done at international level, particularly with regard to civil liability in the event of damage resulting from the extraction and use of mineral resources beneath the sea bed. The Commission is following developments in this field and will not hesitate to draw the necessary conclusions when this work produces a definite result.

The Commission will also endeavour to gather from the relevant international organizations the information the rapporteur asked for and will make this available to the European Parliament as soon as possible. I should also like here to point out that in the various States concerned the industry for prospecting and extracting offshore mineral resources is already subject to strict controls imposed by the governments, whose business it is to license extraction operations.

I should like finally to answer a number of questions raised in the debate relating to ways of reinforcing Community action.

Mr de Lipkowski sketched a positive and ambitious programme. I note three basic points. Firstly the idea of notification to the Commission of infringements committed by merchant ships. Then the suggestion of imposing more severe penalties in certain cases which could be used to set up a fund for areas affected by pollution, and finally the idea of increased Community solidarity.

I intend to put these three basic points to the Advisory Committee as soon as possible so that the Committee can discuss them and advise the Commission.

I can also assure Mr Muntingh that the Commission will be taking steps to protect bird life. Looking beyond this, however, it is my view that we should not draw up a special strategy for birds and one for fishes and one for the purity of the water. I think the overall success of a comprehensive policy will be of benefit to all species on the coast, including man, and the strategy here should be directed at the whole rather than at individual aspects of the ecosystem.

Mr Johnson and Mr Muntingh rightly drew the attention of the House to the need to devote significant amounts of money to preventing pollution of the sea from hydrocarbons. It is a source of regret to the Commission that the 600 000 EUA previously applied for for setting up an information system were not granted. Both speakers rightly regretted the fact that there is no chance of getting funds approved for environmental protection in the 1981 budget. The Commission hopes this debate will help to persuade the Council of Ministers to change its attitude if — as I intend it should be — this request is repeated for the 1982 budget.

The position is equally dismal — if I may put it so bluntly — with regard to staff, i.e. the number of posts on the establishment plan available to deal with environmental measures. This is something we shall have to discuss in greater detail another time.

Mr President, the questions we have discussed in this long debate are all interrelated. I can thus refer back to what my colleague Mr Contogeorgis said here when the first report was being discussed. We are convinced that the effective, coordinated application of international agreements in the Community is also a particularly good means of preventing disasters resulting from the pollution of the sea by hydrocarbons. We must, however, always be in a position to take effective measures if an accident does occur.

As I said before, the proposals under discussion today are a first step. It is now up to the Council to decide on these proposals. The Commission will do all it can to have the Council of Ministers reach a decision without delay. It counts on the European Parliament to give its support with properly publicized initiatives of its own, so that the idea of effective control of pollution in European waters, in the Mediterranean and in northern coastal waters, can finally — backed by broad public consent — be taken a stage further.

President. — I call Mr Collins.

Mr Collins, Chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

— Mr President, I must apologize to you and to the House for not being present earlier. I was speaking to a group of students from the United Kingdom and we were discussing the Community's environmental policy among other things.

May I begin by extending a welcome to the new Commissioner responsible for environmental policy. I hope that the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and the Members of the Parliament will establish a friendly and useful working relationship with him in the coming months and years. May I also acknowledge the role played by the outgoing Commissioner responsible for the environment. Mr Natali was clearly responsible for a fair bit of the work that has gone into producing these reports, and I thank him for this contribution.

This debate has shown that the expression 'oil crisis' has more than one meaning. We are used to describing the energy shortage, cost inflation, political and military conflicts and so on in terms of the oil crisis. But this is another kind of oil crisis that we have been discussing today and on Tuesday: this is the oil crisis which affects the health of the environment, which affects the livelihood of the people who inhabit that environment. I join with my colleagues who spoke earlier — Mr Muntingh and Mr Johnson in particular — who regretted that more funds had not been made available for this kind of undertaking because many of us believe that combating environmental pollution is a field in which the European Community has a very real, positive and helpful part to play if the environment is to be kept fit for human beings and other species to live in.

There are several reports here of course representing a wide spread of political opinion, and I find it remarkable that there has been so much unanimity both in the reports and in the debate. For example, it is now widely accepted by the Parliament and by the Commission that there is a wide disparity of safety standards in tankers and oil platforms and that there is a need for Community action. Only very occasionally do we find people from the left and the right and from several Member States uniting, as in this debate, to declare without any reservations that there is a real problem and that Community action is indeed necessary.

I would point out to the House, and to the Commission too, that some of these reports spring from motions for resolutions which were tabled by Members. They were not prompted by the Council or by proposals from the Commission, they came from Members of this House; and this shows a clear willingness on the part of Parliament to act as spokesman for public opinion, which occasionally finds it difficult to make its voice heard in some fields of political activity in the European Community. I find this entirely satisfactory, because if this Parliament has a role, then it is to express the public opinion of Europe.

I was conscious during part of the debate that one or two of our newer colleagues seemed to feel that some mileage was being made of their particular situation. If there are any Greek colleagues in the Chamber at this moment, I should like to reassure them that it was not in the mind of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, nor, I think, of the Committee on Transport and certainly not of the Commission, I am sure, that the Greeks were here during this debate to be used as a whipping-boy. We look forward to hearing their contributions in future debates on the environment.

Both the causes and the results of pollution are fairly well known and have been fairly well dealt with in this debate, and I do not think I need go over the ground again. Several speakers have mentioned that 35 000 birds were killed as a result of the recent accident in the North Sea; others have gone over the ground of *Bravo* and *Amoco Cadiz*; I would go even further back to accidents like the *Torrey Canyon*. These have an irrevocable effect on wildlife — not only the higher forms of wildlife but also right down to plankton — and I am very happy to hear that research is going on, that the Commission intend to continue devoting attention to this problem. I am cynical enough to believe that some of the work which is being done has nothing at all to do with the effect on wildlife but rather has a great deal to do with the fact that job loss is pretty central to this whole question. None the less, I accept that a global approach is likely to achieve satisfactory results, and I welcome the Commission's statement on this point.

So far as we are concerned, our demands can be put very simply, and they are that Member States must ratify *and implement* existing agreements. Economic death and ecological death are important matters, and therefore pious hopes are not enough. We must take these matters seriously, we must implement them, enforce them. I think, too, that action must be taken at European level and that standards must apply, for example, to all vessels using Community ports and not just to Community vessels. We must go further than that and cooperate with non-member States. We must cooperate with the Norwegians. We must cooperate with those States which lie just outside the Community but whose activities and whose environment clearly impinge on the European Community.

We need a satisfactory information base, and the information must be accessible. We need continued research into the methods of dealing with oil pollution, the effects of oil pollution as well. For example, I must say that I personally still have some doubts about the efficacy of some of the mechanical methods. I am not convinced, for example, that these really cope with the very large waves which occur in the North Sea. Nor do I believe that we can entirely free the oil companies from responsibility or even blame for this state of affairs: we have got to draw them into our research

Narjes

and even into the way we go about dealing with these problems.

I think this debate has resulted from a great deal of painstaking work on the part of several committees and the Commission. Apart from the Committee on Transport and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, the Committees on Budgets and Agriculture have also been involved, and some of the opinions given by these committees have been of a very high quality. In particular, I refer to the one by Miss Quin from the Committee on Agriculture. I think this is a very useful document and one which should be studied very carefully.

When Members come to vote on this tomorrow — and I must say I regret that it will be tomorrow — all I ask is this: that they will set aside the pettier feelings of national pride and narrow interest and recognize the wider importance of the economic and ecological health of this planet and of Europe in particular.

Finally, having listened to this debate and read those parts of the debate that I have been unable to listen to, I would say that the European Parliament has made its views very clear. I welcome the views of the Commission today as an expression of greater or lesser agreement with the Parliament. But we must recognize that in this Community at this time, if we are to have executive action, then that action must come from the Council; and I hope that this time, having listened to these views expressed very strongly and clearly by Members of this Parliament and by members of the Commission, the Council, collectively and individually, will take note and that we shall at last see action to protect our environment for the future.

President. — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen.

Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President first of all I would like to thank all the Honourable Members, especially our Greek friends, for their useful contributions to this debate. The most important part of the debate was on Tuesday. This is just the tail end of it. I think we would all agree that tremendous interest has been shown in this debate, and that we have been very much united in our views. I hope that the Commission and the Council will bear this in mind.

There is just one more point that I want to make clear, which is why I am taking this opportunity to speak again. Various speakers, including myself and Mr Collins, just a moment ago, have insisted that it is of the utmost importance that the treaties concerning the safety of shipping are ratified as quickly as possible by the Member States. At the recent Ministerial Conference in December, the Dutch chairman promised that a conference would be convened of all ten EEC Member States and four other countries involved,

above all to make sure that the most important treaties — the SOLAS Convention, the MARPOL Convention, the ILO Convention and the STCW Convention — are ratified by 1982. Mr President, I believe that this an important initiative, because I think that it will serve to spur the Council into adopting the proposals which have been put forward. I would emphasize that the Commission has a part to play in furthering the work of this conference. I must also emphasize that we intend to hold the Dutch presidency to this promise, and that this is not the last time the matter will be raised. This is what I wanted to add to this debate and once again, Mr President, I am particularly grateful that it has been held in such a good atmosphere and has been so well conducted.

President. — The joint debate is closed. The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

14. *Research and development programme in the field of environment*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. - 1-660/80), drawn up by Mr Alber on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the

proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. - 1-330/80) for a decision adopting a sectoral research and development programme in the field of environment (environmental protection and climatology) (indirect and concerted actions).

I call Mr Alber.

Mr Alber, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report I have the honour to present and introduce today is concerned with the establishment of a sectoral research and development programme in the field of the environment, with special reference to environmental protection and climatology. What we are dealing with here is the extension up to 1985 of the research programmes which began as long ago as 1973 and the extension of the research programme on environmental protection which expired at the end of 1980. At the same time, we are concerned with the consolidation of current research programmes, in other words, with the concentration and coordination and incorporation of these programmes into a suitable multi-annual framework. Finally, we are concerned with the provision of suitable financing arrangements, estimated at 43 million EUA for environmental protection and 8 million EUA for climatology. These are estimated costs. The Committee on Budgets is prepared to support the proposal, albeit stressing the purely indicative nature of these figures. The committee's chair-

Alber

man, Mr Lange, has empowered me to make this point on his behalf to save time.

The research programmes cover research agreements concluded with organizations in the Member States — known as 'indirect actions' —, the coordination of individual Member States' programmes — known as 'concerted actions' — and research carried out in the Joint Research Centre. Bearing in mind the doubtless correct principle that it is better to prevent environmental damage in the first place than to put it right after the event, the programme concentrates on research into new 'cleaner' technologies, especially those which produce less waste and consume less in the way of natural resources. It is also concerned with waste management, waste disposal problems and ways of effecting savings in energy and raw materials as well as research into noxious substances — in particular lead and cadmium —, noxious organic micro-organisms and the increase in the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. It goes without saying that, in view of the importance of these issues, the Committee fully supports the report. I would therefore ask the House for its support too, although what we really need is for these programmes to be intensified and their scope widened.

Allow me just to go into a few detailed points. We very much welcome the research in the environmental field. Appropriate legislation can be passed only on the basis of adequate knowledge of the facts. But in view of the lack of time and the limited financial resources available, it is right to concentrate the research effort on those fields which are important to the Community. There is in existence a research programme dealing with the effects of noise on people's well-being and efficiency. This kind of research may be interesting in itself, but we do not need any research to tell us that noise is disruptive and damaging. Even if there were no negative effects, it would be nice to reduce the level of noise. In the field of climatology, there is a programme aimed at reconstructing earlier climatological conditions. This too may well be interesting in itself, but its importance is debatable. I do not believe that research should be allowed to become an end in itself.

In view of the shortage of funds, it is therefore more sensible to concentrate on important fields. Another part of the programme is concerned with establishing the link between the pollution of water by polychlorinated diphenyls and the death of seals. I have no doubt that this too is important, but unfortunately, if research goes on for much longer, there may be no seals left in the Wattenmeer. A more sensible move, then, would be to find a replacement for these substances before the event. We therefore feel that direct actions undertaken without any further delay would be more effective than long-term research. At any rate, all the research programmes must be speeded up so that subsequent direct actions will be effective. That is why we propose that Article 3 be amended, and why

we recommend that the programme be reviewed after two rather than three years. We should also like to see the European Parliament more closely involved in the review procedure.

One extremely important point — and one which goes far beyond the scope of the current research programmes — is the need for intensive coordination of national and private environmental research activities, not only as a means of saving substantial time and money. All the isolated work that goes on is a waste of intellectual effort. This is true of research work in universities as well as in industry. This point would be debatable if all we were concerned with was industrial processes or material interests; to take an example, the development of alternative energy sources or clean technologies is something which concerns all of us. We all need the results of this research in the near future. It seems to me that, if there is such a thing as the social obligations of material wealth, there must also be such a thing as the social obligations of intellectual wealth or knowledge, disregarding the legal aspects of ownership. This would have repercussions not only on the exploitation and application of inventions; it would also mean that research findings would have to be made generally known rather than kept hidden away, jealously guarded, in a back-room. This would have an effect on what research was done, and how it was done.

I would stress the social aspect of research in this field, and I believe that we need fresh ideas in this respect. At any rate, I believe there is no getting away from the need for concentration and better coordination of national environmental research activities. The same applies to the need for priorities and decisions on where the research should be carried out. Environmental protection and environmental policy are not matters limited to their narrow subject field. Environment policy is something which concerns all of us and which affects all sectors. The research programme this report is concerned with is therefore no more than part of an important whole. I hope that this House will continue to cooperate effectively with the Commission and especially with Mr Narjes — and I am pleased that he has been made responsible for this subject field — in completing this edifice, which is so important to all our futures.

IN THE CHAIR: MR POUL MØLLER

Vice-President

President. — I call Mrs Schleicher to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mrs Schleicher. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as always when a new programme is

Schleicher

presented, the thought occurs as to whether it is really necessary, because as we all know, there are many programmes of this kind and of course they all cost a great deal of money. On the other hand, there is increasing awareness in our countries of the whole problem of environmental pollution. There is a very real fear among the public at large that the natural environment could be deprived of its regulating function and that the resultant damage could be irreparable. The lack of information and the lack of clarity as to current developments generates fear in the public at large and leads to the rejection of politically essential decisions. It is also a fact that there are substantial gaps in our knowledge of, and research on, the resilience of whole ecosystems and the long-term effects of certain factors.

I expect this Commission proposal to fill the existing gaps — no more and no less. I would therefore call on the Commission to ensure, when putting the programme into effect, that there is no duplication of effort and that the various programmes are constantly coordinated, as Mr Alber mentioned just now. The point is, after all, that we should do everything in our power to investigate the really important things and concentrate on these particular points.

The programme should be checked again and again during its life to make sure that the criteria I mentioned just now are — as I hope — being properly applied. The Group of the European People's Party is in full agreement with this report, and we hope that it will soon be put into practice.

President. — I call Mrs Pruvot to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs Pruvot. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Liberal and Democratic Group also fully supports Mr Alber's report. We approve of priority being given to scientific and technical research into climatology and the environment. This research is clearly absolutely vital to all the projects concerned with the prevention of environmental damage and the replacement of environmental nuisances by solutions which do not involve pollution. We therefore advocate that the programmes now in progress be continued. If we are ever to be successful in our aim of preventing pollution, it is vital that we be aware of the factors which are adversely affecting the quality of our natural environment and the conservation of the world we live in. We are of course delighted at the grouping together of various existing research programmes, but this must go hand in hand with more effective coordination of national programmes. Environmental policy must be one of the Community's priority areas. All the Member States must play their part if we are to avoid discrimination and if we are to protect our environment from serious damage. It is therefore vital that research be concentrated on those areas which are important from the point of view of the Community.

Likewise, long-term research must be harmonized by the Member States. We can therefore only encourage the Commission to persevere with its efforts and to make the ongoing environmental protection effort more effective. Environmental policy is increasingly concentrating on the prevention of pollution by protecting water, air and land. It would be unfortunate if this new trend were to be denied its full measure of importance.

President. — I call Mr Narjes.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, let me begin by addressing a word of thanks to the rapporteur for his report. It seems to me that the brevity of this debate has a lot to do with the quality of the report, which was so brief and prepared so thoroughly that it could be accepted without comment.

The Commission proposal which is the subject of this report concerns a research programme in the field of the environment. This is an area of pre-eminent importance for the Community research effort. I should like to remind you that this fact was acknowledged by the European Parliament and by the Council at its 619th meeting on 20 December 1979. The programme itself has two aims. The first of these is to obtain the scientific and technical knowledge to implement a joint environmental policy, and the second is to coordinate national research programmes on the environment. The Commission is using Article 235 of the EEC Treaty to extend the research work carried out so far in the wide-ranging field of the environment. At the same time, the plan is to group ongoing programmes together in a single sectoral programme so as to rationalize the research effort and make it easier to keep track of work carried on in the Community over recent years. The proposed sectoral programme comprises two sub-programmes, the first of which is concerned with environmental protection and the second with climatology. This second programme was approved by the Council on 8 December 1979. I shall therefore restrict my remarks here to the sub-programme dealing with environmental protection. This is an extension of work going back over several years and which has come up with a number of important findings of great interest as regards the Community's environmental policy and which have been published in a large number of journals. This work, supported by financial aid from the Community, has made it possible to improve coordination of national programmes and thus to render more effective the overall effort in the environmental field. Several hundred research agreements have been concluded, and more than a thousand national projects are currently being coordinated by way of 'concerted actions', with even third countries being involved by dint of COST. It is important that these efforts be continued and the scientific framework thus

Narjes

brought into line with the need for environmental research.

Whereas the main emphasis was placed initially on environmental pollution — its incidence, its effects and the means of reducing it — increasing importance is now being attached to the prevention of pollution, in particular by the introduction of low-emission technologies producing less waste and less pollution. There is also more interest in protecting the natural environment, conserving fauna and flora and improving living conditions, which are affected not only by environmental pollution but also by the sum total of ecological variables. As regards environmental pollution in the narrower sense of the word, there is a continuing need for intensive research into the classic pollutants like lead and cadmium. There is also increasing concern about the effects of chronic exposure to organic pollutants. This is true both of the problems caused by various sources of pollution and the 'invisible' effects of atmospheric pollution on crops. The question of the safety of old or new chemical substances has, in recent times, led to increasing public concern, and the same goes for the dangers of contamination as a result of accidents in factories — as in Seveso — or with tankers, as in the case of the *Amoco Cadiz* and *Bravo* accidents mentioned earlier. Finally, the high level of carbon dioxide in the air has become a global problem of considerable importance. I am sure that this House will be called upon to discuss this specific problem more often in the future. The new Community research and development programmes must cover all these aspects since their scope extends to short-term applied research and the strategic, long-term solution of ecological problems. The Commission proposes that 43 million EUA be allocated to the sub-programme on environmental protection. Bearing in mind the research needs discussed earlier, five areas of research have been identified. The first of these concerns the sources, processes and effects of pollutants. This area covers work on the effects of pollutants on human beings and the environment, the identification of sources of emission and the extent of pollution in the environment. The Commission proposes that roughly half the total resources be allocated to this area of research.

Secondly, the scope of the area of research dealing with the reduction and prevention of environmental pollution has been considerably extended compared with the previous research programme on environmental protection. In addition to the classic means of reducing the level of pollution of water, air and land, the Commission has incorporated research on low-emission technologies, something I mentioned earlier.

Thirdly, the area of research concerned with the protection, conservation and management of the natural environment is largely concerned with natural ecosystems and the ways in which man interferes with them. The proposed research covers investigation of

these ecosystems and the repercussions of human activities, including modern agricultural methods. The central element here will be sensitive ecosystems and the protection of endangered species. The Commission proposes to devote between 15 and 20% of the total amount requested to this sector.

Fourthly, we have the field of environmental information management, which is concerned in particular with the establishment of a data bank for environmental chemicals, to be set up in conjunction with the Joint Research Centre. This will take up between 5 and 20% of the money available for the programme.

Fifthly and finally, there is the question of overall inter-relations between man and his environment. This is a new field, the first stage being to establish a methodology for dealing with the whole problem of the complex inter-relations between man and his environment. Our main concern here is to investigate the effects of environmental disturbances due to natural causes or to man on human health in the widest sense of the world. To begin with, a maximum of 5% of the available resources will be committed to this field of research. As regards the implementation of the programme, the idea is to improve the coordination of research financed at national level as well as financing Community research agreements. A million units of account have been set aside for the continuation of several concerted actions which are already in progress within the framework of COST, involving third countries.

Additional concerted actions will be initiated during the life of the programme, and special efforts will be made to facilitate cooperation with third countries in general. The Commission wholeheartedly supports the report drawn up by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection which — I believe — is to be voted on in this House tomorrow. I have already made the point that the aim of environmental protection must be increasingly shifted from repairing the damage done to preventing such damage in the first place and conserving the flora and fauna and man's natural environment. I believe that the programme you have before you now is very much along these lines.

I have only one brief comment to add on the proposed amendment to the Commission's proposal. The period of three years was proposed by us for very practical reasons because a two-year period would mean that we would already have to start discussing the continuation of the programme in the second year when, at best, we would have only statistical material and the results from the first year. If you take three-year periods, you have at least two years' experience behind you and you can then talk about the continuation of the programme in the third year. That is why we proposed the period of three years in Article 3, so that the next review could be prepared on a reliable basis in the best interests of environmental protection worthy

Narjes

of the name. We believe there is a lot to be said for the Commission proposal on this point. Otherwise, I would thank you for your report and for the support you have given to the Commission's work.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

15. *Directives on maximum levels for pesticide residues*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-729/80), drawn up by Mr Combe on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the

proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-806/79) for

- I — a directive on the fixing of maximum levels for pesticide residues in and on cereals intended for human consumption
- II — a directive on the fixing of maximum levels for pesticide residues in and on foodstuffs of animal origin.

I call Mr Combe.

Mr Combe, rapporteur. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we all know that the protection of crops is one of the factors in modern agriculture which make it possible to increase yields, improve the quality of food produce, and thereby encourage trade. The high yields of the industrialized countries where agriculture is intensive — which account for 40% of world wheat crops on 28% of the total land area used for wheat growing, and 59% of the maize crops on 34% of the land used for growing maize — have been obtained over the last 30 years only by the combined application of new agricultural techniques. I would mention in particular the growing use of chemical fertilizers, the simultaneous use of plant health products designed to protect the single-crop fields and orchards, better supplies of water for irrigation, and the creation, by crossing or genetic research, of high-yield varieties and strains which are more resistant to pests.

The result of this regular growth in agricultural yields is that the markets of the West are now regularly supplied with healthy produce of high nutritional value at all times of the year. Had it happened a century ago, the drought of summer 1976 would have killed tens of thousands of people in France and other European countries. Let us remember — and this does not go back to the dawn of time — that in the 19th century alone the years 1812, 1815, 1847, 1854 and 1862 were synonymous with agricultural disasters and famine. The depredations of insects and infestation

with weeds and diseases combined to aggravate the then endemic scourges, food poisoning and nutritional imbalance. Meat was a rare commodity and fruit remained a luxury until the end of the 19th century.

When the fight against parasites is discussed, people tend rather too often to think only of chemical means. That is totally misguided, for there are other equally important means, but in many cases chemicals have become a necessary supplement which we should know how to use discerningly. To that end, one must first and foremost know which pests attack particular crops, and the risks which they entail for the plants. It is equally essential to inform oneself about the nature of a pesticide and the rules governing its use in order to avoid damaging one's own crop, that of one's neighbours, and the human beings and animals who are the final consumers of the harvested produce, and also in order to protect the environment and obtain maximum effectiveness from the treatment. Plant health treatment must be carefully thought out and prepared, and carried out only when necessary. In this respect, any user of pesticides should be extremely careful about two essential points — respect for the recommended dosage, and respect for the times of application. It is a matter for satisfaction that there exists a Commission proposal for directives on the fixing of maximum levels for the most harmful and persistent pesticide residues in and on cereals and in foodstuffs of animal origin for human consumption. It is important to take such measures, since human health can be threatened if maximum levels are not fixed for these residues. It must be pointed out that the proposed directives relate to the level of pesticide residues at the moment when the cereals and the foodstuffs of animal origin come into circulation, i.e. when they are made available for human consumption. It must also be pointed out that the maximum levels for pesticide residues stipulated are extremely low.

Our committee has, I think responsibly, examined the content of this proposal for directives and has proposed some amendments which seemed to it essential in view of the criteria which it follows — protection of the environment, of public health and of the consumer.

That is why, Mr President, I am convinced that Parliament will adopt this report, which represents the unanimous position of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. I would like to add that this report could be improved by some amendments. I am thinking particularly of Amendment No 1 by our colleague Mr Sherlock, which would indeed complement the existing report very well. With regard to the two other amendments which relate to the problem of the beta isomer, the rapporteur cannot accept Amendment No 3 by Mrs Martin, since it was rejected in committee. However, I think that Mr Delatte's amendment could be accepted. We would then have a report which would make it possible to have very useful directives on a very important

Combe

problem affecting the public health of Europeans in general.

President. — I call Mrs Cresson to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Cresson. — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report which has just been presented to us is an interesting one which provides a good deal of technical information.

For my part, I would like to approach the question from a slightly different angle. Pesticide residues in cereals also create economic problems and, I would even say, problems of choice of social models. Indeed, you must still remember what happened recently — I refer to protests by consumers over the problem of 'hormone-ridden veal', to use a rather telegraphic style. We shall encounter this type of protest more and more when the consumer is offered products which would in some way be harmful to public health. Allow me to tell you that farmers — particularly French farmers — care about public health, and they also wish to contribute to it. They wish to supply quality produce. In order to do so they have to live. Just as stock-breeders are governed by the whole of the food production system of which they are prisoners — and particularly by all the industries on which they depend — they are led to produce commodities which are not always what we would like them to be. Pesticide residues in cereals pose exactly the same problem. In these circumstances I would like to draw your attention to one fact — that the income of French farmers has been dropping for six or seven years and that it is particularly low this year, particularly in view of the rate of inflation. We can always hope that technical measures may be taken — and they are desirable — to reduce the amounts of pesticides and other chemical products which may be found in cereals or other agricultural products. However, the real solution requires the problem also to be tackled in terms of agricultural policy. Farmers wish to supply quality produce, and they also want to be able to make a living. They are not asking for alms — such as they receive in my country on the eve of elections. They are asking to be paid according to the work which they do. And so that they may be paid, it is necessary that the agricultural prices fixed for them by the common agricultural policy should in effect no longer be indicative prices but firm prices, so that they know where they stand. Since one cannot subsidize a whole profession by firm prices — when some farmers produce very large quantities — and if one wants quality to be maintained by the small and medium producers as well, it is essential that these firm prices should be slightly degressive, since it is necessary to have sizeable stocks and since it is wrong to say that the Community has a real surplus of cereal products. It is necessary to have surpluses if one wants to be able to export, and if one wants to introduce a common trading policy for agricultural products.

Pricing policy must therefore be revised in the context of the common agricultural policy. Account must be taken of production costs, and the prices must no longer be indicative, but firm. If these conditions are met, ladies and gentlemen, there will be high-quality production by small and medium-scale farmers as well as by large-scale farmers. I would stress this point. I hope that in the very interesting study carried out by the relevant committee on the problems of pesticide residues, which relates to a recent debate as well as to other debates which we shall no doubt have in the future, Parliament will take into account the problem of agricultural incomes.

President. — I call Mrs Lentz-Cornette to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mrs Lentz-Cornette. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the EPP Group, I would like first of all to congratulate Mr Combe on his precise, clear and succinct written and oral report on the two directives in question.

The two directives are concerned with fixing the maximum levels for the most harmful and persistent pesticide residues found at present in agriculture and stock-breeding. Pesticides are substances used to fight all kinds of parasites which are harmful to plants and animals. At the present stage of our knowledge, this is the only way of guaranteeing harvests and increasing plant and animal productivity.

A total ban on all pesticides, as dreamt of by consumers in certain countries — and no doubt by some Members of this Parliament — would in a short time bring about, even in the countries with intensive agriculture, famines like those which were endemic in past centuries, in a Europe with a much lower population than today's — as Mr Combe said.

Even today, depending on the crops and region of the world — and in spite of the moderate use of pesticides — between a quarter and a third of the harvests are lost to parasites. It has been shown in the United States that a ban on the use of pesticides would lead to a drop in yield of about 50% for wheat and potatoes and of about 25% for meat and milk. This partly explains the increasingly urgent need for anti-parasite products in order more or less to ensure food supplies for the world population. Before the 1950s, it was expected that all problems arising from plant diseases, harmful insects and weeds could be overcome by the use of increasingly effective organic pesticides. Since then it has been realized that their use led to very serious disadvantages — the appearance of insect species resistant to insecticides, risks of pollution of the natural environment — air, water and soil — the accumulation of large quantities of pesticides in plants and in the organs of animals, and a certain degree of

Lentz-Cornette

toxicity to animals and human beings. This last point reminds me of Paracelsus, who stated in the 16th century: 'Everything is poison, nothing is poison — only the dose makes a poison'.

With regard to the first directive, dealing with residues in edible cereals — wheat, rye, oats, rice, etc. — these can arise from two stages of the treatment — firstly from the treatment of the plant, with the residues diminishing during growth as a result of rain and general weather conditions so that the amount left is minimal or virtually nil, and secondly from treatment during storage and transport.

Most of the residues covered by these directives arise from treatment after growth has ended. Very considerable attention must be paid to the atmospheric and hygienic conditions during storage and transport. This would enable one to avoid the treatment of grain pesticides as far as possible.

It is natural that the cereals which we import into the Community (in small quantities) should be subject to the same regulations as those which circulate within Community territory. With regard to cereals which are exported, particularly to hot and humid regions, I agree with our colleague Mr Sherlock when he stresses the need to distinguish between the pesticide level at the time of marketing and the level at the time of consumption of the grain. It is particularly when we export cereals to the Third World countries that weeks or even months may pass before the grain arrives at its destination and is consumed. So we have to choose — either we fix at the outset maximum levels for residues, which would be the same as for European countries — and we then run the risk of the grain being destroyed by parasites and climatic conditions during transport or in the hot countries themselves — or we tolerate values higher than those laid down in the directive so that the grain arrives at its destination in good condition. If the latter course is chosen, one must be careful to use pesticides of lower toxicity which gradually decompose. The time-limits and the levels corresponding to those limits must be indicated on the packaging and if possible checked on the spot. We would then be choosing the lesser evil, since the greater evil for these countries is famine.

We must also remember that hardly anywhere are cereals consumed raw, for they are transformed by processes of fermentation and cooking for quite a long time and at quite high temperatures. Since the levels fixed are relatively low, we are justified in thinking that the absorption of pesticide residues is minimal or even nil.

With regard to the second directive, relating to residues in and on foodstuffs of animal origin, it is necessary to make some comments. The non-biodegradable pesticides used for their prolonged effect on parasites — particularly because they are insoluble in water but soluble in fats — leave more or less sizeable residues in

plants, the organs of animals and eventually those of human beings. These residues accumulate if ingestion is repeated. It is a question particularly of organic chlorine compounds. If the animal which is the primary consumer becomes the prey of another, the process is repeated with a higher level of absorption. When the food chain is an extended one, there is concentration at each stage. This is true for domestic and wild animals living in a biotope treated with the pesticides concerned. The concentration of residues becomes very substantial in aquatic fauna. That is why I wish to see fish and other marine creatures included in Annex I to the second directive, unless they are regarded as covered by the overall heading ex 02.04 'other meat and edible meat offals'.

Whereas cereals are nearly always consumed in the cooked state, the situation is different for meat, but above all for milk, cheeses and eggs which are often consumed in the raw state. This is a reason for dealing with these foodstuffs in a separate directive and devoting to them very special care. When one hears mention of substances such as pesticides, hormones, estrogens, antibiotics, colouring agents and others which may be found in isolation or together in meats, one ends by wondering what the real cost, real colour and above all the nutritional value of such meats is.

For both the first and the second directives, it is necessary to implement as soon as possible the measures for sampling and the means of Community analysis. Article 7 of the two directives envisages that in certain conditions urgent measures would be taken in the light of new scientific knowledge. We, the members of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, understand this, but we would like to know about further developments in this matter.

I shall conclude these remarks, ladies and gentlemen, by expressing my belief that these directives must be implemented from 1 July 1981 and that they will guarantee adequate protection of consumers in the Community and third countries.

President. — I call Mr Sherlock to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Sherlock. — Mr President, believe it or not I have 15 seconds in which I congratulate Mr Combe on his customary thoughtfulness and admirable presentation, present formally my amendment and note that there are two ways of approaching this, each of which is equally implemented, and equally effective in the Community at the present time. I happen to prefer the one not used in this directive but it will still command a very great deal of my support.

(Laughter)

President. — I call Mr Newton Dunn to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Newton Dunn. — Mr President, I have fractionally more seconds than my colleague Dr Sherlock. I shall therefore be very blunt indeed.

I find this proposal from the Commission a very bad one and I am asking my colleagues in this group to vote against it. The reasons are very simple indeed. I want to quote a couple of facts. First of all I quote from the annual report of the UK laboratory of the government chemist — a government testing organization. 'Comparisons with similar studies carried out in other EEC countries show that the pesticide residues in human fat in the United Kingdom are among the lowest in Europe.'

That is fact number one. The UK is very low in pesticide residues. The consequence of this proposal from the Commission would be to vastly increase the amount of supervision and sampling that would be necessary in the United Kingdom and therefore to raise the cost. However, since the UK is already at the bottom of the league for residues there would be no benefit. Therefore, there is no possible benefit to the United Kingdom in accepting such a proposal.

Mr President, directives should lay down only the broad objectives for protection of consumers, not the detail, and Member States should be left free to choose, as my colleague Dr Sherlock hinted, their own methods for implementing the objective in detail. That is why I consider this a very bad proposal from the Commission and will be asking my colleagues to vote against it.

President. — I call Mr Narjes.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is not without a certain emotion that I take the floor to speak on this report on behalf of the Commission, as this subject was the responsibility of our late colleague Mr Gundelach. The last time but one that I spoke to him he asked to take over this dossier and transmit to you — to the members of the Committee and to the rapporteur — his special congratulations on the report and the proposals put forward. I do so now, as I said, in memory of an outstanding colleague.

On the matter in hand I should like to say this. Although the use of pesticides in modern agriculture is of decisive importance to protect crops from the ravages of pests and weeds, the residues remaining in foodstuffs are not without danger for human health.

Most Member States have therefore introduced regulations on the maximum permissible levels for these

pesticide residues. These regulations vary, however, and constitute trade barriers within the Community for the product concerned. Community regulations on pesticide residues in foods and feedingstuffs are therefore justified by the need to safeguard the internal market, to provide the consumer with adequate protection against the dangers caused by residues and to harmonize the national regulations already adopted in this field. They thus constitute a substantial contribution not only to the Community programme for approximating legal provisions in the field of agriculture but also to our environmental and consumer protection policies.

The present proposals cover pesticide residues in cereals and products of animal origin. They supplement previous Commission proposals for fruit and vegetables and for feedingstuffs. It was suggested in the debate that similar directives should be issued as soon as possible for fish. On this point I have a note here to the effect that there is at present no sufficiently reliable scientific basis for a corresponding directive on fish.

On the proposals themselves I have two general comments. Firstly, it should be pointed out that these proposals aim at a system of complete conformity, in other words the establishment of common maximum values to be monitored officially in each Member State at least on a sample basis.

Although the earlier proposal I mentioned for fruit and vegetables was subsequently modified by the Council to provide for only partial harmonization, the Commission sticks to the view that laying down a uniform Community system in this field offers more effective consumer protection and also avoids the difficulties in intra-Community trade which would result from partial harmonization. At this point I should like to comment on a remark made by the last speaker. Even if the available scientific findings do vary from one Member State to another, as far as I can see from the dossier the view of the British organization he mentioned is not shared throughout the Community. All our proposals have been discussed with the relevant Scientific Advisory Committee and reflect its views, and we have no knowledge of a dissenting opinion on the part of the British members. But even if this were the case, the interests of uniform trade conditions, accepted trade practice and the single internal market, together with the need to eliminate internal protectionism, mean that here too, despite differing views, we must arrive at harmonized measures, and it would be wrong to remain aloof from the Community on grounds of sectional market interests.

As to the change in Article 9 contained in your detailed proposals, I am sorry to say the Commission cannot agree to the deletion of this article. Our view is that it is basically up to the importing country to decide itself on its own conditions for trade in the

Narjes

products offered. Many third countries already have their own regulations on maximum levels for pesticide residues and we should take account to the fact that there may be sound, objective reasons why in certain circumstances these requirements differ from Community regulations. We should not force our own regulations on them, but deleting this article would be tantamount to trying to do so.

Such a step could cause irritation and would subject Community exporters from the start to less favourable conditions than their international competitors who are able to take account of third-country requirements. However, I appreciate the concern expressed in the report with regard to consumer protection in third countries, particularly in countries where there is as yet no adequate control. In the Commission's view this problem can best be solved by an international agreement, and we have been taking an active part in the work on drawing up a code of conduct for international trade in foodstuffs under the ILO and WHO food standards programme. The final version of this code is expected to be published shortly. The Commission will then consider what measures need to be taken at Community level. With this reservation, the Commission will be glad to see Parliament adopt this resolution, which it would regard as an incentive to continue its own efforts in this field. If I may, I should like to add just three comments on the amendments. On Amendment No 1 I must express some reservation on the part of the Commission. This proposal should be looked at again more closely. The proposed monitoring system is foreign to the regulatory mechanism envisaged in the Community directive and represents an additional check. That could lead to duplication, and this arrangement would only be justified if the additional check also gave additional protection, in other words if elements were being monitored which would not be covered by the systematic procedure provided for in the directive, i.e. the testing of maximum levels.

As regards Amendment No 2, I must also express a reservation. At present I have no scientific basis for the new value of 0.1% proposed for Annex II. The Commission was advised by the Scientific Advisory Committee for pest control, which was unanimous in proposing the value given in Annex II. I cannot see any way to change this value here without sufficient evidence. As regards Amendment No 3, I support the rapporteur's proposal not to accept it.

President. — I call Mr Combe.

Mr Combe, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, after listening to Mrs Cresson's speech, I must say on behalf of all the members of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection that we, too, thought about agricultural incomes. The very fact of trying to regulate the pesticides necessary to

agriculture — without going to extremes, but correctly — in the interests of the consumer proves that all the committee members, whatever their political party, were pursuing the same aim. But since their primary task is to protect health and defend the consumer, it was in that context that all of us worked. I simply wished to remind you of this so that you would not imagine that our committee had forgotten that there are people who work hard to earn their living. We have not forgotten this.

I thank all my colleagues who have spoken. The only small reservation which I would like to express is that my neighbouring colleagues did not comment during the discussion in committee. I could have discussed it with them, in order to see how we could have reached agreement, for I fully appreciate their concern. But they will no doubt consider the matter, and I think that tomorrow we shall be able to vote unanimously in favour of this report as a whole.

President. — I call Mrs Lentz-Cornette.

Mrs Lentz-Cornette. — (D) Mr President, may I ask Mr Narjes a further question? I wanted to know before if it would not be possible to incorporate fish and other sea creatures into this directive. Did I understand correctly that you said this was not the case as yet? My question is, therefore, why does the directive refer to 'foodstuffs of animal origin'? Fish and other sea creatures are after all animals. Are these animals included in Annex I under heading 02.04, which says 'meat and other products'? To put it plainly, are fish included in this directive or not, or is there to be a special directive? In that case the title should be changed from 'Directive on maximum levels for pesticide residues in and on foodstuffs of animal origin'. I ask again, are fish included or not?

President. — I call Mr Narjes.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (D) Mr President, as I said before, we are aiming at a separate directive for fish, because we do not at present have sufficiently well-founded scientific data, which we need in order to prepare a directive properly. It follows from this that in the Commission's view your interpretation of the Second Directive is not correct. Fish are not included. I take your point. Perhaps we shall clarify this as the procedure takes its course and find a suitable formula to specify that fish and everything derived from fish and sea creatures are not covered.

President. — I call Mr Sherlock.

Mr Sherlock. — Mr President, I should like to clarify with our excellent new Commissioner one aspect of

Sherlock

anxiety that he has. The insertion I suggested the Commission might consider is in line with my usual efforts to ensure implementation, of trying to ensure that these things are carried out and carried out to the same extent in every one of the Member States. This is one of our responsibilities, Mr Commissioner, as well as the simple one of preventing damage to the health of our Community.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

16. *Greek nominations to the committees*

President. — I have received from the Bureau a list of the Greek Members nominated to the committees of Parliament. This list is now being distributed to the Members.

I propose that the deadline for the tabling of amendments to these proposals by the Bureau be set at 9 p.m. this evening.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

I would point out that only Greek Members can be nominated. The vote on the candidates will take place tomorrow morning after the voting on requests for urgent procedure.

17. *Recovery and reuse of waste paper and board*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-659/80), drawn up by Miss Hooper on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-210/80) for a Council recommendation to the Member States concerning the recovery and reuse of waste paper and board.

I call Miss Hooper.

Miss Hooper, rapporteur. — This proposal is part of the Community's active anti-waste policy and reflects the fact that the recovery and reuse of waste paper and board was adopted as a first priority in the Community's action programme on the environment. I welcome recycling wherever it is practicable and makes economic sense, and I welcome this particular proposal, the intention of which is to encourage Member States to define and implement their own policies to promote the use of recycled paper and board. The emphasis is on increased utilization at this

stage, since it is anticipated that an increased recovery will then automatically follow. It should be noted by Parliament that the proposal is in the form of a recommendation which does not, of course, have binding force. This is welcomed, because although at first sight the subject-matter may seem simple, important and complex economic problems are involved. Furthermore, there has in any event been a natural increase in the use of recycled paper and board as a raw material in recent years.

I think, Mr President, that Parliament should also be aware that the Council of Ministers has already considered this proposal at its December meeting. I understand that it was approved in principle, awaiting Parliament's opinion. The figures on which the proposal is based were calculated by industry in 1976. They show that the Community provides less than half of its own raw materials, some 45%, of which approximately 32% was calculated to be recycled paper. The latter figure has increased since then to an average of something around 40%. The 55% deficiency is made up by imported raw materials, mainly in the form of wood-pulp.

The benefits sought by encouraging the use of recycled paper and board are, first, to reduce dependence on imported raw materials and secondly, to reduce the pollution caused by the accumulation of waste and to alleviate other problems connected with the disposal of waste which include financial costs. At present it is estimated that 25 million tonnes of waste paper and board could be recovered and recycled within the Community, but only 10 million tonnes are recovered, so the source of supply is there.

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, in considering the proposal, felt that it should be tightened up. Otherwise, in the words of one of the members, it is not worth the paper it is written on. To achieve this tightening-up process the committee felt that Member States should aim at a target figure. We were advised that the maximum practicable use of recycled paper and board is 60%, and since in certain member countries, notably the United Kingdom, a figure of over 50% has already been achieved, that 60% seemed to us to represent a worthwhile aim. It was also felt, bearing in mind the enormous quantity of paper used by Parliament and the other Community institutions, that they should not escape the effect of those recommendations and should also consider and implement policies in this respect. I am very happy to notice during the course of this week, Mr President, that our group at any rate is already using recycled paper for the work of the Parliament. Bearing in mind the availability of unutilized waste paper in domestic waste, it was also considered that the proposal should contain a recommendation to encourage voluntary schemes for selective recovery. The alterations proposed by the committee were therefore minor.

Hooper

In conclusion, Mr President, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection considers that a growing public sentiment exists in favour of the concept of waste recycling and accepts that in this particular context a reduction in consumer standards in appropriate cases may be necessary to enable paper containing recycled materials to compete more effectively. Therefore the Community's own resources policy in this field should be based on an increasing level of recycled paper and board as well as on wood-pulp. It is hoped that this policy will be developed in parallel with research both to improve the quality and to find alternative uses for waste paper thereby increasing stability in the waste paper market.

I trust, Mr President, that Parliament will support the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer protection by accepting this report.

President. — I call Mrs Fuillet to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Fuillet. — (*F*) I am speaking in this debate on the problem of the reuse of waste paper and board not on behalf of the Socialist Group but in a personal capacity, because I want to propose that the sixth indent of the preamble be withdrawn. I feel that it is unrealistic to aim to recover 60% of waste paper when the present figure is only about 30%. To try to double the amount would raise technical and financial problems, apart from the fact that recycled paper is mainly used for packaging and board. The withdrawal of the sixth indent of the preamble would, I think, largely be compensated by the sixth indent of the draft recommendation proposed by Miss Hooper, whose ideas are on the same lines as my own. It is somewhat contradictory to maintain the sixth indent of the preamble and the sixth indent of the draft recommendation. These are my reasons for requesting the withdrawal of the sixth indent of the preamble.

President. — I call Mr Purvis to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Purvis. — Mr President, I listened to Mrs Fuillet's remarks, and I must admit on looking at the committee's amendments that it seems to me personally that no harm can be done by having an aim which is going to save timber and energy in the future.

But my concern is in moving another amendment standing in my own name and that of the group. For many years we in my part of the world, Scotland, have happily eaten our fish and chips from newspaper. I even understand from my doctor friend here on my left that if I am caught in a taxi delivering a baby an unused newspaper is recommended as a suitable wrap.

It is quite adequately hygienic and provides good heat insulation.

(*Laughter*)

However, in the name of hygiene and no doubt with the best of intentions the Community has enacted directives, in particular Directive 76/893, which make it virtually impossible to use recycled paper for food packaging. Since then and more recently saving energy and timber has become a priority and the use of recycled paper can perhaps help. When I checked the Commission's proposals with a paper company in Fife in Scotland which uses very large amounts of waste paper as its raw material, the managing director considered them laudable, although in his opinion waste paper would only be recycled so long as it was commercially viable to do so. But on the other hand, he expressed the opinion that it might be considered a sour joke that the Commission's own actions of four years ago prevented one of the main commercially viable outlets for such paper, food packaging, from being availed of.

I therefore move my amendment, which is also in the name of my group, which asks the Commission to reassess urgently those of its directives which may prevent the use of recycled paper and to make new proposals in the light of the current energy and timber supply position and any new technology that may have developed in the meantime.

President. — I call Mrs Pruvot to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs Pruvot. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Liberal and Democratic Group on the whole approves and supports this draft recommendation, which aims both to prevent wastage and achieve lower consumption, and at the same time follows the lines of the directive on waste control. However, the amendment to introduce a new sixth indent to the preamble, recommending the recovery of 60% of present consumption of paper and board, should, I think, not be adopted. A small calculation has shown that total consumption of paper and board in the Community is at present about 33 million tonnes, so that 60% recovery would represent a little under 20 million tonnes. Since present total production of paper and board in the Community is around 23 million tonnes, this would mean that if 60% recovery were achieved and all this recycled more than four-fifths of all paper and board produced would come from recycling. We do not feel that this aim is realistic, neither for consumers nor for producers, and for this reason we will vote against this amendment.

President. — I call Mr Sherlock.

Mr Sherlock. — Mr President, in view of the time we are now using which might otherwise have been spent in eating fish and chips from newspapers, I intend to stray a little beyond the quarter of a minute which is my true allocation from my group and say that we must — those of us who are in the Chamber at this time — realize that this is a recommendation, a recommendation made, I am quite sure, by the Commission initially knowing full well the delicate balance pulp prices and reclaim prices upon which this highly refined industry moves from day to day, let alone from week to week and year to year. It is a series of sensible projections, though I cannot imagine where we have clawed out this 60% recommendation, which in the present state of the trade, I am assured, is a total inachievable nonsense.

I do feel that we must emphasize the recommendative quality of this whole issue. It is not a directive, it is not a command, it is not a fiat. I am sorry Mrs Agnelli is not here, I meant no reference to her firm.

(Laughter)

These are then voluntary schemes and I trust that the Community institutions will see this in the same light, that this is something we are hoping to do together. It is a fine thing to try and save the forests of this earth. On this I am desperately serious. Possibly that will result in helping in the salvation eventually of mankind, as we know mankind at the moment. The objectives are wholly laudable. Therefore, though it is a joke in the printing trade every now and then to put together an assemblage of ill-assorted articles and publish them under the name of 'printer's pie', I hope this will not prove to be pie in the sky.

(Laughter)

President. — I call Mr Narjes.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should first like to thank Miss Hooper very much for her precise and interesting report and for the suggestions that have emerged from the discussion and preparation of this report in the relevant committee. In view of the very serious problems faced by industries engaged in the recovery and reuse of waste paper, the Commission welcomes the help and support for its work provided by this report and by the present debate in the European Parliament.

I have a few remarks on the proposed amendments, which I shall take in order. The amendment to the third recital of the preamble adding the words 'on a selective basis' is thoroughly acceptable to the Commission. The same goes for the amendment to the fifth indent of the preamble, which is a change made in committee; this too is acceptable. The same can

unfortunately not be said for the proposed addition of a sixth indent to the preamble. It is normal practice for the ideas put forward in the preamble to be explained and developed in the main part of the recommendation. There is no recognizable link between this addition and any ideas developed in the main part. From a purely practical point of view, quoting a percentage figure is misleading. The figure of 70% originally mentioned is both technically and economically unrealistic for the Member States. With the possible exception of two of the 10 Member States, the same can be said for any figure above 55%. Let me, however, make it quite clear that I do not want us to squabble over percentages, even if they are too ambitious; at best this is a small piece of wishful thinking expressed in percentages and in real terms no harm is done. The price mechanism may in fact under certain circumstances be more of a help than is apparent at present. Both the Commission's working group of national experts and the Council's working party on the environment have examined the possibility of including figures and both came to the conclusion that this was not practicable. The first two amendments to the draft recommendation are wholeheartedly supported by the Commission, as these ideas were expressed in the original explanatory memorandum to the draft recommendation.

The proposed amendment to the third indent of the draft recommendation may perhaps have arisen from a misapprehension as to the Commission's original intention. What we meant was that it might be possible, on re-examining specifications, to incorporate more low-value 'mixed' waste paper and still produce paper suitable for certain uses, which is precisely the opposite of the proposed amendment.

This brings me to the fifth indent of the draft recommendation. The intention behind the proposed amendment is understandable. Any further restriction on the possible outlets for the collectors of waste paper would mean a further deterioration in an already shaky trade position. Particularly at collector level, the waste-paper industry suffers from a relationship between supply and demand which is determined by cyclical trends. The Commission take the view that the businessman's responsibility for his decisions should not be interfered with. In addition, the re-examination of specifications provided for in the third indent of the draft recommendation could radically alter the concept of what is or is not suitable for reuse.

The Commission's objections to the proposed new sixth indent have nothing to do with the idea put forward. The Commission's intention in launching this draft recommendation was primarily to take action on the demand side. All the proposed measures therefore relate to the stimulation of demand. For this reason the Commission takes the view that the question of supply is separate from that of demand and should be dealt with accordingly, if necessary by means of separate measures. The Commission does not believe that

Narjes

simply adding three lines to the present draft recommendation can significantly contribute to solving the manifold problems on the supply side in this sector. As I said before, the Commission welcomes the report and will submit to the Council a revised version of the draft recommendation taking account of both the report and today's debate. In light of this, I should like to say on Amendment No 1 that the Commission is not in favour; on Amendment No 2 I originally wanted to say that I saw no reason to go along with this. Having heard, however, that in Scotland babies are born wrapped in newspaper, I am prepared to re-examine this and take account of these considerations.

(Laughter)

Amendments No 3 and No 4 are acceptable.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

18. Agenda

President. — Mr Nyborg has requested pursuant to Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure that his report (Doc. 1-646/80) on the final importation of certain goods be deferred to the next part-session.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

19. Human rights in Uruguay

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-693/80), drawn up by Mrs Van den Heuvel on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on violations of human rights in Uruguay.

I call Mrs Van den Heuvel.

Mrs Van den Heuvel, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, anyone who follows the situation in Uruguay or who reads the reports of such international organizations as Amnesty International and the International Secretariat of Jurists for Amnesty in Uruguay, can only experience a deep sense of disgust. The facts revealed in these reports are so horrible that they are difficult to grasp. The common reaction is to want to ignore them. For this reason I am glad that a number of motions have been tabled in this Parliament which will oblige us to face up to this subject.

The volume of material available to me as rapporteur was overwhelming. Only a few of the horrific facts

documented in this material are contained in the report I have submitted. But, of course, it is not possible to know at any given moment all the violations of human rights in Uruguay. The truth, alas, the terrible truth is that they are occurring all the time.

Even when my report was completed the press was publishing many new horrors. I wish to mention a few, not — as I assure you from the depths of my being — for sensational reasons, but because we simply must know the facts if we are not to be lulled into inaction. On 13 January the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* reported that Hugo Dermit, a student, was tortured to death shortly before he was due to be released from prison, in which he had spent eight years. The Dutch newspapers, undoubtedly in common with others, printed an illustration of the latest Uruguayan instrument of torture, a box in which the prisoner is suspended over a bar at an angle of 90 degrees. The lid can be pressed downwards, squeezing the unfortunate victim in a kind of human press.

I was also deeply shocked by the report by the pianist Miguel Angel Estrella, who spent more than two years in the Libertad prison. He was made to wear a black hood and was kept permanently in handcuffs and subjected — relatively privileged though he was, since a major international campaign was launched on his behalf — to constant intimidation, beatings and humiliation. It is heartbreaking to read: 'Merely to give a crumb to a pigeon which landed on your windowsill was enough to arouse the fury of the guards'. They even went so far as to poison pigeons so that no contact was possible, even with a dumb creature.

Obviously the European Parliament's task is to think carefully about what it can best do. We are well aware that a resolution by this Parliament will not change the situation in Uruguay from one day to the next. None the less, we can cooperate with all those who oppose torture and dictatorship, and it is in this light that Parliament has dealt with the problem of Uruguay on a number of previous occasions.

Various political groups have submitted motions for a resolution. Statements have been made in this Assembly both by the European People's Party and the Socialist Group.

On 21 November this Parliament adopted a resolution relating to the referendum with which the dictatorial regime, which is still unconstitutional, wished to establish its own legitimacy. On 30 November the people of Uruguay made their views clear in this referendum and said 'No!' to a regime that was trying to give itself a legal basis, and thus implicitly rejected a procedure which was designed to create the impression that there are democratic freedoms in Uruguay. The people of Uruguay deserve our admiration.

Van den Heuvel

We must, however, be careful not to allow these events to mislead us. There is no democracy in Uruguay, none at all. The people are gagged and the victims of arbitrary power. The reports in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* and conversations which I have had with Uruguayan refugees confirm that repression in Uruguayan prisons has intensified since the referendum. The reports of the various international organizations collaborate this. It is still the case that one in fifty Uruguayan citizens is arrested, one in a hundred citizens is tortured in prison. They must have a lot to hide in Uruguay, for the International Red Cross has still not been permitted to carry out an independent investigation. Moreover, a delegation which the Dutch Parliament wished to send to Uruguay was not permitted to enter the country.

It is hardly surprising that even those persons in Uruguay who originally were in favour of the mini World Football Championship, which I mentioned in my report, have changed their view and argued in favour of a boycott. The Dutch Parliament and the executives of the two major political parties, the Socialist and the Christian-Democratic parties, also called for a boycott. Despite this the Dutch players took part in the competition, arguing that sport and politics should be kept separate, and received the enthusiastic praise of the regime for their efforts. They were told literally: you have demonstrated that you do not believe the lies which are spread about our country. In fact, therefore, they were used as political tools of the regime.

I give these examples to illustrate the nature of the Uruguayan dictatorship. I can only repeat that the European Parliament will do all it can, though that is not much, to support the opposition to these practices. This is the purpose of the motion which the Political Affairs Committee has submitted to Parliament. The motion calls on the Foreign Ministers to take suitable joint measures and to protest to the Government of Uruguay against each new violation of human rights. We know that persistent international pressure has at least some effect. And of course, and this is in accordance with Parliament's earlier declarations, the governments of the Member States are urged immediately to cease all participation in the supply of weapons to Uruguay.

Mr President, the people of Uruguay, whose courage was lauded in all our countries following the 30 November referendum, deserve our support. If the world shuts its eyes to these horrific facts it is the dictatorships who gain. This is something which the European Parliament, which represents the citizens of Europe, must not countenance.

President. — The proceedings will now be suspended until 9 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 8 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ZAGARI

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

I call Mr Lezzi to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Lezzi. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group gives its full support to Mrs Van den Heuvel's report, which is marked by in-depth analysis, ample documentation and vigorous argument. You will forgive me, Mr President, for saying that I find it extremely depressing that this debate, which should, after all, demonstrate the united support of the European Parliament for the struggle being waged by democratic oppositions, should take place in an empty Chamber. The blame for this must fall, in my view, not only on those who are absent, but on the Bureau, which was incapable of appreciating that it would have been better to discuss a matter of such importance as the freedom of the Uruguayan people earlier instead of fish or beef and veal.

I am taking the liberty of making this mild protest to the President of the House, in the certainty that he will be kind enough to pass it on, since it reflects the feelings of the Members present, who are thus prevented from participating in a debate on a report which could only have been so amply documented and compiled by someone with the democratic and anti-fascist convictions of Mrs Van den Heuvel. It is particularly unfortunate, Mr President, since before even being discussed in the European Parliament this report drew the attention of the Uruguayan press.

On 3 November, i.e. even before the Political Affairs Committee finally approved this report, the Montevideo daily *La Mañana* published an article entitled 'Agresion a nuestro Pais' which showed a thorough understanding of the work of the European Parliament. If *La Mañana* tells its readers tomorrow that this debate took place in the presence of ten Members, it will obviously give the impression that we do not take our commitment of solidarity seriously. Yet this is a real and genuine commitment. Similarly, when we have to turn to the Council, as Mrs Van den Heuvel has just done in paragraph 4 of the motion for a resolution, to ask the Ministers acting in political cooperation to adopt common positions at government level and in the various international forums, we find we are speaking to empty Council seats in this House.

The concern of the government-controlled Uruguayan press was that the actions of the European Parliament might impede the mini World Football Championship, even though this was not the objective of the proposals put forward by Mrs Van den Heuvel. She wished to encourage the sports organizations to coordinate their approach so as to prevent this championship from being used to glorify the regime, and for this purpose — as the Montevideo newspaper *La Mañana* knew well — she turned to the press to urge it to draw public attention on the occasion of the *Mundialito* to the oppressive and tyrannical nature of the military regime.

I do not know what the situation was in other countries, but in Italy, which has certainly contributed in the past and continues to contribute to the struggle against fascism at home and abroad, I did not have the impression that the mass media paid sufficient attention during the mini World Championship to the misdeeds and crimes of the military regime in Uruguay.

I am limited to a speaking time of six minutes, and I only wish to say that I hope that the Political Affairs Committee under its chairman Mariano Rumor will take up these questions again, because I do not believe that when it approved the report by Mrs Van den Heuvel the Political Affairs Committee had had the opportunity to consider various new elements affecting human life and the situation in the world, particularly the election of Reagan, which has been heartily welcomed by the military and tyrannical regimes of Latin America, including that in Montevideo. Likewise I do not believe that the Political Affairs Committee, and thus this Parliament, has yet analysed the results of the 30 November referendum.

The result of the referendum held in Uruguay on 30 November merits attention and close study by the European Parliament, since it shows that, confronted by a tragic reality, deriving from five years of tyranny which has been admirably described in the report, the Uruguayan people rejected the plans of the military regime to consolidate its power by dressing it up with so-called democratic norms, which were, however, formulated by the notorious COSENA, the Council of National Security, and not, of course, by any constituent assembly elected by universal suffrage.

In our debate on 21 November we asked the question, on the assumption that the *Noes* would carry the day, what would happen to the opposition groups, the democrats and anti-fascists among the Uruguayan people. I should like to ask the President-in-Office of the Council, who can draw on the services of the representatives of the Member States in Uruguay in the context of political cooperation, what the present situation in Uruguay is. Has the repression got worse? We can learn the answers to these questions from the opposition forces underground and in exile. We can know then at first hand, since we do have people

there, but are the representatives of the Member States of the Community in a position to answer enquiries from the President-in-Office immediately on the state of affairs in Uruguayan political life following the 30 November referendum?

Otherwise all we are doing is continuing to make the appropriate declarations of solidarity, whereas we are now at a stage where the European Parliament elected by universal suffrage should be demanding to know from the President-in-Office of the Council, of the Commission, of all the Community institutions, a Community which moreover has economic and commercial relations with the countries of Latin America, starting with Brazil (we shall be discussing the relations between the European Community and Brazil in the next day or so, and this is a country which has a decisive influence on the internal affairs of Uruguay) an explanation of what the Presidency of the Council and the Commission are doing, by means of action in the economic field, to insist on certain behaviour which can help lead to the release — I repeat — of Seregni, Massera, Liliana Celiberti, Teti and many others, which can lead to the tearing-up, to the destruction of the lists of proscribed persons so that they can come back and take part in democratic life, limited though it may be, following the 30 November referendum.

The Socialist Party, which has major responsibilities, calls for solidarity from the Christian-Democratic Party, the Liberal Party and the Communist Party, which the constitution, fortunately thrown out by the population, would have suppressed, merely because of the common links which the Uruguayan political parties have with their counterparts in Europe and elsewhere in the world, representing as they do the main streams of idealism and thought.

Mr President, I appeal to your renowned Europeanism, your anti-fascist convictions, your commitment as a militant socialist and democrat, to use your authority in the Bureau or elsewhere to ensure that this matter is discussed again, perhaps in the Political Affairs Committee, following the meeting of the European Parliament and the Latin American parliament in Bogotá, an event of importance for the European Parliament which will bring together numerous delegations of Christian-Democrats, socialists, liberals and communists from the various countries of Latin America.

I was delighted to hear that Christian-Democrat colleagues will be going to Uruguay. There they will discover how different the viewpoints of the Uruguayan Christian Democrats are from those in El Salvador. Let us hope that they return with full documentation on which they can base reports which will permit us to pass, as we must, from the phase of political propaganda, necessary though that is, to a more practical phase in this Parliament and in the Community institutions.

President. — Mr Lezzi, I have no desire to act as counsel for the Bureau but I must say that the Bureau is not responsible for how things run. As you know, this debate was supposed to be held this afternoon. Be that as it may, I shall pass on your requests which I consider to be of extreme importance.

I call Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, despite its long tradition as a country of democracy and social progress Uruguay has seen its political and social institutions destabilized by the combined effect of a serious economic recession since the 1960s and of the guerrilla campaign of the Tupamaros. The urban terrorism and the political kidnappings of the latter have encouraged the establishment of an increasingly openly repressive and authoritative regime composed entirely of soldiers and based on the ideology of what is termed 'national security'.

All forms of democratic opposition, all criticisms however constructive, all expression of social and trade union rights have become acts of subversion in the eyes of the military regime and have been consequently dealt with according to the military criminal code.

This military criminal code restricts the elementary rights of the defence. But what is worse, questioning and arrests are carried out without any protection of due process or legal guarantees.

Political prisoners are arrested, physically and mentally tortured and even killed. Sometimes, indeed, they disappear without trace, as in Argentina.

We hear that in Uruguay one in every thousand inhabitants is a political prisoner, but to this sad figure must be added the half million exiles and outlaws out of a population which totalled 2 700 000 in 1973.

As for the trade unions, it is worth remembering that Uruguayan workers have seen their purchasing power diminish by 53%! And these workers, already so exploited, are refused even the slightest possibility of expressing or organizing themselves, in spite of the so-called improvements in the labour sector introduced by government regulation, which are the result of agreements in which only the powers that be participated.

In the political sphere we have had the constitutional referendum of 30 November, organized by the regime in circumstances marked by manipulation of public opinion and a total absence of any liberty of expression.

None the less, the Uruguayan people struck a severe blow against the dictatorship, since it rejected the new proposed constitution by 58% of the votes cast, to say nothing of the abstentions which the country's rulers did not mention.

This vote has prevented the military leaders from taking decisions for the future: the planned timetable, including the pseudo-elections for the presidency in November 1981, has been suspended.

I should like at this point to congratulate Mrs Van den Heuvel on her report, which makes a real effort to reveal the character of the Uruguayan dictatorship, although I would point out that there is only one Christian-Democratic party in Uruguay, contrary to what she said in her introduction.

This Christian-Democratic party was one of the prime movers of the 'Frente Amplio', and participated in all the joint efforts of the political and trade union groupings to achieve real democracy. It consequently supported the common candidacy for the post of president of Liber Seregni, who has now been in prison for seven years.

Moreover, even this Christian-Democratic party has been suspended and threatened with final dissolution by the regime. Its leaders and militant workers have been deprived of their political rights for fifteen years and its president, Juan Pablo Terra, has been in prison five times and has had his passport confiscated on two occasions. The press organs of our party have also been suppressed. 1973 saw the final closure of the newspaper *Ahora* and the party's weekly has also been closed for two weeks and the editorial staff sent to prison. Thousands of officials and teachers who support the Christian-Democrats have lost their jobs.

Finally, the Group of the European People's Party gives its full support to the conclusions of this report and to the motion for a resolution.

The Commission, the Council and the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation must seriously study the case of Uruguay and undertake coordinated and systematic action at the various levels, such as:

- strict monitoring of the EEC-Uruguay trade agreements, bearing in mind the populations concerned;
- joint action at the United Nations, and initiatives to ensure that independent international investigations are carried out in Uruguay;
- closer cooperation with all the democratic Uruguayan movements for defence of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

I should like, however, to stress two practical aspects:

- it is high time that the European Community established a policy and a suitable means of moni-

Cassanmagnago Cerretti

toring exports of arms to countries which are guilty of severe violations of basic human rights. It is not sufficient nowadays to condemn this or that delivery of arms by one of our Member States; what is essential is to establish common norms which will put all of the Community on a footing of equality. In addition, it would be advisable to extend this to all the Western countries by means of the OECD.

In this context, I should like to see the Coppieters motion on the export of arms from EEC countries, which has been suspended in the Political Affairs Committee for far too many months, being dealt with much more rapidly, and practical conclusions being drawn from it;

- we must be extremely demanding with respect to the follow-up to the report which we are debating here today. This is, in fact, the first time that the Political Affairs Committee has presented such a detailed and systematic document on a single country. We must therefore consult with the Commission and the Ministers of Foreign Affairs in six to eight months' time, taking this report and the motion for a resolution — which we approve as it stands — as our basis, since the resolution by the European Parliament will have no value unless it is followed by specific action and a careful examination of the results obtained.

President. — I call Sir John Stewart-Clark.

Sir John Stewart-Clark, draftsman of an opinion. — Mr President, I should first of all like to move formally three amendments by Mr Fergusson — Nos 1, 2 and 3, which are self-explanatory, and to withdraw Amendment No 4 as the text is now correct.

I speak on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations and I speak also on behalf of my political group. Our conclusions are the same. I speak to this Parliament, but I hope also in some way to the people and the government of Uruguay. I speak as one who lived and worked in Uruguay for a full year in the 1950s. At that time, Uruguay was an example to all of South America and indeed the world. There were free elections, a free press, free speech and a strong and democratic government. What a contrast this was to the dictatorial and oppressive regime of Juan Peron in Argentina across the waters of the Rio Plata! Yet in the 1960s, the economy of Uruguay fell into decline: world commodity prices collapsed; there was increasing corruption within Uruguay itself and a lack of modernization in agriculture.

We saw the emergence of left-wing urban terrorist groups and the strong democratic government, as it had been known, fell into disarray. It was understandable that measures had to be taken to put the economy onto its feet, to fight terrorism and to restore law and

order. But throughout the 1970s the military regime in trying to achieve economic recovery, increasingly resorted to imprisonment without trial, to torture and to virtual elimination of free speech. I put it to this Parliament, to the government and people of Uruguay: Uruguay of course must have order but only with justice, only with a freely-elected Parliament. Uruguay must see a return to democracy and to a proper rule of law. No-one wants to see a return to urban guerilla terrorism, but we do not want to see terrorism exercised by the Uruguayan Government.

Meanwhile, this Parliament should remember the vital part that the Community plays in its trade with Uruguay. The Uruguayan people depend upon us for their trading outlets, and we should certainly not abrogate our trading agreements: to do so will be to hurt Uruguayan farmers and Uruguayan industry. But we should not extend the trade agreement; we should review it every year, and this should be dependent on the real moves taken by the government in Uruguay to restore freedom and human rights. Strong nations and strong economies have seldom lasted in history under the reign of repressive dictatorships. No man has the right to persecute and torture his fellow man. No government has the right to persecute its own citizens. Let Uruguay return again to its previous strength under democracy and enlightened law and order, and let this Community help it to do so!

President. — I call Mrs Baduel Glorioso of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the late hour, the absence for good reasons of many colleagues, and indeed the introductory remarks of Mrs Van den Heuvel, our rapporteur, together with the speeches by Mr Lezzi and Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, make it possible for me to limit these remarks which I am making on behalf of the Italian members of the Communist and Allies Group.

First of all, I should like to draw your attention to the long delay in submitting this motion to Parliament.

Mrs Van den Heuvel was given the task of drawing up this report and presenting a motion for a resolution in January 1980, and this is now January 1981! The timetables in this Parliament are so varied as to justify a vigorous protest against the fact that some items are dealt with urgently and others are left, as it were, to ripen by themselves. If they go rotten, of course, then nobody's interested and it's nobody's fault. This morning, just to give an example, I heard a senior member of a major political group in this Parliament state that there was plenty of time for El Salvador and for the urgent motion for a resolution submitted by Mr Van Minnen because it was not necessary for the European Parliament delegation which will be going to Latin

Baduel Glorioso

America shortly to present the clear and precise position contained in the moderate Van Minnen motion, which could have indeed been approved this morning. So I suppose we shall get round to discussing El Salvador in June 1982! If in the meantime El Salvador drowns in a sea of blood we shall simply stand here in all serenity and discuss the consequences.

If we believe that this is the way to demonstrate Europe's power and the political influence of the European Parliament, we are not so much infantile as thoroughly cynical. I would remind you all, whatever your attitudes and political positions, that we live in a democratic society, that it is our duty to give our views on events as they actually happen if we wish Europe to earn in the world the recognition and respect which it deserves, and which in particular the European Parliament deserves.

On this point I would like to say, and this is my second remark, that unfortunately the Van den Heuvel report takes no account, evidently for these reasons as well, of the recent developments in Uruguay. The figure of 57 to 58% of the population who said 'No', is the official figure, and is perhaps lower than the real figure if we are to believe certain accounts from there which have appeared in the press. However, let us accept these figures, which are enormous in themselves. This referendum has highlighted a very interesting and increasingly common phenomenon in Latin America, which is that a revolt has grown up around the front which unites the Socialist, Communist and Christian Democrat movements, some Liberal Nationalist units, the two parties which have traditionally alternated in the government of Uruguay throughout the last 100 years, the *colorado* party and the *blanco* party, a revolt organized behind the scenes which began to grow only two years after these democratic and anti-dictatorship parties, which was born only two years ago, in exile, in the prisons and whose strength and force have only become evident since the 'No' vote in the referendum, since until ten days ago many of us were uncertain as to the results, knowing as we did the pressures, the blackmail and the situation in Chile, which is well described in the Van den Heuvel report. I do not wish to engage in demagoguery by repeating all that Mrs Van den Heuvel and others have said on the instruments of torture, the disappearance of citizens, exile, forced emigration, the living standards of the workers and the use of the army to maintain a privileged class. All of this is a further sign that in Latin America something is beginning to stir again, after several years of silence. For something more than a year we have been watching the events in Nicaragua, Honduras, Bolivia — a democratic experiment which was brought to a rapid end, but which, none the less, has left its traces — and in El Salvador and Uruguay. This is why I do not believe that Europe's role in the world is to accept, even before it is even asked to, the positions of the United States, but instead to indicate to the USA, with all the experience which we unfortunately possess and which we bear in

the eyes of the world, of fascism, of nazism, of colonialism, as well as the culture, technology, science, philosophy — for this heritage, too, we also bear — to indicate to the USA, as our contribution to an alliance between independent entities, between different forces and major economic and political realities, our own views on things, and in so doing demonstrate our solidarity with the countries of Latin America.

We are extremely concerned by the attitudes adopted and statements made by the new American President, Mr Reagan, which appear to be confirmed by the mere fact that Dr Kissinger has reappeared on the scene. We must not forget that this man has boasted publicly not merely of contributing to but of actually causing the *coup d'état* in Chile, and of causing it in order to stop the communists from remaining in power! This is the reason Kissinger gave himself. We are extremely concerned at this, not only because it would again alter a certain pattern which had been re-established in the United States following the end of the Vietnam war, in spite of the waverings of the Carter presidency, but particularly because it would constitute a grave threat to world peace.

If Europe wishes to follow this route, and to accept orders blindly, it will not only be marching against history — since the movement in Latin America is unstoppable; it may be halted in the short term but not in the longer term — but it will also lose the alliances it has gained by the shelter given to political refugees and the assistance given in various ways by the democratic European parties. And when Europe loses this wealth of alliances it will be our survival which will be at stake.

I have one final remark to make. Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Van den Heuvel motion for a resolution call upon the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Ten to take measures to improve the situation in Uruguay and appeal to the governments of the Member States to cease all participation in the supply of weapons to that country.

I should like to add that we consider it necessary that this Parliament and this Community should demonstrate a clearer, more rapid and more timely solidarity with respect to the countries and events in Latin America. Our group will not vote in favour of the amendments tabled, because we find the report sufficient in itself, and we approve it fully.

President. — I call Mr Vié to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Vié. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I take the floor on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, for whom, as is obvious, the problem of human rights is of fundamental importance. Our very name, with its attribute 'progressive',

Vié

would have no meaning unless it referred to progress in human rights and liberties.

I should like to begin by saying that we are pleased that the report which we are debating this evening has been dealt with in the context of the Article 25 procedure, and has thus been preceded by a discussion in committee. The result is that we have a report of outstanding quality, in which great care has been taken to record as faithfully and fully as possible the dreadful situation in Uruguay. We regard this as an excellent report and we shall vote in favour of it. The evidence in this report and all the other available evidence confirm that flagrant and systematic violation of human rights is taking place in Uruguay. All the signs are there, in this report and elsewhere, to indicate that in Uruguay inhuman and degrading treatment and torture are everyday events, and the evidence is that this inhuman and degrading treatment is not fortuitous but effectively a form of government.

We have not forgotten, of course — and the report discusses this in detail — the situation in Uruguay before the present regime came to power, but I do not believe that this provides any excuse at all: one crime never justifies another. And without going as far as Mrs Baduel Glorioso did a few minutes ago on the questions of foreign policy, I do believe that it is vital in this kind of debate for the international Community which we represent to offer to these suffering peoples — without interfering in foreign policy problems, of course — evidence that we support them wholeheartedly, and to contribute by our public condemnation to the solution of these problems. Let us hope that the Uruguayan people will soon regain their liberty.

President. — I call Mr Van Minnen.

Mr Van Minnen. — (NL) Mr President, a superficial observer could get the impression that this Parliament is concerned day and night with the persecution and terror in Latin America. This morning we discussed the severe repression in El Salvador and this evening we have turned our attention to the chronic persecution in Uruguay. It is a dark and sinister picture, and Mrs Van den Heuvel was right to draw it to our notice in her excellent and detailed report. It is dark and sinister, not only for the countries and peoples concerned, but — and this is what I should like to talk about briefly — for ourselves. Even in this Parliament we have today witnessed the incredible hypocrisy with which a number of Members refused this morning to concern themselves with the suffering peoples of Latin America, and specifically of El Salvador. This is in striking contrast to the speeches we have heard this evening. Perhaps, as Mrs Baduel Glorioso said, perhaps we'll get round to it during 1982. Today, none the less, the majority of this Parliament took the view that it need not be overly concerned with this persecution by criminals in uniform, this persecution

which is driving Christian Democrats, social democrats, churches and trade unions to underground resistance. Everyone of us — when we are all here, at least — must surely share common convictions or at least common humanity with those who are the victims of this terror.

Yet while the events in El Salvador were apparently not such as to merit our direct attention, those in Uruguay are. In terms of days the Uruguayan situation is perhaps less acute, but in terms of years the situation in both countries is comparable. Both suffer from the most inhuman kind of dictatorship, the kind of dictatorship which will be given an extra fillip shortly by President Reagan. How else are we to explain the words of Reagan's new ambassador to the United Nations? He said literally that when the United States had to choose between what he called 'quasi-dictatorship', in other words a dictatorship which was not over-particular about human rights, and a government that, whatever its other characteristics, tended to be less friendly to the United States, then the United States would have to support the dictatorship. This is the happy message which Reagan's ambassador is sending to all the dictatorships in Latin America, dictatorships which, by the way, are in power owing to the United States. This is the new unambiguity which President Reagan has brought: at least we know where he stands, which is more than can be said for some people in our own Parliament. We must therefore put the question of whether the votes of the Christian-Democrats on El Salvador today must be interpreted as meaning that reforms in Uruguay, Paraguay and Brazil should be rejected in line with the thinking expressed by Reagan's new ambassador.

I should like to turn now briefly to the questions of boycott and mini World Football Championship, because here again we are confronted with a practice which is in sharp contrast to the fine words which will undoubtedly again resound through this Assembly this evening. Moreover, what I have to say about this is contained in Amendment No 5 submitted by my group. Does what we profess by word match what we actually do? There is always plenty of enthusiastic talk in this Parliament about boycotting unsatisfactory regimes, about whom to boycott and how. This has happened again in the case of Uruguay. Obviously delegations must go there, for this gives hope to those who have remained trapped in those countries, delegations such as those from the European Parliament, which can show our oppressed and imprisoned colleagues in those countries that we have not forgotten them. That is the kind of visit which the ruling regimes invariably refuse to welcome; these are the kind of visitors that are not allowed to cross the frontiers. Both this Parliament and a delegation from the Second Chamber of Netherlands Parliament were very recently refused permission to make such visits. Contact with the outside world is also necessary — particularly with Uruguay — and I fully agree with Sir John Stewart-Clark on this, because Uruguay was at

Van Minnen

one time almost an exemplary democracy. This need for contacts with the outside world is an urgent need, but it is also a need which is most definitely not satisfied by those people who visited Uruguay in the past few weeks to attend this vaunted football tournament.

Here I should like to quote literally the remarks made by another Member, who said: 'There is no doubt that it is an illusion that sport, football championships and political events can be kept separate, as if sport and football championships could be held in a vacuum, indeed as if football championships were not a display of power and a recognition of the host country.' I have quoted this statement with approval — although the colleague I have quoted perhaps does not remember his text so exactly. It was all a year or so ago. Perhaps, indeed, he does not remember this quotation at all, because the original version contained the words 'Olympic Games', instead of 'football championships', and 'the Soviet Union' instead of 'Uruguay'. None the less, it is fair to ask whether this quotation retains its validity for the Member who spoke it. It is surely difficult to conceive that colleagues who previously argued so strongly in favour of a boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games should suddenly have no objection to these mini football championships taking place in a country where the political parties and the trade unions are prohibited on the grounds that they are a danger to the State, where a third of the population is forced to flee the country by political and economic pressures, and where the remaining population performed a little miracle of their own, just before the colourful opening ceremonies and in spite of the police repression which characterizes that land, of rejecting by a large majority a so-called proposal for a constitution put forward by the military. That is something which led immediately and during the football championships to a new and even more intensive wave of arrests, particularly among Christian-Democrat leaders, although nothing of this appeared in the reports. We find it hard to believe that the Christian-Democratic spokesman in this Parliament should suddenly have no more objections to a regime which unambiguous reports from respected organizations such as the World Council of Churches and Amnesty International show to have developed a system of torture, murder and degradation and destruction of human life in Latin America to an extent which would previously not have been thought possible.

I do not even wish to criticize the sportsmen themselves, nor can I condemn the people who cheered so vociferously in the streets of Montevideo following the success of their national football team: the man in the street in Montevideo has little else to cheer about. Our criticism is of the regime in Uruguay. But how does it happen that in Parliament those who argue that political and sporting prestige are linked when it comes to the Moscow Olympic Games, are suddenly indifferent to this question when it comes to the football championships in Montevideo? That is why we have submitted Amendment No 5, an amendment which

was unfortunately rejected in the Political Affairs Committee, which is why my astonishment is not of a purely theoretical character. This is why I and my group are surprised at an amendment in which the kidnapping of an ambassador by the Tupamaros is declared to be an act of terrorism, and the arbitrary arrest, the disappearance, the tortures and the terror of what is claimed to be a legitimate government are accepted as legitimate acts. What kind of logic is that? Where are your moral standards? The governments and all those in Europe who not only agreed to send football teams to Uruguay, but all those who approved the broadcasting of this spectacle in Europe, are the people who share the responsibility for strengthening the regime in Uruguay. These are the people who have helped to disguise and falsify the image of this horrible dictatorship among the European public. It is our moral duty here in the light of the repression in Uruguay to attack this misuse of the mini world football championships, and that is why we have tabled this amendment.

President. — I call Mr Vernimmen.

Mr Vernimmen. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to join in congratulating the rapporteur, Mrs Van den Heuvel, on her objective and balanced report on the violation of human rights in Uruguay. My group is particularly appreciative of the fact that Mrs Van den Heuvel consulted countless, indeed unsuspected sources to arrive at a true picture of the situation. It is a description of facts and situations which send cold shivers running down the spine of every true democrat. Once again we read of man's inhumanity to man, and of situations which illustrate the blindness and cruelty of dictatorships of whatever hue.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this Parliament is right to deal with these problems, even though we made a remarkably united protest against the farce of the referendum held in Uruguay on November 30, 1980. Had the proposal for a new constitution been accepted the military regime would have been enabled to legalize a situation of repression and continuing violation of fundamental rights and freedoms by giving a legal basis to the power which the military have in fact held since the *coup d'état* in 1973.

Despite clear intimidation from the armed forces the draft 'Constitution' was rejected by a large majority, and in addition some 20% of the population of Uruguay has fled the country and sought shelter elsewhere. Moreover, the military authorities are hunting down political opponents, even abroad, with the connivance and even support of some governments, such as that of Argentina. They do not stop at murder and kidnapping even of political refugees protected by the High Commissioner for Refugees of the United Nations. On the domestic scene I would simply

Vernimmen

remind you that Uruguay holds the sad record of the largest number of political prisoners in relation to the population of the country. The elimination of democratic freedoms — I am referring to both political and trade union freedom and, to constitutional rights — has allowed a regime of terror to come into being in which repression, torture and murder are everyday events, all the vital forces in the country are crushed, the economy is tottering and the poorest sectors of the population are brought to the brink of starvation.

The fact that some days ago the national football team of Uruguay presented the mini World Cup to the military junta before the eyes of a large number of the world's citizens does not alter the case. Instead, it simply means that a sport even has once again been scandalously misused for propaganda purposes. History is repeating itself, and that is why I find it strange that those who shouted loudest in favour of a boycott of the Olympic Games in Moscow now stand silent.

However that may be, the undisputed rejection by the Uruguayan people of the draft constitution shows clearly that the forces of democracy remain very much alive in that country, and do not plan to accept the suppression of democracy and of the fundamental rights and freedoms. In this they are entitled to our support.

This Parliament must accept the challenge of continuing to monitor the evolution of human rights throughout the world, particularly now that in Reagan's America this concern for basic human rights could well be forced into the background. We who have been fortunate enough to have been elected following free elections by direct and universal suffrage owe this not merely to the European voters, but, in my view to all democrats wherever they may be. Although there are occasionally sneers about Parliament's concern with these matters it remains one of the ways to unmask dictatorships. Dictators are in general afraid of the truth — why should they otherwise falsify the truth and repress liberty so systematically? If, moreover, we can in some cases also make the suffering of those who are oppressed more bearable, this must be our encouragement in this Parliament to continue along this road.

President. — I call Mr Coutsocheras.

Mr Coutsocheras. — (EL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, human rights are being hit — and hit hard — at the present time. Even those international bodies whose *raison d'être* is to protect human rights are merely making resounding statements without imposing sanctions. Both these bodies and the Member States will have to share the blame for these infringements because of their unacceptable policy. In the Council of Europe — and its business, in particular, is

human rights — I never cease to speak out against this policy of toleration. Now that I am speaking for the first time in the European Parliament, I can only say that it, too, is unfortunately becoming an accomplice, because it is a sad fact that the European Parliament gives priority to economic relations and trade instead of to human rights. This is not just my own view — and I have experience of what a bitter dictatorship is like — but an international view. Let us not be mistaken — this intimidation will continue as long as the dictatorship in Uruguay lasts, and it will continue as before in the neighbouring countries as well, while Carter — and, I assume, his successor — will devote themselves to speaking out on human rights.

I feel it is high time the international organizations abandoned this policy of hypocrisy and that the United Nations' resolutions stopped being ignored. I have extremely bitter experience of the seven years of dictatorship in my own country — a country which gave birth to the Athenian democracy and where every single citizen is born a democrat. Despite this, because of the intervention of foreign interests, we spent seven years under the colonels' boots without seeing those international bodies or Europe not just speaking out but taking active steps. Believe me, ladies and gentlemen, we were waiting for you to help us in our struggle, and time and time again we would see representatives of foreign governments arriving in Athens to haggle over sales of arms. And to whom? To the colonels — at a time when the prisons were full of democratic citizens and our sons and daughters were protesting and fighting on the streets. I saw all this with my own eyes, and I had to suffer a lot — as did many of my colleagues who are now here in the European Parliament. I should like to make a protest and draw your attention to another dramatic situation, over which we do not really see Europe taking any active steps. I would remind you, ladies and gentlemen, that for six years now the martyred State of Cyprus has been suffering a tragic fate, and that there are still 200 000 Greek Cypriots who are refugees in their own country, while 2 000 are still unaccounted for. In the meantime, a series of United Nations resolutions has been passed — to no effect. Let there be no mistake, if we allow dictatorships to survive and if we trade with such totalitarian regimes, we share the guilt, and we are not promoting the cause of genuine democracy or doing anything to stop ordinary people being tortured, imprisoned and murdered. If we do not strengthen human rights, mankind will never know real peace.

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, it is proper that we should be discussing the report and motion for a resolution on the violation of human rights in Uruguay. Our text this time is an extremely interesting, indeed brilliant report from Mrs Van den Heuvel. We know that the situation is frightening. Previous speak-

Coppieters

ers have given examples and I should like to add another one, namely that one in every thousand Uruguayans is imprisoned for political reasons; note that this figure does not include the 500 000 or so Uruguayans in exile. Europe is right to point out this shocking state of affairs.

But words alone are not enough, and I should like to touch briefly on one aspect, which is the direct responsibility, the shared guilt of the arms trade in the repression by this regime. Unfortunately Belgium has played a shameful role in this, for example by granting a permit for the export of 22 armoured cars to Uruguay. I am ashamed to say that my country has for years been a major supplier of light arms and ammunition; only last week an entire ship loaded with arms and ammunition left the Belgian port of Zeebrugge for Uruguay.

This is the reason for my amendment, Mr President, which aims to insert a paragraph 5 a. It follows from the fact that in the foreseeable future there is likely to be no further conflict between the neighbouring States of Brazil and Argentina that any supply of arms can only serve the violent repression of the population. We in Europe, with our constant talk of regulations and agreements among the Member States on all sorts of trade products, have been disgracefully lax in this respect, particularly since the arms trade has a marked political aspect, and various governments, including the Belgian Government, have never rendered an account of it to their own parliament.

My motion for a resolution on the arms trade of the Member States was tabled for discussion six months ago. I have heard little of it since. This attitude of Parliament contrasts unfavourably with this report, which is idealistic, specific and competent.

I hope that this will encourage us to think seriously about the arms trade, which is why I have submitted this amendment and made this short speech.

President. — I call Mr Andriessen.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, it is difficult to know what the Commission can add to this debate, after the many heartfelt speeches which we have just heard. We have first of all the clear and penetrating analysis of the rapporteur, together with many comments, and even personal experience, relating to the question of the practical violation of human rights among the many present-day dictatorships.

I can assure you that the Commission has no hesitation in echoing the condemnation contained in this report and in the speeches we have heard here of practices which, as has been stated this evening, are virtually indescribable. It seems to me that it is the task

of parliaments — and in particular the European Parliament, given its supranational dimension — to bear unremitting witness to our condemnation of such practices. I agree with what the documents say: that it is only by publicizing and constantly drawing attention to what is happening that progress can be made in the long run in the fight against the violation of human rights, and I believe that a debate in a parliament such as this one, which in this area can certainly, and where necessary must certainly, influence other parliaments, can itself help — no matter how fruitless our efforts seem in the short term — to combat this phenomenon, which is really unworthy of our 20th century civilization. On behalf of the Commission, therefore, I wish to express my agreement with all those who have so impressively declared their rejection and condemnation of these dictatorial practices this evening.

Mr President, the words expended on a subject like this may be many or few. Having heard what this Parliament has had to say, I think the Commission can be brief. Perhaps I may make one comment on an economic aspect which has been mentioned by a few of the speakers in this debate. For its part the Commission has avoided any direct contact with the present government of Uruguay, and has also refused to attend the meetings of the Joint Commission deriving from the trade agreement. I would point out, by the way, that this is a pure trade agreement, which does not contain any preferential elements with respect to Uruguay.

It is my view, Mr President, and I should like to emphasize this here tonight, that there is no reason at all to believe that if this contract were annulled — admittedly the motion for a resolution does not call for this, but a number of speakers did imply this in the debate — it would lead to any kind of improvement of the situation with regard to human rights in Uruguay. The Committee for External Economic Relations has given its views on this.

The important thing, and I should like to emphasize this at the end of this brief speech, is that the Commission considers it of vital importance that every time a violation of human rights takes place, and particularly when such violations are as flagrant as they are in this case, the elected representatives of the people should make their views known, and should exert pressure on everyone who can do anything at all to remedy the situation, to make use of their influence, no matter how limited it is — and you know that the influence of the Commission, too, is limited.

President. — I call Mrs Van den Heuvel.

Mrs Van den Heuvel, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I should like first of all to thank all of those who were kind enough to comment favourably on my work, although I attach little importance to such

Van den Heuvel

praise, but particularly to thank those who have endeavoured to contribute something by their speeches. I found the account of our Greek colleague most impressive. It demonstrated yet again that international support is of great importance in difficult times, such as those which the Greek people had to live through during the rule of the colonels.

Nonetheless I feel I must correct him in one respect. Europe did not leave the Greek people in the lurch during the colonels' regime. I am proud to be able to say that my friend, Mr Van der Stoel, made great efforts for the oppressed Greek people as rapporteur of the Council of Europe on the question of Greece. This is the way I wish to continue working. I know from experience — it is something I observed when I visited Greece as part of a Dutch parliamentary delegation — how greatly the Greek people appreciated the efforts of Mr Van der Stoel. This is the spirit in which we must all try to work, particularly when the situation is such as we have described here this evening.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution and the amendments which have been tabled will be put to the vote at voting time tomorrow.

20. Regulations concerning sugar and isoglucose

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-792/80), drawn up by Mr Delatte on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the

proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-700/80) for

- I — a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1111/77 laying down common provisions for isoglucose
- II — a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1592/80 on the application of the system of production quotas in the sugar and isoglucose sectors during the period from 1 July 1980 to 30 June 1981.

I call Mr Louwes.

Mr Louwes, deputy rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, it is a big jump from Uruguay and the violation of human rights to one of the everyday problems of the Community. I will not dwell on Uruguay: I should just like to congratulate my two compatriots, Mr Van den Heuvel and Mr Andriessen, on their excellent speeches on this question.

To turn now to isoglucose and sugar: as Mr Delatte has had to leave Strasbourg, he asked me to introduce this report on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture.

Since the mid-70s it has been possible to produce isoglucose from maize starch, and this made it necessary to draw up a regulation for marketing the product. Isoglucose is a liquid sweetener, which can be used as a sugar substitute for some purposes. For sugar, there was and still is a Community regulation imposing a production quota and heavy financial co-responsibility on producers, both beet growers and sugar manufacturers. This made it essential to regulate the isoglucose market, so that the position of isoglucose on the sweetener market was similar to that of sugar. Obviously, if one party — in this case the sugar growers and manufacturers — is subject to restrictions and levies, the other cannot be allowed complete freedom. Neither Commission nor Council had much luck in drawing up or implementing a regulation on this. The Court of Justice has twice had to reprimand the Council, and the Commission, for their negligence; the first because of a more or less arithmetical imperfection with regard to content, the second time because of a procedural error involving our Parliament. The Council had adopted the regulation, which was due to enter into force on the 1 July 1979, without waiting for Parliament's opinion. In this instance the Court ruled that the regulation at issue must be declared void simply because of this infringement of procedure, and in my view it was quite right. The Court established that the actual content of the regulation was in conformity with Community law. All the facts and details of the proceedings are examined in the explanatory statement in the report and I shall therefore not go into them any further now.

I should like to make a further remark in connection with this subject. Isoglucose is often said to be a product of the future, a product of advanced research. I have my doubts about that and I will explain briefly why. In the first place — let's get this clear from the start — I do not want to criticize the research work in the starch industry, which is going through a bad patch. But I do not think it is true to say that this research has led to the development of a product which can compete well with sugar. In most Member States isoglucose has only won a modest share of the market thanks to tax benefits. Furthermore I would like to point out to the honourable Members that this sweetener can so far only be manufactured from imported maize, a raw material which is in very short supply in the EEC. Sugar on the other hand is entirely a product of the Community and a certain amount is exported every year, largely at the expense of the producers, and not at the expense of the taxpayer, and therefore not at the expense of the EAGGF. All praise to the enthusiastic research being carried out in the starch industry, but isoglucose is unlikely, in the circumstances in Europe, to represent a breakthrough into a new era of sweeteners.

My second and last remark deals with the queries put by some lawyer members about the supposed — and I repeat: supposed — retroactive effect. I too am against retroactive effect, if it creates legal uncertainty. Of

Louwes

course, every member of Parliament would oppose that. But there is no question of legal uncertainty here! All those involved were aware beforehand of the terms for the production of isoglucose. The Court of Justice also ruled that these terms were in conformity with Community law. Most producers, then, paid the required levies imposed by this draft regulation. All kept within the quotas, although they were not officially obliged to, because the Council had declared the regulation void, simply because of the infringement of procedural requirements. This procedural error is now, I hope, about to be rectified, but in all this time no-one has mentioned legal uncertainty. I would like therefore to appeal to my colleagues with more legal learning to drop their formal objections and I would like to ask all of you to approve this report of the Committee on Agriculture.

President. — I call Mr Vernimmen to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Vernimmen. — (NL) Mr President, I would of course gladly comply with your request, but might I just point out that for certain regions this problem is so important that — even though at first sight it appears to be of small interest — it deserves to be debated seriously in Parliament. The problem we are now facing is however, in my opinion, more a problem of industrial development than simply an agricultural matter, as has been made clear by the rapporteur himself. The production of isoglucose or liquid sugar is in fact, as the deputy rapporteur has also said, the result of advanced scientific research in the starch industry, and very advanced technology. Could we pretend that Europe does not need industries like this? That would be indefensible, for in a few years we could bind ourselves in deep water — the car industry should be a warning to us — when our economies and jobs are at the mercy of other countries with an even more advanced technology. Let's just consider why there are so many objections to this regulation? Isoglucose is, in the opinion of the sugar producers a competitive product which could pose a threat to their age-old monopoly. This is what has been claimed, and I must say at once that it is nonsense. Liquid sweeteners can only be used in certain sectors of industry such as soft drinks, confectionery, etc. Total production in Europe now stands in fact — despite the freedom allowed by the absence of regulations — at only 1.7 % of total sugar production. Without the imposition of any quotas, isoglucose holds at the moment only 2 % of the market. I feel that for an old industry like sugar such a percentage must be completely negligible, especially in the eyes of those who oppose protectionist measures so strongly, and are so much in favour of maintaining the free market economy. There are many who confuse sugar with sugar beet; indeed, the income of many of our farmers depends on sugar beet. In the present day structure of our agriculture, sugar beet is an important resource, and in some cases,

in some areas, the only source of income. Whenever this situation arises, agricultural experts must urgently consider whether such one-sided production is not in the long run somewhat dangerous for agriculture as a whole. In some European countries, premiums are still awarded for the production of sugar beet, often in areas where the climate and soil could almost certainly produce certain crops which at the moment have to be imported on a massive scale. In fact, if in the near future the sugar market collapses — and I hope it doesn't — it will in the first place be the farmer, and not the sugar industry, who will have to foot the bill.

The sugar industry has put forward another argument — more or less along the lines of the European Commission's argument, namely: the maize starch industry uses raw materials 50 % of which have to be imported into the Community. We do not grow maize on a large scale simply because we don't want to. It has been claimed that maize is being bought against world prices, but nothing could be further from the truth. The levies are so high that the cost price of maize processed in Europe is double the world market price. When the raw material is so heavily taxed to begin with, any levy is simply absurd. The product might as well be banned, which would be an infringement of the EEC Treaty. This proposal comes virtually to the same thing.

The fourth and last argument against the isoglucose regulation: this regulation was declared void by the Court of Justice on 25 October 1978, and again on 25 June 1979. The Commission, as though nothing had happened, is now proposing that the old regulation be declared valid with retroactive effect to 25 June 1979, at a time when the new regulation is already in preparation in the Committee on Agriculture. This proposal consequently meets with disapproval from Parliament. The concept of 'retroactive effect' is always problematic from the legal point of view, and the regulation might well give rise to legal problems. Indeed the inclusion of a clause in the regulation to the effect that production may only amount to 85 % of the industrial capacity, is a slap in the face in a period of economic crisis. For all these reasons I shall vote against this regulation, which amounts to more than just protectionism, and protectionism inside the Community, at that.

President. — I call Mrs Barbarella to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Barbarella. — (I) Mr President, I would like to make one or two remarks on our contribution to the proposals tabled by the Commission.

We feel that the new regulations proposed for the isoglucose sector would fill a legal gap which has been left open for far too long. Secondly, we feel that the measures embodied in these regulations are in line with the decisions taken by the Court of Justice which

Barbarella

did not contest the substance, but only the irregular procedure by which they were adopted, that is, without obtaining our Parliament's opinion.

We are, therefore, in agreement with the general content of the Delatte report, but we feel nevertheless that it should be stated, at the beginning of the resolution, that the approval of these proposals must in no way prejudice the future provisions on isoglucose. These provisions will be discussed in due course in the appropriate offices of the Commission, the Council, and our Parliament. This is why Mr Diana and I tabled an amendment which, in our view, serves simply to state more clearly what is in part contained in the Delatte report. I hope I have been brief enough, Mr President.

President. — I call Mr De Keersmaecker to speak on behalf of the European People's Party (Christian Democrat Group).

Mr De Keersmaecker. — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I want to begin by saying that we are ill-advised to regard this subject in such black-and-white terms. Of course, everyone is inclined to present their arguments as forcefully as possible. Indeed, if I wanted to follow suit, I could very easily settle the whole debate by pointing out that the Court of Justice has already supplied all the arguments on the substance of the matter, since it declared this regulation void on the grounds of infringement of essential procedural requirements, but rejected all the complaints of those who had appealed against the regulation, who claimed that it violated the principles of the law of competition, proportionality and equality of treatment, and created discrimination. All the — admittedly respectable — arguments advanced by the isoglucose producers are invalidated by the fact that the sugar market is controlled by a system imposing production quotas. It was the aim of the European Community to draw up a similar system for a sector similar to sugar and in competition with it. The question is then quite simply whether this system is really comparable, fair, and efficient. As to the fairness of it, the Court of Justice has put forward conclusive arguments and we must not waste time repeating what is already stated very clearly in both the Commission report and the Delatte report. I would just like to mention that a regulation proposed by the Commission for the fats and oils sector was based on similar arguments. In this case a co-responsibility levy was introduced for the fats and oils sector, which was competing with certain sectors of the dairy industry. In fact Parliament and the Council dropped the Commission's proposal, not on the ground of discrimination or unfairness, but for reasons of consumer protection.

The second point is whether this ruling is useful; in other words, is it achieving what it was intended to

achieve? Some people are trying to claim that isoglucose is only a liquid sweetener and so cannot really compete with the traditional sugar sector. This of course is not true. That is one aspect of it, but it is certainly not the whole truth. Others point out that it only accounts for 2% of total production in this sector: this does not get to the heart of the problem either. I do not think we should try to make out that this measure is acting as a damper on the further development of what is really a progressive sector of the industry. I would just point out that one of the most prominent isoglucose concerns is situated not far from my home, in the middle of my European constituency. I can assure you that I take the greatest possible interest in it, especially from the point of view of the employment problem in this sector, but that should not exempt us from the obligation to look at this sector from every point of view. I am fully aware of the problem but, as with other sectors — the car industry and the steel industry for example — we must consider it in the light of the need to maintain or recover the balance of trade in this sector. We should look to the future — and this is the aim of the Bocklet report — and try to formulate an overall market plan for the sugar sector. But in the meantime, for the reasons put forward both by the rapporteur and the Commission, our Group will support the draft resolution for this transitional period, under the conditions set by the Commission.

President. — I call Mr Remilly to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

Mr Remilly. — *(F)* Mr President, we are dealing once again with the fundamental problem of sugar substitutes, and in this case with isoglucose. This is a product whose chemical composition and properties are virtually identical to those of invert sugar, which is obtained from saccharose, and which can be used as a substitute for the latter in a large number of products in which sugar is used.

In the Community, where isoglucose has begun to be produced, the potential of the industrial plants built so far is growing. This rapid growth is linked to the existence of three types of distortions of competition, working to the disadvantage of beet and cane sugar: the first production refunds on maize starch; the second, tax on sugar, in particular excise duties in several countries of the EEC: Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy; and third, the fact that the production and marketing of beet and cane sugar is subject, in the EEC, to controls and restrictions, and to the payment of a contribution to marketing costs, while its direct rival has so far escaped any control, restriction, limitation or contribution.

A Community policy whose effect is to promote the use of glucose syrup to the detriment of beet and cane sugar is therefore completely irrational. On the one

Remilly

hand it increases the need to import maize, on the other hand, it decreases the outlets for sugar, making it necessary to export. Every tonne of glucose syrup with a high fructose content sold in the EEC means that an equivalent quantity of Community sugar must be exported. By pursuing this policy, which results in twofold expenditure for the EAGGF — production refunds for maize starch, export refunds for sugar — we are in fact increasing the Community sugar producers' contribution to marketing costs.

We therefore welcome this desire to control production. The Commission's original proposal for a production levy was a satisfactory first step; the Court of Justice felt otherwise. The Commission is now proposing a similar system to the one used for sugar with a range of quotas, but let us not forget that isoglucose is a semi-industrial product and is therefore not subject to natural fluctuations in production conditions. Because of this, the application of quotas could be more strict and therefore less complex. One very restrictive quota might be adequate. It would allow better protection for our sugar and beet producers, especially for sugar cane producers in France's overseas departments.

May I, Mr President, conclude by complimenting Mr Delatte on his report and assuring him, on behalf of my Group, of our full support.

President. — I call Mr Richard.

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I should like first of all to thank Mr Delatte for his report and indeed for producing it as quickly as he has done. May I also say, since this is the first time that I have had the privilege of addressing the Parliament, that it is a pleasure for me to be here. I see all the ranks packed in order to listen to my maiden speech!

(Laughter)

We have had a brisk debate, Mr President, on an issue of some importance to which the Commission has indeed given a great deal of thought. I think Honourable Members will find that the Commission's explanatory memorandum accompanying the two proposed regulations explains in full the circumstances in which the Community now finds itself. There are a number of points which I think are worth emphasizing. Most of them indeed have been raised in the course of this short debate.

Briefly, the situation is that on 29 October last year, the European Court annulled certain legislative proposals which were previously applied to isoglucose as part of the common agricultural policy. The result is that the essential elements in that policy, namely production quotas and production levies, are at present

inoperative. The Court's decision to annul the Council regulation concerned was based on the fact — and I emphasize this point to Parliament — that the procedure for consultation with Parliament was not properly followed by Council before the regulation became law. I think one must also draw Parliament's attention to the fact that the Court affirmed that the annulled provisions were fully in conformity with Community law itself. In other words, the annulment was based on an infringement of procedure and not on the nature of the provisions themselves.

We, therefore, Mr President, now have what I suppose one could call a juridical vacuum extending back to 1 July 1979, and the Commission believes strongly — and I very much hope that Parliament will share this view — that it is both necessary and urgent to fill the gap by revalidating the previous legislative provisions as soon as possible. This is necessary because the Community must restore the legal basis on which certain actions were taken, notably the charging of a production levy on isoglucose in respect of the 1979/80 marketing year. It is urgent because the delay in restoring the status quo which existed previously would inevitably lead to uncertainty for all concerned, not least the isoglucose industry itself. It will also make it difficult to implement a policy which is designed primarily to achieve a fair and reasonable balance between the sugar and isoglucose sectors.

It is for these reasons that the Commission could not accept Amendments Nos 3 and 4, because they would negate the whole purpose of our proposal. On the other hand the Commission has great pleasure in accepting the amendment which was moved by Mrs Barbarella.

I would like to stress one further point. What we are now seeking to do by way of restoring previous provisions is without prejudice to the future isoglucose regime. The restored provisions would in any case lapse next June, would be replaced by a new five-year regime, the proposals for which are now before Parliament.

I was encouraged, Mr President, by the very positive endorsement given to Mr Delatte's report by the Committee on Agriculture last Monday, and I hope Parliament itself will find no difficulty in approving the committee's proposed motion for a resolution on this matter.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution and the amendments which have been tabled will be put to the vote at voting time tomorrow.

21. *Framework agreement for cooperation between the EEC and Brazil*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-529/80), drawn up by Mr Louwes on behalf of the

President

Committee on External Economic Relations, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-456/80) for a regulation on the conclusion of a framework agreement for cooperation between the European Economic Community and the Federative Republic of Brazil.

I call Mr Louwes.

Mr Louwes, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I am sorry that I have had to ask for extra time, despite the late hour, but we are dealing with an agreement with a great and proud country, and I think it only right that this House should devote some time to it.

On behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations I should like to discuss a few important points which we decided to include in our report to Parliament on this agreement between the EEC and Brazil.

During the Committee's discussions we felt it extremely important to emphasize that Brazil is a country which has only recently become industrialized, that it has enormous production capacity and potential, and that it is able to export a range of industrial and agricultural products to the Community. We are therefore dealing with a trading partner, and it should be emphasized in the agreement that the agreement is not about development aid but about paving the way for trade and economic cooperation. Our Committee therefore decided that this motion for a resolution should make it clear that this agreement between Brazil and the Community should be based on reciprocity.

We also analysed Brazil's economic structure and drew attention, in particular, to the way that country has developed over the past 20 to 30 years and is still continuing to develop. Just imagine, last year alone Brazil's economic growth reached 8.5 %, while in the Community it hardly exceeded 0.5 %! Brazil is now an economic power of the first order. True, it is struggling with serious economic problems, mainly as a result of the need to import increasingly large amounts of oil. Our report states that the proportion of the export revenue used to pay for energy imports has increased from 9 % ten years ago 48 % last year. This has contributed towards a staggeringly high rate of inflation of 113 %, inconceivable for us western Europeans, and has of course prompted drastic economic measures, for example the 30 % devaluation of the cruzeiro in 1979 together with a shift of emphasis from the economic policy to domestic agriculture, and if my information is correct, this last measure has been successful.

The EEC is the largest single market for Brazilian goods and in 1978 absorbed about one-third of Brazil's exports. Obviously, therefore, this agreement is as much in Brazil's interest as in the Community's. This is

borne out by the fact that over the past year the Community's trade deficit with Brazil has amounted to 1 thousand million units of account. And now a few other comments. Brazil is deliberately restricting the flow of Community goods onto its own market by means of import duties and deposits, by making it difficult to obtain import licences and by introducing legislation under which importers must prove that no similar domestically produced goods exist which are comparable in terms of price, quality and delivery time. If such goods do exist, the importer must pay heavy import duties. Such a policy over the long term is totally unacceptable to the Community. Once again I would draw attention to the requirement for reciprocity in these trade arrangements.

Another very important problem with regard to Brazil is investment by industrial undertakings which have their headquarters in the Community. Brazil's considerable industrial development has been largely due to imported technology and foreign investment. In this cooperation agreement attention is paid to the problems of protecting such investment. Unfortunately, owing to a disagreement between the Member States it was not possible to produce any clear-cut wording of the text on this issue. Some of the smaller Member States had wanted to see specific provisions applied in this area instead of the vague declarations of good will which the agreement now contains. But, Mr President, this may be achieved later after the five years covered by the agreement.

Another problem connected with trade with Brazil is that of discrimination against ships flying a foreign flag. For years Brazil has been pursuing a policy of discrimination against ships flying a foreign flag as a guarantee that goods exported from Brazil to Europe are transported on Brazilian ships. The trade agreement which preceded this one contained a declaration which referred to this problem and in which an undertaking was given that a solution would be sought in the future. So far nothing has been achieved, and the Committee on External Economic Relations has therefore found it necessary to state that empty declarations of this kind are no longer sufficient. The time has come for Brazil to realize that it has to adjust to the general trading rules observed by industrialized countries. My committee ended its report by mentioning certain conditions which it feels Brazil should meet in the near future. These include the requirement that Brazil should become a signatory of GATT, abolish tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade, halt export subsidies for its industrial products, facilitate capital investment for companies in the Community and provide investors from the Community with a greater measure of security.

Lastly, my Committee wanted to draw attention to the need to limit the concessions granted to Brazil under the system of generalized preferences. The Committee feels that this system should normally benefit the

Louwes

poorest countries in the world rather than the more industrialized nations.

Mr President, I am approaching the end of this brief survey of my Committee's discussions on Brazil and would like to conclude by saying that the report now before Parliament was approved in its present form by all the groups in the Committee. It is more than just a set of economic observations concerning trade with Brazil alone. It also contains a number of comments which could be applied to Community trade with certain other countries which have only recently become industrialized. These comments — and I would stress this point — should therefore be regarded more as statements of principle.

Brazil is an unimaginably vast country. It is the largest of the Latin American countries and, all things considered, politically and economically one of the most stable. It is extremely important that the Community should establish close links with Latin America, a continent with enormous potential. If it is to explore these possibilities, the Community should be prepared to open up its markets so that the younger industries which are growing in South America — and in particular in Brazil — are able to export their products to the Community. The only demand we make is that the arrangements should be mutual, that is access to the Brazilian market, and to those of the newly industrialized countries in general, should be made easier for our products. This is far from being the case at present. But I hope — and here I think I speak for the entire Committee on External Economic Relations — that our trade with the newly industrialized countries will grow considerably in the coming years and that political and economic considerations will lead us to forge closer links with Brazil. That is furthermore completely in line with the Community's liberal trading ideals, according to which exchanges of goods and services should be as intensive as possible and benefit everyone — at least, that is how my Committee interprets them. On behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations I therefore call upon Parliament to approve this report.

President. — I call Mr Seeler to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Seeler. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to thank Mr Louwes most sincerely for his excellent report in which he sets out the economic importance of this agreement. I can thus put aside three pages of notes and concentrate in my short speech on a second aspect of this treaty. Besides the economic effects already discussed, this treaty also has numerous political consequences. South America is increasingly demanding more attention from us in Europe. They no longer want to be a sort of backyard to the United States but are seeking relations of their own with the European Community. Although Latin

America will in the future undoubtedly be of increasing economic importance for the European Community — both as a supplier of raw materials and as a market for European products — the development of political relations is of no less importance.

It is here, ladies and gentlemen, that I see the prime significance of this cooperation agreement with Brazil. So far, however, it is not very clear what conception the Commission is pursuing, either in relation to South America in general or in relation to the rest of the world. I should therefore like to insist that the Commission should in the near future present and explain to Parliament its South America policy, if I may call it that, and also, I would add, its policy with regard to cooperation agreements.

Although it would be wrong to overestimate the content of the agreement, I should like, if I may, to make two critical comments. The safeguarding of investments is dealt with in this treaty only in very general terms. If experience hitherto with Brazil is anything to go by, this is far from satisfactory. My second remark concerns seaborne trade, which the rapporteur has already discussed. The contentious question of the transport of goods by sea between Brazil and the European Community has once again remained open and is to be dealt with simply by an ultimately meaningless exchange of letters.

My Group therefore intends to vote tomorrow for Amendment No 1 by Mr Müller-Hermann. The same goes for Amendment No 2. It must naturally be the aim of the European Community to use its cooperation policy also to help improve the position of working people and reduce poverty. I would add that our aim is and will continue to be to strengthen democracy and democratic conditions.

My Group, does not, on the other hand, support the third amendment tabled by Mrs Squarcialupi, not so much because we do not share the aims expressed in this amendment — calling for the observance of international standards in working conditions in Brazil — but quite simply because this has no place in a cooperation agreement.

Ladies and gentlemen, we in Europe must be careful not to arouse the slightest suspicion of interference in the internal affairs of our partners. We do not want to be schoolmasters to the world, and the truth is that we are not an untarnished example for the world either.

I should like in conclusion, if I may, to comment on the procedure applied here. Together with the budget, external trade is one of the few genuine responsibilities of the Community, and it is therefore regrettable that this point could not be dealt with until this evening, when the public gallery is practically empty. This observation is nothing new. Many of the Members still here have previously commented on this sort of thing. We should, however, for once give some thought to

Seeler

whether this cannot be changed. My proposal — and I address this to the Bureau — is that Question Time, which is only attended by those interested, should be moved from Monday and Wednesday to Thursday evening; this would give us three hours for dealing with this and other similarly important reports.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us be under no illusions: in the outside world Europe's political weight is often given greater importance than in our own countries. It is up to us as Members of Parliament to take account of this fact — and to do so quickly.

President. — Mr Seeler, the Bureau will take account of your suggestion.

I call Mr Van Aerssen to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

Mr Van Aerssen. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European People's Party would like to thank Mr Louwes most sincerely for his report. We support him on this matter and appreciate his conclusions. We therefore hardly need to go into the details of his analysis now.

In political terms, we rate this agreement very highly. We believe that with this agreement we have managed to forge a link with the Latin American continent. This is the European Community's first attempt to forge contacts in these countries on a joint and, I think, fraternal basis, for Europeans in particular have a special responsibility towards these countries, having influenced this continent culturally for many centuries.

I believe that the European Community, as the biggest trading power in the world, which has no armed forces at its disposal but is a major force for peace, can in future achieve great things from this link, and I also think that when we meet our colleagues of the Latin American Conference next week in Bogotá we should present this cooperation agreement as a very useful example of how we can further democracy and freedom.

I am extremely grateful to Mr Seeler for his remark that it is not for us to be constantly interfering in the internal politics of other countries but that we should make it our concern to use our good offices in the world and try to find a basis, by means of more stable economic conditions, for furthering peace and freedom throughout the world.

Against this background we are particularly glad that this agreement has gone through with so little delay and so unanimously, particularly as with Spain and Portugal our family in the European Community will shortly be joined by members who have as it were a natural role as interpreters to Latin America and who

can work with us to help achieve our joint aim of improving economic and political conditions.

With this agreement the European Community has also, however, taken a further strategic step. It has shown its determination to diversify its heavy dependence on raw materials — we talk mainly of being dependent on oil, but the same goes for other raw materials — and to develop contacts with a country which is in a position to ease the strain on the European Community in this respect. That is something which deserves emphatic support, and we should make it our business to see that the necessary investment is undertaken.

Mr Louwes made it clear in his report that there is as yet no final solution to the problem of investments and the protection of investments in Brazil. I think the same goes not just for this one country but in general, and in this connection I should like to state on behalf of my Group that we support the Commission's efforts to draw up a charter for *all* investment measures in countries of the Third World and in the new industrial countries. This has our wholehearted support and we particularly welcome the document submitted by the Commission on this question.

Mr President, like Mr Seeler I am sorry we are holding a debate today which is basically too late, that is too late to give the European Parliament, as the sovereign representative of the people of Europe, any chance of influencing the course and content of the negotiations. We know that this is a situation we cannot continue to accept. Today's debate puts the seal on what is right; we do not, however, as responsible representatives of our electorate, have any further chance of saying to our friends in Brazil how we would like things to be or what we could do better. Mr Louwes talked about what could have been done differently. What this means, Mr President, is that the only way open to us is to improve the Luns-Westerterp procedure, and I would therefore ask you, Mr President, to inform the Bureau that we as responsible members of the Legal Affairs Committee are absolutely determined to see that Parliament is granted the right to be involved in shaping the European Community's external trade agreements.

My Group, Mr President, would like to raise a further point which Mr Louwes was not able to include in his report but which, as he made quite clear, he and his colleagues have considered, i.e. that representatives of the European Parliament should be able to take part as observers, or even as full members, in the so-called cooperation committees. These committees are what actually gives substance to these framework agreements. There is a great need for these committees to take a creative and dynamic approach, and it is very important for expert representatives of the European Parliament, as members of the corresponding delegations, to have at least the opportunity of taking part in these cooperation committees. This does not, Mr Pres-

Van Aerssen

ident, mean mixing up the executive and the legislature. What it does mean is that the legislature, in other words this directly elected European Parliament, must be given a chance to influence the shape and further development of these agreements. My Group reserves the right to raise this matter again in this House and to ask other Members to join us in this, as we know there are Members of other groups who also want to move in this direction and have been considering suitable initiatives.

Mr President, finally I should like to say that we cannot support the amendment by Mrs Squarcialupi of the Communist Group, as it is our view that this must be dealt with in the Cooperation Committee. It is not a matter for the Agreement as such but a problem which can be discussed with the Brazilians in that committee.

In conclusion, Mr President, we value this agreement as a contribution to stabilizing democracy in Brazil and stabilizing relations between the European Community and South America. We should like once again to thank Mr Louwes and all those who have contributed to this report in the Legal Affairs Committee, as we have hereby finally succeeded in forging a link with Latin America.

President. — I call Lord O'Hagan to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Lord O'Hagan. — Mr President, I hope you will rap your gavel very hard if I exceed my time-limit but please allow me one extra second to congratulate my compatriot Commissioner Ivor Richard on his first and characteristically penetrating intervention in our debates.

This is a very important subject. The Community is Brazil's largest export market and we, the Members of the Community, are the largest foreign investors in Brazil.

I should like, on behalf of my group, to pay tribute to the persistent and important work of Mr Louwes in bringing forward this report to the debate.

It is very important that the Member States of the Community give the Commission a clear mandate to negotiate with Brazil on the same basis as we did recently with Japan. We need a simple position with clear objectives for all the Member States to back the Commission in these negotiations. I am only sorry that Mr Louwes did not include the five points on pages 21 and 22 of this excellent report in the actual memorandum.

Mr President, there is one danger in these debates. We indulge in too many mutual congratulations. All we need to say tonight is that this report is on the right lines. We need to make cooperation agreements some-

thing real, not just a formal exercise in themselves. They must be developed into political reality. Brazil is important to the Community — we are important to Brazil. Let us have a basis of reciprocity between us both. I hope Mr Louwes' excellent work will be translated into full political actuality soon and I hope that Mr Louwes will not find my compliments to him and his excellent and formidable work too sugary.

President. — I call Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli. — (I) Mr President, we are in favour of the agreement, which is in line with the development of relations with Latin America and therefore with Brazil, which is the chief partner of the Community among Third World countries.

Given this trade policy position, with which — I repeat — we agree, and accepting the line taken by our rapporteur, whom I, too, wish to thank for his painstaking work, I would like to mention a few things which perhaps could not be said in the agreement, but which we as a European Parliament must undoubtedly bear in mind. In the background there is a Brazilian reality which we cannot ignore, and which we must bear in mind in order to see what can be achieved in applying the agreement.

Firstly we would like to mention that the system of export subsidies implemented on a massive scale in Brazil prevents Brazilian industry from diversifying, developing and becoming competitive. We must realize that for some products the position is on the verge of dumping. These are wood, soya, stainless steels and steel tubes. Secondly, Parliament must be aware, and keep in mind, that the economy and internal life of Brazil suffer from two serious handicaps. The first is the absence of an agrarian reform, which is very far from being launched, and this has repercussions, with which we are all familiar on employment, on urban development — where I would not hesitate to describe the position as tragic — and in the expulsion of small landowners from Amazonia and the Mato Grosso.

The second handicap is the absence of a fiscal reform, and if this is not carried out Brazil's public debt will increase. This is one of the factors which most weigh down the Brazilian economy, as our rapporteur rightly pointed out.

Thirdly, we do not think that the process of democratization of that country can be so calmly regarded as a foregone conclusion, Mr President. I would say frankly to the rapporteur that in our view a mere mention of social tensions is not enough, because we are all aware of the social and regional disparities in that country, and of the repressive measures directed at trade union activity. Moreover, arrests of trade union leaders and suppression of strikes are quite

Carettoni Romagnoli

frequent. We know what working conditions are like in that country. That is why we are in favour of Amendment No 2 and take the view that perhaps the tablers of Amendments Nos 2 and 3 could combine those amendments, with the spirit of which we entirely agree.

I would add that, in my view, in the report itself there should have been a more explicit reference to the tragic unemployment in Brazil. Since we talk about our very serious employment crisis, I think we should also admit that the employment crisis in Brazil is really disastrous. To this must be added the problem of free movement of persons — a principle which is constantly disputed in that country. Moreover, no democrat can fail to be concerned at the news of attacks against the Church there.

I am entirely convinced that Parliament, in drafting a report and approving it, and approving what is in essence a new and closer relationship with the great country of Brazil, cannot ignore these aspects, which concern us all and our consciences as European democrats.

President. — I call Mr Andriessen.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, I would like to begin by expressing my appreciation, on behalf of the Commission, for the excellent work carried out by the Committee on External Economic Relations and of course in particular by its rapporteur, Mr Louwes, in his report on the conclusion of a framework agreement between the European Economic Community and the Federative Republic of Brazil. The fact that the Committee approved the report unanimously is in itself seen by the Commission as an indication of its quality. I also echo the view expressed here that it is extremely important for Europe to develop the best possible trade relations with Brazil, and with Latin America in general, since this would be of enormous benefit to both continents.

The Community is very important to Brazil, and vice versa. In the field of investment in particular considerable opportunities are open to the Community in Brazil. I have no doubt that this new cooperation agreement will strengthen existing relations and that they will be more effective as a result. Of course, the Commission is willing to comply with the request made in the resolution that Parliament and its committees should be supplied with all information needed to make a continuous and satisfactory assessment of what is being achieved under the agreement. If the agreement were continuously assessed, this could help to ensure that it is implemented effectively, for as has been rightly pointed out, we shall have to work on the agreement in the future, because certain sections are

rather vague and need to be reworded more specifically in concrete cooperation agreements.

I may briefly return to this point in a moment when discussing the procedure governing international treaties.

Obviously, the Commission notes with approval the comments concerning contact between the Parliaments of both — I would almost say — ‘continents’, because Brazil can almost be described as a continent. As a former parliamentarian I am aware that contact between parliaments can be very useful — though honesty compels me to say that this is not always the case — but they can play a valuable part and can promote developments like those referred to in this agreement.

I would now like to reply briefly to a number of positive questions raised by certain Members. Mr Louwes and another speaker referred to the problem of shipping. This problem, the significance of which I appreciate, should be the subject of multilateral negotiations and regulations, and it should be possible to resolve it in the context of a bilateral agreement of this kind. As far as the procedure for approving such agreements is concerned — a point raised by Mr Aerssen, among others — I have noted his comment that his Group would be submitting proposals to Parliament on ways of improving this procedure. I am well aware that Parliament has already discussed this matter. Naturally, the Commission is eagerly awaiting these proposals and is willing to discuss ways of improving institutional procedures with Parliament and the other institutions. Whether this should include the participation of Parliament in groups which prepare cooperation agreements is a point which I think we should discuss again. The honourable Member has already stated that he wishes to draw a clear distinction between the executive and legislative powers. I think we would do well to discuss the subtle differences between these at a later stage.

The Commission is of course prepared to enter into discussions with Parliament on general matters of policy on this issue and on our policy *vis-à-vis* Latin America.

Finally, to turn to the suggestion concerning the problem of working conditions in cooperation agreements: Parliament is aware that the Commission has repeatedly tried to take account of this problem in international agreements. The Lomé Convention is a case in point — as Parliament is also aware — but so far the Commission’s efforts have not produced the desired result. In conclusion I would like to express my thanks for Parliament’s contribution to this important topic and for the way in which it has tackled this problem.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution and the amendments which have been tabled will be put to the vote at voting time tomorrow.

22. Information policy of the Community

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-596/80), drawn up by Mr Schall on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on the information policy of the European Community, of the Commission of the European Communities and of the European Parliament.

I call Mr Schall.

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would first like to thank you, Mr President, and all those members present for your patience and forbearance. I might begin with a quote from Schiller: *Nacht muß es sein, wenn Friedlands Sterne strahlen.*

The Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport set itself an ambitious task in preparing the own-initiative report on information policy. Firstly, the Community's entire information system was examined and assessed from its origins a few decades ago to the present day, and an appraisal made of its present relevance. The purpose was to apply the Community's many years' experience of developing its information service in preparing an information policy which is futuristic and appropriate in view of the importance of the merging together of Europe.

Such an ambitious task had to be carried out without fear of political, organizational and informational considerations or criticism, where this was felt necessary. Those carrying out the investigations had to be receptive to new ideas and suggestions.

The report is based on four fundamental principles, which form the backbone of the motion for a resolution.

I shall discuss these principles by way of introduction to the report and shall not dwell on the individual assessments, recommendations and detailed proposals, as these may be read in the motion for a resolution and in greater detail in the explanatory statement.

The first and most important principle expressed in the report is the conviction that even the best information policy cannot turn a half-hearted or even misguided policy into a sound, futuristic policy which can be grasped by everyone; on the other hand, in modern pluralistic democracy, in the present technological consumer society even the best policy is doomed, if not to failure, then to incompleteness if such a policy is not made appealing and convincing to the general public who, in a democracy, are the ultimate rulers. In other words, a sound policy is a prerequisite, but good information is the basis on which such a policy can be applied to the future.

This brings me to the second principle, which determined the form of the report, its structure, inner logic and — for a parliamentary document — its doubtlessly unusual degree of detail.

Following the first direct elections to the European Parliament, it should be a fundamental requirement for each member of Parliament, apart from questions of political detail and experts' questions, to have an overall picture of the Community's general information policy. No one depends more on being able to make his personal and political actions clear, understandable and therefore convincing to his fellow citizens than the parliamentarian, who is elected on the basis of confidence in his ability and judged according to his success or failure after five years. No member of Parliament can gain an accurate impression of all the ramifications and constraints of all fields in which politics in general play a part.

Public information on the political effectiveness of the European Commission as the executive body of the European Community and on the European Parliament as the initiating and progressive agent moving towards European union and as a supervisory body is of vital importance if, as we hope and strive for, the authority of Parliament as a whole grows along with, on a more local and personal level, that of its members.

If there is one political field dealt with by Parliament for which the motto *Tua res agitur* holds true for each of its members, then it is information policy.

In line with this principle I tried to give a very detailed account of the historical background and present state of the information services both of the Commission and of Parliament, weighing up the importance of one medium against the other and sorting out the important from the unimportant. My overall purpose was to help all members of Parliament, and not only those concerned with information policy in the Commission and Parliament, to become more sensitive to the role of information, its shortcomings and future prospects.

The whole information service of the European Community is a world-wide organization employing many hundreds of experts and is a major institution. It is well-known that large institutions mainly draw on four kinds of resources, which can operate successfully if successfully applied. They are the following:

firstly, an organization effectively tailored to the aims and tasks of the institution;

secondly, the timely and effective use of resources to achieve these tasks, in this case the use of appropriate information media;

thirdly, an appropriate personnel policy, i.e. effective selection, allocation of tasks and staff training;

Schall

fourthly, the financial resources needed for the effectiveness of the organization, personnel and the information media needed.

In line with the principle of running an institution the prerequisites already mentioned for a successful information policy were therefore examined and assessed in the report. In such an analysis the principles governing the allocation of tasks among personnel can obviously be kept fairly brief. Organizational recommendations and criticisms required more detailed justification. References to the necessary financial resources appear virtually throughout the analysis. The examination of the information media used hitherto and to be used in the future must take up most space. The present report takes account of these four considerations.

The financial resources needed for information policy call for special comment.

The most casual glance reveals the discrepancy between the tasks of modern information and advertising and the financial resources set aside for these. This is without doubt the most delicate and thorny problem in the whole report, but it lies at the heart of any political decision which Parliament may take in the future. True, money can hardly compensate for poor organization; it is wasted if personnel policy is weak and cannot improve the effectiveness of mischosen information media. On the other hand, theoretically optimum tasks, effective organization, personnel policy and use of information media can never achieve their full potential without the funds required in keeping with the political significance and necessary scope of modern information systems. Without adequate financial resources they are doomed to failure from the outset. The most important political decision which this report requires Parliament to take is that it should recognize this fact and act accordingly in the future. For in basically recognizing this fact Parliament will have to decide whether it really wants to change the public's widely acknowledged lack of awareness of the merging together of Europe, or whether it will continue to be content with complaining, without having the courage to do anything about it.

As far as the information media and the detailed analysis, assessment and recommendations made in the report are concerned, we have to adopt a scale of priorities. What is essential to the achievement of our objectives, and what is merely desirable? The desirable, as we all know, can never be completely attained. So it is all the more important for us to distinguish between the necessary and the desirable. The report therefore contains the bulk of the material to be analysed and the majority of the recommendations, and allows ample scope for specific evaluations and new proposals.

Lastly, I would like to mention a fourth principle which has radically influenced both the form and

content of the report, namely the separate treatment of the information policies of the Commission and of Parliament.

The preamble to the motion for a resolution and the introduction to the explanatory statement take full account of this principle. Although their tasks differ, the ultimate aims of both institutions, namely to provide political information and promote a united Europe, are the same. But even this House is divided on this point. For the report is founded on the determination to support European union on the basis of the Rome Treaties and to help develop this further using the modern techniques of information and publicity.

Those who are half-hearted or even hostile towards Europe will certainly object to many aspects of the report, which may even be used as a test of dedication to the European cause. In addition to the necessary factual information for the citizens of Europe and their information disseminators and lobby groups, a quite deliberate attempt is made in many parts of the report to make an emotional appeal. People who 20 years ago were fascinated by the idea of a united Europe should once again come to feel and recognize that the time is ripe for endowing Europe's greatness and economic influence with a definitive political form necessary to ensure that in future we live in peace and cooperation with all nations. The report should therefore also stimulate a rebirth of information policy and not be a mere factual description the value of which is soon forgotten in everyday political life.

In the closing section of the motion for a resolution it is recommended that in future annual reports should be submitted to the Commission and the Directorate-General for Information of the Parliament to monitor the implementation of the report and that the executive and legislative authorities should jointly ensure that the necessary progress is being made in information policy. Parliament's task is therefore to continue to perform its statutory monitoring functions while constantly striving to improve the policy.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, having outlined the four major principles on which this report is founded, I attach particular significance to the fact that the report was accepted unanimously by the committee, irrespective of the differing political views of its members. On behalf of the entire committee I would like at this point to extend my warmest thanks to our chairman, Mr Pedini, for his wide experience, skill and patience with which he directed the drafting of the report and the many technical discussions right up to the final meeting.

When drafting the final version of the report it was possible to accommodate the ideas and wishes of members of the most widely differing political groups in a spirit of mutual understanding and compromise without eliminating any awkward points which had

Schall

been deliberately included. Again, as rapporteur, I would like to extend my sincere thanks to my fellow committee members, regardless of their political affiliations, for their consistently positive criticism and for numerous suggestions which have been included in the report and which will be the subject of numerous motions for amendment.

The committee's unanimous acceptance of the report prompts us to hope that, in keeping with the importance of the Community's information policy and the need to strike out in new directions, the report will meet the approval of as many members of this House as possible.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Member of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, I regard it as a happy coincidence that, having taken over the responsibility for Commission information policy only a few days ago, I should see on this dark night a star shining in the form of the Schall Report — a weighty report which has been presented this evening competently, passionately and, I would even say, lyrically.

My speech will be extremely brief and concise, partly because, as the rapporteur rightly stressed, both he and the Commission intend this report, I would say, to be the beginning of a new life. Perhaps after that quotation from Schiller, I may be allowed to quote something in Latin: 'Incipit vita nova'. But, clearly, a new life must also take account of past experiences and of a series of activities which are bound to be the object of study and debate.

I would like to say at once that I hope — and I have already informed the chairman of the committee, Mr Pedini, to whom I address my greetings — to have a meeting as soon as possible with the parliamentary committee to discuss matters in an even more specific way, in order to study together the means by which our common objectives can be achieved.

Indeed, we are faced with a considerable problem — how can an ever closer union among the European peoples be brought about without involving in it the individual citizens of the ten countries of the Community?

Undoubtedly, the election of Parliament by universal suffrage was a very significant milestone, but I think we are all aware that we still have a tremendous amount to do together in order to make Europe more tangible, more human and closer to everyday life. This Europe may sometimes appear to be the result of necessity, but it must also be seen to be the result of a great ambition and a great hope.

The Commission's aims in information policy seek to meet two requirements — that of the daily task, linked to Community activity, of communicating information to our fellow-citizens through all the channels now available, and that of creating and developing a real European awareness, without which it would be difficult, if not impossible, for us to make European integration progress.

At this point I would like to tell you that our intention is to pursue these two aims, which together form the basic objective which we must try to achieve, making improvements where that is possible, and launching new initiatives when the occasion arises. This report is also extremely important because of the detailed work which has gone into it.

I would like to say at once that for my part I shall take account of a number of suggestions which have been made, and I also undertake to implement a number of ideas with regard to internal organization, which as you know is the Commission's responsibility, and to which I intend to devote my attention.

Of course, in this first debate I cannot go into details, and in any case I do not think it is even the wish of Parliament to tackle the specific and detailed aspects of information policy, organizational structure and future modalities.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is not by chance that the motion for a resolution proposes the creation of a study group to tackle and debate these problems. This is a suggestion which we can assess, although I must say that before it can be implemented it will probably need further investigation, in order to cover in addition the legal and institutional problems which may arise.

I also wish to say that I find particularly interesting the suggestion that the Commission's information services should be more strongly represented in Parliament, above all during the parliamentary part-sessions.

However, I am not in a position to give my agreement now to an amendment proposing nothing less than the creation of a permanent office at the place where the parliamentary part-sessions are held. I cannot at the moment accept the creation of permanent structures, partly for financial reasons, partly for staffing reasons, but also for reasons related to certain debates at which we were present and about which I think we shall have to think quite a bit.

Mr Schall spoke of four principles. I would like to tell Mr Schall that I agree on the principles. For my part, at this stage, I wish to say only one thing — that in deciding on the type of organization which we must strengthen or create, I shall follow above all the criterion of efficiency and productivity. All of us here have criticized the problems which have arisen in respect of finance and staffing. We cannot ignore one fact —

Natali

that we have a budget which has been approved and which the Commission will implement — as Mr Thorn has stated. The budget is there. We can work with an eye to future budgets, but at this moment our duty is not so much to criticize what has happened as to ensure that we make better use of the means at our disposal.

I should also say, with regard to the work of the Commission, that we must be very careful not to make a clear distinction between the service dealing specifically with current news and the general information service. Both of them are useful. Current news gives people immediate knowledge of decisions that are taken, but it would not make sense unless it were placed in a political context, involving questions of why and how certain decisions are taken and how they are implemented.

So, when all is said and done, information policy cannot tolerate a split between current news on the one hand and the further development of opinion forming and information activities on the other.

I would also say that I read with interest the part of the Schall Report relating to the European Parliament's information services.

It is not within my province to speak on this specific subject, except to say that the report makes a very clear distinction between the tasks of the Commission services and those of the Parliament services, just as on the other hand, it stresses the need for cooperation between those services without prejudice to the specific responsibilities of both. It has been rightly said here that the information services of both institutions are working to a common end. I would like to assure Parliament that I am convinced of the need for coordination and liaison. For my part, I have a very favourable memory of the work of the Commission and Parliament information services during the election campaign for the European Parliament. I had the honour at that time to be in charge of this matter in the Commission, and I can say that we succeeded in ensuring that the two services cooperated to a single end, while acknowledging their separate tasks, responsibilities and management.

Finally, I agree with that part of the Schall Report which stresses the need to pick out the priority sectors. I shall mention three in particular—workers, women and young people. Indeed, where is the future to be found if not in our young people?

We should do everything possible to increase the means available for action in the sector of schools, secondary education and higher education. Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we must jointly prepare to hand over the reins when the time comes to the next generation, so that our children and grandchildren will not be able to turn to us one day and ask us why we failed to put into practice one of the most revolution-

ary ideas of this century — the idea proclaimed by Robert Schuman on 9 May 1950.

President. — In view of the late hour and the number of Members who are still down to speak, I propose that the debate be adjourned until tomorrow.

I call Mr Kavanagh on a point of order.

Mr Kavanagh. — Mr President, do I understand that the Schall report is being postponed until Friday? Do I understand that you are postponing the debate on the report until Friday? Some of us have been here since 8 o'clock this morning waiting to continue this debate and it is rather unfortunate that this may not take place now until sometime in the afternoon tomorrow. I believe we should look at our working programme so as to ensure that items that are accepted on the agenda in the morning are continued until they are finished.

President. — You are perfectly right, Mr Kavanagh. I have done my utmost to ensure that our proceedings went as smoothly as possible. Unfortunately, it is now past midnight as a result of the report by Mr Schall and Mr Natali's speech, even though it was only short.

Although the staff are willing to carry on, I should in any case have to interrupt the proceedings shortly on account of the numbers down to speak. I think the best course would be to adjourn the debate until tomorrow, after the votes on urgency. We could hear no more than two or three speakers tonight.

I call Mr Pedini.

Mr Pedini, Chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport. — (I) I think your proposal is acceptable, Mr President, if the staff are kind enough to wait for a few more minutes so that a number of speakers can say a few words.

What I should like to ask is that the debate be continued tomorrow immediately after the necessary business — which I believe consists of decisions on urgency and voting — unless we manage to cram everything into this evening's debate.

President. — That is precisely what I suggested, Mr Pedini.

I call Mr Kavanagh to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Kavanagh. — Mr President, I will endeavour to be as brief as possible. Can I say on behalf of the Socialist Group that we believe very strongly in the need for an open outgoing information policy. Citi-

Kavanagh

zens of the Community must have available to them all the necessary knowledge and information about the Community, its failure and its crises as well as its successes, given the ever-increasing role it plays in their lives and the influence it has over the evolution of policy at national level. They must be able to see clearly how we, their elected representatives in the European Parliament, are fulfilling our mandates in their interests.

We believe that the information about the Community must be given in other countries, in view of the role and the potential of the Community as a force for peace and stability.

Mr Schall's report is a very useful basis for the beginning of an ongoing debate on information policies of both the Commission and Parliament and it makes very many useful suggestions. Many of these must be taken up and discussed in greater detail within the framework of the working group proposed in the report. Further we believe the committee should draw up, on a regular basis, a report on the Commission's annual information programme.

We support the Schall report in principle. However, we have tabled some amendments taking up some of the points we made in committee where we feel they were not fully understood on that occasion. I cannot go into the report or the amendments, as you have suggested, but I would suggest that, if these amendments are acceptable to us then the Socialist Group can indeed vote in favour of the Schall report.

Comprehensive cooperation between the information services and the equivalent services of political groups is a further point we believe must be developed, and we have also introduced an amendment to this effect. We also wanted to underline the need for an extension and deepening of the information programme for groups of visitors. I also believe that a re-examination of the subsidies available for such groups is urgently needed. There has been no increase in these amounts for several years now. This makes it almost impossible for ordinary people from countries like my own to make visits to the Parliament. Indeed, the budgetary situation in the information field is very serious and we are aware that many of the basic plans we make for actions we regard as essential simply cannot be carried out because of lack of cash and staff. We must seriously examine this situation in the coming year, both in the context of discussions on information policy and in the budgetary framework and ensure that the necessary policies, infrastructure and monies are available to facilitate the work of our services and those of the journalists who cover our work.

I do not think I can be any briefer than that, Mr President, in covering this report, and I thank you for allowing me to speak at this late hour.

President. — I call Mr Brok to speak on behalf of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

Mr Brok. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, stars have already been mentioned, and I think it is perhaps a good omen for this work that the Vice-President, Mr Natali, has spoken to us for the first time today on information policy; after all, he was also responsible for information at the time of the signing of the Rome Treaties in 1957. That great victory for Europe is perhaps a good precedent for us.

I should like to add my support to the views expressed by Mr Schall in his report and in his speech. I believe that the European Community and in particular the European Parliament are on trial in the public mind and that this report on the Community's information policy provides us with an opportunity to examine ourselves critically and make any changes that may be necessary.

The changeover to direct elections meant that the European Parliament was faced with two duties: first of all to exert an influence on the democratic development of the European Community, and secondly, as directly elected members, to communicate with the electorate and make it clear to the citizens of the Community that this is a Europe concerned with people and not just a Europe of bureaucrats, vetos and complicated market rules. In my view we have not yet gone far enough towards fulfilling this second duty; indeed the mere fact that we are discussing this report, which has aroused the attention of many journalists, at this time of the night, is proof that we have not yet learnt how to fulfil it.

The Schall report and the various amendments suggest ways of improving the situation, firstly with regard to the organization of the European Parliament and the Commission — amongst other things by facilitating the work of journalists. I am thinking of such important details as providing journalists with decent working conditions in this building or seeing to it that television crews no longer have to allow time in their schedules for a possible two-hour wait at the border when they are bringing in film material — this is also a task which we must tackle at some point.

We must also examine the European Parliament's own image and working methods critically from the angle of public relations, and see to what extent the European Parliament's contacts with citizens have been improved by the activities of the external offices and the hosting of groups of visitors.

I think a few illustrations are called for here, for example on the topic of the hosting of visiting groups. The groups of visitors who arrive with high expectations at the European Parliament, spend an hour sitting in the gallery, and are finally fobbed off with a

Brok

one-hour discussion, usually return home disappointed and are then lost as propagators of the European idea. For this reason I believe that we must substantially improve the information content of guided tours for visitors. For example we must ensure that we at the European Parliament are represented both in Brussels when visitors are shown round the Commission and also here in Strasbourg between part-sessions, so that visitors do not get the impression that this European Chamber belongs solely to the Council of Europe and that we are not present here at all.

Thirdly, in my view there is a need for joint European Parliament/Commission/Press working parties, for a sub-committee on information within the appropriate Parliament Committee, and also for improved contacts with the Press in the Member States and the setting-up of a suitable information service to facilitate the work of correspondents at the European Parliament.

Fourthly, I should like to point out that whether citizens receive a favourable impression of this Europe is also related to the question of Parliament's location; we must succeed in arriving at a fair but clear solution which is acceptable to all.

Fifthly, Parliament's public relations must also be geared to fact that we must concentrate on the most important topics and make this fact clear to the public. Parliament must not fall into the error of becoming tied up in isolated issues and lose sight of its prime duty of expressing the political will to create European unity.

This Parliament is called upon to make it clear to the people, through the communication which I mentioned, that Europe is pursuing a course of freedom, peace and social justice, and indeed I am not always sure that this goal remains at all visible with Parliament's overcrowded agenda. The fact that a Parliament is peacefully engaged in solving conflicts between States and citizens in Europe represents for me a great step forward compared to the methods used for solving conflicts in Europe in the past and which are still used in some other parts of the world. For this reason we need to improve the situation and make this clear to the people of Europe.

To conclude, I should like to say that when we are speaking of public relations we must make it very clear that this is not just a technical matter but that it is also related to the political will of this House. We must make it clear that the European Parliament cannot be the vanguard or rearguard of any national party political struggles, that this Parliament cannot waste its time on urgent motions tabled by Members who are prepared to abuse the system to satisfy a craving for local or ideological success. We must make it clear that Parliament cannot present a responsible image to the public as long as we have unworkable rules of procedure, rules of procedure which are manipulated by

those who reject the European idea, who use these defective rules to ensure that the public do not receive an impression of rational progress by Parliament or by Europe as a whole and thereby disillusion citizens with Europe. Furthermore the European Parliament agenda must in future take the work of the media into account so that the topics which are to be brought to the public's notice are dealt with at suitable times and can be broadcast as required by the press or by television and radio networks. The very best information policy is of absolutely no use if it is not backed up by a good Parliamentary record on practical issues. But may I conclude also by saying that in addition to self-criticism, an appeal must also be made to journalists. The construction of Europe is an immense task and we will not succeed in this task merely by cynically highlighting the inadequacies and defects which undoubtedly exist, but also by stating that we are open to criticism, that, we welcome comments on Europe's. That is the task of the fourth estate, but we must also make it clear that we want to work towards improving the situation by participating in a joint dialogue with people's representatives and with the representatives of this fourth estate, thereby demonstrating that we are jointly responsible for freedom, peace and social justice in Europe.

President. — I call Mr Hutton to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Hutton. — May I thank the staff for indulging the Members of the Parliament on this debate.

Mr President, is this not a classic example of how this Parliament manages to make a complete mess of its information? This subject is one of the most important to this Parliament, but just look at the time at which we are debating it! There is no one from the press here. I could just count the number of spectators here on one hand, and there are precious few Members. Now I do not think that is because the Members of this House are not interested in seeing the people of Europe better informed about their Parliament, but it is a perfectly crazy time of the day to hold a debate on an important subject. It is almost as though we wanted to be a secret society. General Schall has done us the honour of producing a most important document on how we can make the people of Europe very much better aware of our work and of our very existence. The people of Europe have sent us here and they deserve to know what we are doing on their behalf, but here we are behaving as though we were ashamed to be seen and heard.

You might say that by doing nothing, by saying nothing and by keeping our heads down no one will criticize us and that means that nobody is against us. That appears, I am sorry to say, to be the view that Parliament's information services have been taking, but it is not a view that I can take as a Member of this

Hutton

House. I want people to know what we are doing here, and if we do not speak up in this Parliament, indeed if we do not shout out in this Parliament and make our voice heard, the people of Europe will only hear the voices of the Commission and the Council. We are sent here as the democratic check upon these institutions, and if our voters never hear from us, they may reasonably conclude that we are not doing the job we have been sent here to do and they may just as easily send us packing at the next election.

Mr President, I do not think that the institutions — the Commission as well as the Parliament — realize what a valuable asset they have in the Members of this Parliament. There are 434 of us, who are extremely valuable in spreading information right down to the grass roots, to the local levels all over the Community: the institutions really must help us and give us every assistance to do this job well.

I have tabled an amendment pointing out the value of the Members, and I want to move that amendment as well as the others in my name. I also want to underline briefly the amendment I have tabled asking for information to be computerized. The example I have suggested is the progress of legislation through the institutions so that it is easily and quickly available all over the Community. The technology of communications is one of the fastest-moving areas of society and it would be to the shame of this House if we could not keep up with it.

There is a lot we can do to improve the way we talk to the people we represent. There are problems like the cost of television circuits; there are problems here in the Parliament in getting around to appointing the people we need to run the very expensive television equipment which we have bought, but there are things that we can do now to push the material we produce into the hands of the people who need it most. And I believe most strongly that we have got to get our material into the hands of people like teachers, into places like schools and colleges and public libraries. There really is no point in churning out material if we do not get it around the Community.

Mr President, I want to congratulate General Schall on his enormous effort in producing this report. I hope the House will adopt the report as the starting point for a rapid and tangible improvement in the way this Parliament in particular, and the Commission too, speak out to the people of Europe.

President. — I call Mr Patterson on a point of order.

Mr Patterson. — Mr President, I return to the subject Mr Pedini raised earlier on, the question of when this debate will continue. I understood you to say that it would continue tomorrow morning after the votes on urgent procedure but before the debates on

these items. If this is the case I am very grateful, but it is a break with precedent, and so I am anxious to hear you confirm that and have it recorded in the report of proceedings.

President. — Mr Patterson, the Rules of Procedure stipulate that requests for urgency have priority. I said — and Mr Pedini concurred — that the debate would be continued first thing after the votes tomorrow. The debate is of the utmost interest and no one can accuse the Bureau of underestimating its importance. I myself was given the task by the Bureau of following this particular matter.

All those who are still here can rest assured that the Bureau has the same intentions as those expressed by the speakers. We are delighted that responsibility has been given to someone with the vigorous approach of Mr Natali. He can be sure that we shall work together, in close fashion, so that in the end the image of this Parliament — which after all reflects the image of Europe — is as clear as the famous stars in Schiller's night sky that we heard about.

In spite of the disappointment we all feel because of the lack of a big audience, we can really say that the will is there and that we really are now starting a *vita nova*, if I may repeat the Commissioner's short Latin phrase.

23. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received four motions for resolutions with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-807/80) by Mr Seeler and others (S) on the Community fisheries policy;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-814/80) by Mr Helms and others (EPP-CD), Mr Maher and others (L) and Mr Battersby and others on fisheries policy;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-810/80) by Mrs Bose-rup and others on the violation of human rights and freedoms in Greece;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-821/80) by Mr Glinne (S), Mr Klepsch (EPP-CD), Mr Fergusson (ED) and Mr Haagerup (L) on the Community's cooperation with Chad, in the framework of the Lomé Convention, following the 'merger' between Libya and Chad.

The reasons supporting these requests for urgent procedure are contained in the documents themselves.

The vote on these requests will take place at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — On a point of order, Mr President. We do not have the texts of the first two motions on which you declared there would be a vote on urgency tomorrow morning. I understood it was now the practice of the House to have these documents in circulation for at least 24 hours beforehand so that Members could at least see their contents. We have seen the one on Chad earlier this morning, which is now being presented by Mr Glinne and others, but the other two we have not seen. I would therefore request that they should not be voted on tomorrow morning and should be postponed.

President. — I was just making an announcement. We have reason to believe, however, that the documents will be ready during the night.

24. *Agenda for next sitting*

President. — The next sitting will take place tomorrow, Friday, 16 January 1981, with the following agenda:

9 a.m.:

- decision on urgency
- appointment of Greek Members to committees
- regulation concerning the market in cereals and a motion for a resolution
- continuation of the debate on the Schall report on the information policy of the Community
- interim report by Mrs Pruvot on cultural workers
- Prag report on linking work and training for young persons in the Community

Votes

9 a.m.:

vote on requests for urgent procedure

10.30 a.m.:

vote on motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed

after 10.30 a.m.:

a vote will be taken after the closure of each debate

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 12.30 a.m.)

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 16 JANUARY 1981

Contents

1. Approval of the minutes	271	11. Votes	
2. Documents received	272	• Proposal for a regulation (Doc. 1-701/80) and Gautier et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-813/80): Market in cereals:	
3. Petitions	272	Procedural motions: Mr Galland; Mr Martin	284
4. Membership of committees	272	Mr Von der Vring; Mr Gautier	285
5. Decision on urgent procedure: Lady Elles; Mr Arndt; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Martin; Lady Elles; Mr Glinne (S)	272	Explanation of vote: Mr Marshall	285
6. Appointment of Greek Members to committees	273	• Seeler et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-807/80): Community fisheries policy:	
7. Market in cereals — Proposal for a Council regulation (Doc. 1-701/80) and motion for a resolution by Mr Gautier and others (Doc. 1-813/80): Sir Henry Plumb, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture; Mr Gautier; Mr Dalsass; Mr Sutra; Mr Provan; Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Pranchère; Mr Curry; Mr Lowwes (L); Mrs Cresson; Mr Andriessen; Mr Remilly	274	Adoption of the resolution	285
8. Community fisheries policy — Motions for resolutions by Mr Seeler and others (S) (Doc. 1-807/80) and by Mr Helms and others (EPP), Mr Maher and others (L) and Mr Battersby and others (Doc. 1-814/80): Mr Seeler, author of a motion; Mr Helms, author of a motion	279	• Helms et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-814/80): Community fisheries policy Procedural motion: Mr Marshall	286
Mr Andriessen (Commission)	280	Adoption of the resolution	286
9. 'Unification' of Libya and Chad — Motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne (S), Mr Klepsch (EPP), Mr Fergusson (ED) und Mr Haagerup (L) (Doc. 1-821/80): Mr Andriessen (Commission)	281	• Glinne et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-821/80): 'Unification' of Libya and Chad: Explanations of vote: Mr Glinne; Mr Israël; Mr Habsburg	286
10. Community information policy — Report by Mr Schall (Doc. 1-596/80) (contd): Mrs Pruvot (L); Mr Skovmand; Mr Schwencke; Mr Bangemann; Mr Patterson (ED)	281	Adoption of the resolution	286
		• Walz report (Doc. 1-696/80): Energy production (soft technologies): Mrs Walz, rapporteur	287
		Adoption of the resolution	287
		• Carossino report (Doc. 1-708/80): Shipping safety and pollution prevention: Mr Carossino, rapporteur	287
		Adoption of the resolution	288
		• Maij-Weggen report (Doc. 1-709/80): Marine pollution: Adoption of the resolution	288
		• Maij-Weggen report (Doc. 1-473-80): Prevention of disasters during oil and gas extraction: Mr Beumer, deputy rapporteur	288
		Explanation of vote: Mr Muntingh	288
		Adoption of the resolution	288
		• Spaak report (Doc. 1-467/80): Marine pollution:	

<i>Mr Collins, deputy rapporteur</i>	289	12. <i>Membership of Parliament</i>	294
<i>Mr Baillot</i>	289	13. <i>Community information policy — Report by Mr Schall (Doc. 1-596/80) (contd):</i>	
<i>Explanation of vote: Mrs Dekker</i>	290	<i>Mrs Gaotti de Biase; Mr Martin; Mrs Lenz; Mr Pedini, chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport</i>	295
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	290	<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>	
• <i>Alber report (Doc. 1-660/80): Research and development in the field of the environment:</i>		<i>Mr Schall, rapporteur</i>	297
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	290	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	303
• <i>Combe report (Doc. 1-729/80): Maximum levels for pesticide residues:</i>		14. <i>Social situation of cultural workers — Interim report by Mrs Pruvot (Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport) (Doc. 1-558/80):</i>	
<i>Mr Combe, rapporteur</i>	290	<i>Mrs Pruvot, rapporteur</i>	303
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	290	<i>Mr Schwencke (S); Mr Pedini, chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport; Mr Hahn (EPP); Mr Hutton (ED); Mr Estgen; Mr Andriessen (Commission)</i>	304
• <i>Hooper report (Doc. 1-659/80): Recovery and reuse of waste paper and board:</i>		<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>	
<i>Amendments to the proposal for a recommendation:</i>		<i>Mrs Pruvot</i>	307
<i>Miss Hooper, rapporteur</i>	290	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	307
<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>		15. <i>Linking work and training for young persons in the Community — Report by Mr Prag (Committee on Social Affairs and Employment) (Doc. 1-460/80):</i>	
<i>Miss Hooper</i>	291	<i>Mr Prag, rapporteur</i>	307
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	291	<i>Mr Boyes</i>	308
• <i>Van den Hewel report (Doc. 1-693/80): Human rights in Uruguay:</i>		16. <i>Dates for the next part-session</i>	308
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Habsburg</i>	291	17. <i>Approval of the minutes</i>	308
<i>Mrs Van den Hewel, rapporteur</i>	291	18. <i>Adjournment of the session</i>	308
<i>Mr Fergusson; Mrs Van den Hewel</i>	292		
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Lomas; Mr Forth</i>	292		
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Hord; Lady Elles</i>	293		
• <i>Delatte report (Doc. 1-792/80): Isoglucose:</i>			
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Curry</i>	293		
• <i>Louwes report (Doc. 1-529/80): Framework agreement for cooperation between the EEC and Brazil:</i>			
<i>Mr Louwes, rapporteur</i>	294		
<i>Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mr Louwes</i>	294		
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	294		

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

Vice-President

(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. Documents received

President. — I have received various documents.¹

3. Petitions

President. — I have received various petitions.¹

4. Membership of committees

President. — I have received from the Group of European Progressive Democrats a request for the appointment of Mr Vié to the Legal Affairs Committee in place of Mr Geronimi.

Are there any objections?

The appointment is ratified.

5. Decision on urgent procedure

President. — The next item is the decision on various requests for urgent debate.

The first two requests concern motions for resolutions on the Communities' fisheries policy:

— by Mr Seeler and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-807/80), and

— by Mr Helms and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), Mr Maher and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, and Mr Battersby and others (Doc. 1-814/80).

Since these two motions are on the same subject, I propose that the two requests for urgent debate be decided on by a single vote.

(Parliament decided for urgent procedure)

These motions for resolutions will accordingly be placed on today's agenda.

We come to the motion for a resolution by Mrs Boserup and others, on human rights in Greece (Doc. 1-810/80).

I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — Mr President, as you will know, I have raised this matter before in this House and it was decided by the Bureau of Parliament that such requests for urgent procedure should not be voted on until they have been at least 24 hours before Parliament. This document was reported last night at 00.30 a.m. by the Chair, which was the first time that we had heard of it. We have already had one instance in this House this week of an attack on the behaviour of the Greek Government, and it was totally unfounded. It is quite impossible to find out if there are more lies being told in this House. I therefore demand that this request not be voted on this time but taken next month if the authors of this motion for a resolution dare to put this kind of motion before this House again. It should not be voted on until it has been 24 hours in circulation for Members to verify the veracity of the contents of the motion.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

President. — Lady Elles, I think your point is extremely reasonable, but I have to ask the authors whether they agree to our dealing with their request for urgent procedure on the Monday of the next part-session.

I call Mr Arndt.

Mr Arndt. — *(D)* Mr President, I should be very grateful if this were possible. We have also prepared a motion with request for urgent procedure on this question, and it would be well if we could vote on it immediately on Monday. Then it could be dealt with as the first motion under urgent procedure on Friday.

Because of the length of today's agenda, the motion would be dealt with last, and we should not have enough time to consider this important problem thoroughly.

I therefore welcome this suggestion, and at the same time I would like to announce that my group will present a motion with request for urgent debate at the next part-session.

President. — I call Mr Chambeiron.

Mr Chambeiron. — *(F)* Mr President, I don't understand Lady Elles' arguments at all. That rule exists only in Lady Elles' mind, and I have never seen it invoked in this Assembly. Mr President, I ask you to put our request for urgent debate on this motion for a resolution to the vote. Whether or not our Conservative friends approve of the substance of the resolution is irrelevant: we must have a vote. When you want a decision on your own motions for resolutions, because this suits your plans, you get them put to the vote. We also ask that this be done: there is no reason, Mr Pres-

¹ See the minutes of this sitting.

Chambeiron

ident, why you should not put to the vote the request for urgent debate on the motion for a resolution presented by Mrs Boserup and her associates.

(Parliament decided against urgent procedure)

President. — We proceed to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch on behalf of the European People's Party (CD), Mr Fergusson on behalf of the European Democratic Group and Mr Haagerup on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the 'unification' of Libya and Chad (Doc. 1-821/80).

I call Mr Martin.

Mr Martin. — *(F)* Mr President, for our part, we have always denounced political interference by the Community in the internal affairs of other countries. It is now evident once again that the majority in this Assembly, which represents the political groups in power in the various Member States of the Community, wants to become involved in matters which concern the States of Africa. This is all the more scandalous in that the pretext for such action is that these countries — Chad in this case — are members of the Lomé Convention. Isn't it obvious that, for these political groups who are signatories of the resolution, the Lomé Convention is a means of maintaining a neo-colonial relationship with the young African nations? This is unacceptable. We strongly reaffirm our desire to respect the sovereignty and independence of these nations and to establish a productive cooperation based on equality and mutual interest. For these reasons, we shall vote against the request for urgent debate.

President. — I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — I am speaking, Mr President, in favour of this request for urgent procedure. It is always amazing how many people do not want to interfere in States when things go their way. But Chad after all, in case the opposite side of the House is not aware, has financial, commercial and political relations with the Community, and developments in the internal affairs of Chad are very much the concern of this House if we are to maintain the links which exist through the Lomé Convention, which is surely a matter for urgent consideration by the Community. And therefore, Mr President, I would request the House to vote for urgent procedure on a matter which concerns not only this House but the whole Community in its relations with the States of Africa and members of the Lomé Convention.

President. — I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Mr President, urgent procedure is justified in the text itself, which is very explicit. I would add that in a few weeks' time the EEC-ACP joint committee will be meeting in Sierra Leone, and it is important that we should arrive at this meeting armed with a parliamentary vote on this matter.

(Parliament decided for urgent procedure)

President. — This item will accordingly be placed on today's agenda.

6. Appointment of Greek Members to committees

President. — The next item is the appointment of Greek Members to the committees of the European Parliament.

The list of nominations drawn up by the Bureau has been distributed. This list corresponds to the number of vacancies to be filled.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified ¹

7 Market in cereals

President. — The next item comprises:

— the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-701/80) for

a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2727/75, on the common organization of the market in cereals,

and

— the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Gautier and others to wind up the debate on this subject (Doc. 1-813/80)

Yesterday, Parliament decided to give its opinion on this proposal today in response to the Commission's request for urgent debate submitted under Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, which lays down that question which the Parliament has decided to deal with by urgent debate — and of that there is no doubt in this particular case — may be dealt with on the basis of a report by the appropriate committee, on the basis of an oral report or without report.

The text of this proposal was distributed in December last year. Yesterday we fixed the time-limit for tabling

¹ See the minutes of this sitting

President

amendments to this proposal, and since then one amendment and a motion for a resolution have been tabled.

The Rules of Procedure oblige us to pronounce only upon the texts laid before Parliament, but since we have no report or motion for a resolution from the competent committee, the Committee on Agriculture, it would, perhaps, be advisable to give the floor first to the chairman of that committee.

I call Sir Henry Plumb.

Sir Henry Plumb, Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. — Mr President, you have correctly given the House the information leading up to the circumstances we find ourselves in. I think it is as well that this House should be aware of all the facts leading to these unprecedented circumstances, the background information from the Committee on Agriculture. I can only give those facts by referring to the dates of our involvement in this matter and in others and report to you that at the end of November 1980 the Commission presented a proposal amending the cereal régime so as to allow for export refunds on spirituous beverages obtained from cereals. On 9 December the Council requested urgent procedure on this proposal, and we all remember how, during the December session, Parliament unanimously rejected this request.

The Committee on Agriculture met on the Monday and Tuesday of this part-session to consider five reports on which urgent procedure had been requested in December. All of them were complicated, all of them technical, and therefore time is needed to deal properly with them.

We decided on Tuesday that a vote on the report by Mr Davern on the Commission's cereal proposal which we had before us should be postponed so as to allow it to be considered together with the report by Mr Dalsass on the whole of the alcohol régime. The Commission requested urgent procedure on the cereal proposal on Wednesday morning, and this request, as you have reported, Sir, was accepted by Parliament.

The Committee on Agriculture therefore met yesterday evening again to examine the procedure to be followed, and, for the sake of clarity and to allow Members to express their views on the procedure to be followed, two items were entered on the agenda: firstly, a decision as to whether the resolution by Mr Davern should be voted on, and secondly, in the case of an affirmative decision, a vote on that resolution.

The committee agreed that the Davern resolution should be put to the vote on the understanding that if the resolution was rejected, the proposal of the Commission would be put directly to the vote in plenary sitting. Following the vote the two paragraphs contained in the Davern resolution, which clearly

approved the Commission's proposals, were rejected and the result is, as you have stated, that the Committee on Agriculture is not in a position to present a report on the Commission's proposals to the House.

We therefore have before us the Commission's proposal for amending Regulation No 2727/75 for consideration together with the amendments. That is the situation factually as we see it following the very full consideration that my committee has given to this matter.

President. — I call Mr Gautier.

Mr Gautier. — (D) Mr President, you have certainly described the procedural situation correctly. Since the Committee on Agriculture, by a narrow majority, found itself unable to present a report to the Assembly, there remains before the House only the motion for a resolution which I have tabled, along with 20 other colleagues, and the Commission's draft regulation.

I should like to make a few observations, for the question is a very difficult one, and all groups have been very busy manoeuvring for position regarding the organization of the market in cereals. To those in this House who oppose the export refunds for whisky within the framework of the organization of the market in cereals, the issue is not so much the export refund itself as it is the organization of the alcohol market. We must make this perfectly clear. The organization of the alcohol market, as it is presented in the debate, is rejected by the Socialist Group for various reasons which I will not go into at this point. If we want to be consistent, we must conclude that the problem of whisky and similar alcoholic beverages must be solved within the framework of the organization of the market in cereals.

There are certainly several possibilities in this regard. Either we follow the Commission's suggestion or, and this would be a long-term solution, we align the price of barley with the world market, thus making export refunds unnecessary. I believe the latter solution is the only right one in the long run, though at the moment there are difficulties in its implementation. For this reason the majority of the Socialist Group will be voting for the Commission's draft regulation, but in the long run our efforts will be directed towards solving the problem *via* the price of barley.

One last observation to the Commission. We urge you to make the provisions for implementing this regulation especially clear and precise, so that all possibilities of fraud which arise from the extended storage period for whisky and similar beverages are excluded. Secondly, steps must be taken to ensure that this form of compensation in no way leads, to a preferential treatment of whisky and similar beverages on the

Gautier

internal market of the EEC, that is, to more favourable competitive conditions in regard to other alcoholic beverages. We must make sure that these support measures apply only to exports.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Dalsass.

Mr Dalsass. — (D) Mr President, it is most unfortunate that this question has to be dealt with in plenary sitting without a report from the competent committee. This matter should have been settled seven or eight years ago. There would have been time and to spare to consider the question and to prepare a proper report.

The Committee on Agriculture, as you already know and as the chairman of the committee has rightly stated, studied this amending regulation last Tuesday, when it decided by a two-thirds majority that the matter should be handled in connection with the organization of the market in alcohol. This did not come about by chance. When we read Protocol No 19, the first paragraph says merely that such refunds should be provided, but the second goes on to say:

These measures, which may be taken within the framework of the regulation on the common organization of the market in cereals or of the regulation to be adopted on the common organization of the market in alcohol, must fit into the framework of the general Community policy for alcohol, avoiding any discrimination between these products and other alcohol, account being taken of the particular situations peculiar to each case.

Here it is quite clearly indicated that the Community is to establish a common organization of the market in alcohol and that any form of discrimination between these products and other alcohol is to be avoided. If we modify only the organization of the market in cereals to make such refunds possible, we fail to take this second paragraph into account, and is very regrettable.

I would stress once more that a natural solution within the framework of the organization of the market in alcohol would have been possible, and that the whisky problem should also have been dealt with under this heading. Unfortunately, this was not considered desirable. Now, however, we find ourselves obliged to debate such an important issue without a report from the competent committee, a procedure which is highly unsatisfactory. I stated yesterday that we do not reject these refunds as such, for they are provided for in the Protocol; other means should have been employed, however. For this reason we can in no circumstances accept this proposed measure.

President. — I call Mr Sutra.

Mr Sutra. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, contrary to what preceding speakers have said, no one made any substantial objections to the measure when it was being discussed in the Committee on Agriculture. Export refunds for agricultural products are fair, including those for processed products such as wine, cognac and whisky, and we unquestionably favour them. The Committee on Agriculture could have given the refunds for whisky its unanimous, or nearly unanimous, support in connection with the alcohol regulation and Mr Dalsass's important report on alcohol which has already been presented to the committee orally and which we could, since it is ready, deal with rapidly in the near future. The unfortunate aspect of the *coup de force* effected by the Commission and the Council of Ministers is that it led us last night in the Committee on Agriculture to resist an unacceptable mode of procedure by voting against our own convictions. Let this be made quite clear: no one has expressed any opposition on the substance of the issue.

To my knowledge, Mr President, and to the knowledge of the legal experts, the Members and the staff of this Parliament, the Commission has never taken advantage of the lack of a motion from the competent parliamentary committee to act as it has just done. Clearly, we have been confronted by a *coup de force*, which prevents us from arriving at an untroubled decision on a proper solution. Under these conditions, Mr President, we are sorry that we cannot support this proposal. We shall prove our good faith when the Dalsass report comes before the Committee on Agriculture: then, I hope, it will be adopted unanimously.

President. — A small point by way of correction: the procedure without report is not entirely unaccustomed in this Parliament; it is, in fact, frequently applied.

I call Mr Provan.

Mr Provan. — First of all I would point out both to Mr Sutra and to Mr Dalsass that according to the Treaty of Accession signed by the United Kingdom, Denmark and Ireland — I have it in front of me — the regulation we are discussing this morning can be taken either within the framework of a common organization of the market in cereals or a regulation adopted for the common organization of the market in alcohol. I think this has to be clearly understood. Because we have not been able to reach agreement on a common organization for alcohol it is necessary, just and fair that the producers of whisky, which is produced to a large extent in the country I come from — Scotland — should be looked after.

It is quite unjust that since 1973 export refunds for the cereal content of that product should have not been paid. It is unjust for several reasons, but one of them that has not been pointed out, either in committee or on the floor of this House, is that another product,

Provan

which is used to make whisky, namely malt, does get export refunds. In fact, we had a debate on that very question last month in Luxembourg. If malt gets export refunds and yet the malt content of whisky does not get export refunds, we are in grave difficulties.

What is worrying a large number of Members of this Parliament, of course, is that we are not able to achieve an alcohol régime. A large number of people are also worried about the differential tax problems arising in the Community and are using this as a lever, as it were, to try and achieve their aims. Now this is all very well, but we must realize that on 30 May last year, as part of a package deal that was agreed in Luxembourg, the Council of Ministers came forward with proposals to allow this regulation to go ahead under the cereals régime. The area that whisky comes from is a peripheral area of the Community, which exports large quantities of this product, a very good product indeed, to the Canadian and American markets. In those markets we face severe competition from their own products and yet we are highly successful. I ask Parliament therefore to approve this regulation so that we can fight that competition and use Community products, namely our own barley, which will mean less surplus barley to be put into store. We must allow export refunds on this point so that we can fight the competition where we need to.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

President. — I call Mr Andriessen.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — *(NL)* Mr President, at this stage of the debate I should like to comment briefly on the two documents which have been tabled in connection with the Commission's proposal, namely the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Gautier and the amendment tabled by Mr de Lipkowski and others.

In paragraph three of the former, Parliament is asked to approve the Commission's proposal; without wishing to go further into the two preceding paragraphs, I would naturally like to express my approval of this conclusion on behalf of the Commission. I would also like to add that in implementing these proposals we shall comply with the Honourable Member's particular request that abuses and internal competition should be prevented from occurring as a result of this measure. I can assure him that I shall attend to this most carefully.

As regards the amendment tabled by Mr de Lipkowski, it is quite clear that if this regulation were to apply from the date of the entry into force of the alcohol régime, this morning's whole debate would become superfluous, because everyone is agreed that the alcohol régime would probably provide the best

solution. The point is precisely that there is no alcohol régime and that it will not be achieved in the near future; specific agreements have been made — on 30 May last year it was pointed out in this Parliament that the agreements had to be observed — and therefore, if this regulation is adopted, it must enter into force at the time proposed by the Commission.

President. — I call Mr Pranchère.

Mr Pranchère. — *(F)* Mr President, the pressure used by the Council and by the Commission to obtain an endorsement of all the measures of aid for whisky producers is a significant indication of the interests which are protected on the Community scale.

The Council and the Commission are not in such a hurry to protect the interests of the workers, interests which demand that the Treaties be respected. They are less demanding when it is a question of putting an end to the whittling away of Community preferences or the granting of exceptions such as that for the importation of New Zealand butter.

The Commission's proposal is dangerous both in principle and with regard to its effect on Community wine and fruit producers, especially in France.

I will not reopen the discussion on the methods used by the Council and the Commission, which we have already condemned in the strongest terms during the vote on urgent procedure. I am aware that yesterday the Committee on Agriculture once again rejected — and by a majority, naturally — the proposal drawn up by the Commission. I would, on the other hand, like to dwell on the arguments advanced by the Commission to justify an aid of 60 000 000 EUA to whisky producers. There being no common organization of the alcohol market, the Commission was ingenious enough to remove whisky from the list of alcoholic beverages, which is truly astounding, and to consider it only as a processed cereal product. With this clever bit of juggling whisky finds itself included in the cereal regulation, which does exist at the Community level. So what? — you will say — the cereal regulation, as it stands, still doesn't allow, in this case, the granting of export refunds. This is quite true, and the Commission is well aware of it. For this reason, in order to reach its objective, the Commission has mutilated its own regulations by inserting 'special' refunds designed, so it tells us, to take into account specific peculiarities of production, and in particular the aging process necessary for these beverages.

These machinations are all too obvious, and we are not deceived. The real purpose of all this tinkering is clear, and the Brussels Commission itself recognizes it in its recitals. The question is that of allowing these products to be exported at a lower price than that resulting from the Community price system'. This is

Pranchère

the crux of the problem. While attempting to make room for Spanish wine, for example, by hastening the uprooting of vines through measures for restructuring and conversion, the Commission and the Council want to replace our quality fruit- and wine-based alcoholic beverages by whiskies of any and every breed. The legal juggling engaged in by the Council and the Commission will not blind us to their guiding principle, which still is to dismantle our agriculture to the advantage of multinationals in the agri-foodstuffs sector.

It is symptomatic, moreover, that those who are mounting the offensive against the common agricultural policy and the income of farmers, who prevent the taxation of vegetable fats so as not to offend Unilever and the American exporters, are the very people who now support aid to whisky producers. The effects of such aid will be very serious for our wine- and fruit-growers.

The Commission itself recognizes that the proposed measures may create distortions of competition as between whisky and other alcoholic beverages. Protocol No 19 of the Act of Accession, to which the Commission and the champions of its proposed regulation refer, also recognizes this, and it calls for the avoidance of any kind of discrimination between these products and other alcoholic beverages. Forced to take account of such abuses, the Commission offers us an examination of possible remedies in the guise of a solution. This is making fools of us. We know what promises are worth; we are familiar with these temporary exceptions which last forever. As the proverb says, 'once bitten, twice shy'. This is one reason, among others, for our proposals to amend the Commission's regulation. We will not say, as some do, that what we reject today will become acceptable when a regulation for alcohol is adopted. We are consistent with ourselves and with the interests of our producers.

Our opposition is not a matter of mere form or procedure; it is fundamental. We shall continue to refuse aid to whisky producers at the expense of our alcoholic products, which have just undergone an arbitrary tax-increase of 50 % in our own country. This will result in a 40 % decrease in sales in the immediately foreseeable future, which will mean a loss of income for producers, especially for the smaller ones, most of whom are located in alcohol-producing regions which are already disadvantaged.

I here accuse the French Government of having been directly responsible for this. In raising taxes on alcoholic beverages, it submitted to the decision of the Court of Justice; it could even be said to have prostrated itself before the Court. With the agreement of 30 May 1980, it had already submitted to Mrs Thatcher's demands by agreeing to raise 400 thousand million old francs from French taxpayers for her benefit. For Mrs Thatcher, this was the *plat de résistance*, but Giscard d'Estaing could not deny himself the

pleasure of offering her, as dessert, an aid of 35 thousand million old francs to whisky-producers.

(Laughter from the benches of the European Democratic Group)

Giscard d'Estaing had concealed this provision of the 30 May agreement from the French people; and I think we have to thank Mr Davignon for having brought it to our attention yesterday in the discussion on urgent procedure.

I therefore accuse the French Government of directly threatening our products and the income of our farmers.

I also accuse the Commission, and particularly its two French members, Mr Claude Cheysson and Mr Xavier Ortoli, whom Giscard d'Estaing has reappointed because he felt they both had been of considerable use to him. Farmers and wine- and fruit-growers will appreciate this fact. In the face of this attack on their vital interests, we are more than ever on the side of the farmers and workers. We will fight with them to defeat this policy of destruction, symbolized, in industry as well as in agriculture, by the proposals of this Commission, which is dominated by the Social Democrats and by the right.

(Laughter and applause from some benches of the European Democratic Group)

President. — I call Mr Curry.

Mr Curry. — Mr President, it always amazes me when I hear Mr Pranchère reading his speech, because as he has only got one speech and as he delivers it so frequently, I should have thought that he would know it by heart by now!

(Loud laughter and applause from the European Democratic Group)

It is a commentary upon his lack of retentive powers that he should feel the need to read it so frequently. However, we do not wish to stop him. We wish him to carry on, because Mr Pranchère is our secret weapon: every time Mr Pranchère opens his mouth there is another fifty votes for us. Such is the measure of the contempt in which his party is held in this House that he has only to stand up and speak and immediately the cause of reason is manifest by its simple silence.

I am also indebted to Mr Sutra, who said that we cannot do something which did not have a precedent going back to 1957. Now, Mr Sutra represents a party which in France is supposed to represent change. I always find it endearing when my colleagues of the left engage in such an archaeological search for precedents. Undoubtedly that will explain why his candidate

Curry

will be so disastrously defeated in the presidential elections shortly to take place.

(Loud laughter from the European Democratic Group)

I should like, Mr President, to draw your attention to two vital points which have not been considered this morning. The first is the consequence of refusing to adopt this measure. The Council has now asked us twice for urgent procedure. We have declined it once on the legitimate grounds that we did not have the documents. We have not got those legitimate grounds this time. The Committee on Agriculture has met twice to examine it. The first time it refused to examine it and the second time it rejected it. We are now being asked in this House to refuse to examine the basic proposal.

A short while ago, this House made significant advances in its authority as a consequence of the isoglucose judgment. If we now deliberately refuse to exercise our function of deliberation, the Council may go ahead; and if the Council goes ahead we shall have lost every single gain that isoglucose brought us, and that is a very important constitutional point.

Secondly, what is so terrible about proceeding without a report? We spend here calories and calories of energy in writing reports on the most minor and technical documents, using up hectare after hectare of forest to do so, when it would be perfectly simple to treat proposals of a technical nature on the basis of the document itself. That would facilitate and expedite the work of this House and would be a most excellent precedent, which I commend to my friend Georges Sutra.

(Laughter)

Finally, Mr President, the impression exists that we in this group are anxious to toast the death of ethyl alcohol with a glass of whisky. We are not, let me repeat, Mr President, out to destroy ethyl alcohol by using whisky. This measure is of great importance to us — we have made that absolutely clear — but we are as anxious as anybody to press on with our discussions on ethyl alcohol. We shall submit it to the same rigour to which we submit all regulations, but we are not in this House to obstruct. Those of us who spend the greater part of our time defending Europe in our own countries cannot afford to come here for purely obstructive purposes. We come here to get business done, and I hope that this House will now do business.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

President. — I call Mr Louwes to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Louwes. — *(NL)* Mr President, my group still finds it difficult to agree on its attitude to this

proposal, as was shown yesterday in the vote on urgent procedure. After everything that has been said on the subject already, I do not wish to go any further into the substance of the matter, nor into the procedure followed up to now. Enough has been said about this already, and we are restricting ourselves to the factors which played a part in our deliberations and in the outcome of those deliberations.

I would make just one preliminary remark, which is that I understand why the Commission and the Council have requested urgent procedure. For their own reasons, they both wish to see the matter dealt with quickly, as was also demonstrated last December. I would imagine that both the Commission and the Council have realized, as many of us in this Parliament also believe, that it may still be several years before there is an alcohol régime. This is all well and good, and they are perfectly entitled to press matters on; but I would like to ask the Commission once again why it waited until the end of last November before submitting a proposal, when the obligation imposed by Protocol No 19 had existed for seven years before, and when this regulation also previously formed part of last spring's farm package. I can appreciate that the Commission and the Council want action taken quickly, but why have they not acted quickly themselves? Do they regard Parliament as the only institution which has to act quickly? I would very much like to have an answer from the Commission on this point. The Commissioner's statement did not make this quite clear to me.

Following on from this, one section of my group attaches great importance to the obligations which we have entered into towards whisky producers and exporters, and would finally like to see these honoured, thereby also respecting the treaties of accession and the integrity of the Community. They will therefore vote in favour of the proposal, albeit with some difficulty. Others among us endorse and share these views, but are unable to reach the same conclusion because of their fear that producers of other types of alcoholic beverages will be treated too unequally and too unreasonably — almost ill-treated, in fact. They too ask the question — why not sooner? All the members of my group insist that once it has become a regulation, this proposal should be integrated as quickly as possible into a comprehensive organization of the market in alcohol.

Finally, one further question to the Commission: when will progress finally be made in harmonizing the excise duties on alcoholic beverages in the Member States? If we had made a little more progress on that score, we should not have needed to discuss this proposal, or at least could have done so in a somewhat calmer atmosphere.

President. — I call Mrs Cresson.

Mrs Cresson. — (*F*) Mr President, I will be extremely brief, for I have no desire to prolong this debate, since nearly everything has already been said. I wish only to say that I am indignant over the manner in which the Commission is treating us and the Committee on Agriculture. I would like to stress that it is important to respect the treaties, and that Protocol No 19, which has to do with spirituous liquors obtained cereals, specifies quite clearly:

These measures, which may be taken within the framework of the regulation on the common organization of the market in cereals or of the regulation to be adopted on the common organization of the market in alcohol, must fit into the framework of the general Community policy for alcohol, avoiding any discrimination between these products and other alcohol, account being taken of the particular situations peculiar to each case.

I am making no attempt to interpret the protocol. I am merely reading it, and adding at the same time that we have been waiting for a regulation on alcohol for seven years, and it has yet to appear. We are ready to approve subsidies for the use of Community cereal products because we care, more than some others perhaps, about preference for the Community, and we seek to encourage it. We are completely willing to move in the direction of these subsidies but we don't want the alcohol regulation to be presented to us piecemeal. We wish to be able to discuss it and vote on it beforehand from an overall perspective.

I wonder what is the purpose of this Assembly if the Commission intends to imitate certain other parliaments — like our national Parliament, which uses authoritarian procedures to pass provisions which would be rejected by the Assembly. I used to believe that this European Assembly was a democratic institution, and I have even mentioned in France how pleasant it was to be in an assembly with democratic rules.

I see that this is not the case, and that the Commission has confronted us with a *fait accompli*. For this reason we will reject its proposals, but this will naturally not prevent us from approving an alcohol regulation which we have been able to discuss beforehand, nor from encouraging the use of Community cereals for manufacture, and in particular for the production of whisky.

President. — I call Mr Andriessen.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (*NL*) Mr President, I have two questions to answer, both raised by Mr Louwes.

The first question asked why the Commission only submitted these proposals at the end of last November, and why this was not done sooner. I can understand why the question has been put: it is certainly not true to say that the Commission thinks that only Parlia-

ment should act quickly, as Mr Louwes suggested, but the reason why it has taken so long is because this matter — as he will appreciate — is both technically and legally complicated. This has been demonstrated by the discussions in Parliament, and this is why it has not been possible to submit this proposal sooner.

As for the question of excise duties, he probably knows better than I do that this matter has already been receiving attention for some considerable time, that a number of actions concerning excise duties have been brought before the Court of Justice, and that a compromise proposal has now been submitted to the Council by the Commission, on which, however, the Council has not yet been able to agree; this is why at the moment it is hardly possible for the Commission to make any further progress on what is undoubtedly a very important matter.

President. — I call Mr Remilly.

Mr Remilly. — (*F*) As you have indicated, Mr President, Mr de Lipowski, Mr Fanton and Mr Clement have tabled an amendment designed to replace the second paragraph of the Commission's proposal with the following: 'It will become applicable when the Community organization of the alcohol market has been put into effect.'

President. — The debate is closed.

The proposal for a regulation and the Gautier motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting-time.

8. Community fisheries policy

President. — The next item is a joint debate on

— the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Seeler and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-807/80), and

— the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Helms and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), Mr Maher and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, and Mr Battersby and others (Doc. 1-814/80),

on the Community's fisheries policy.

I call Mr Seeler.

Mr Seeler. — (*D*) Mr President, in December of last year the Council once again tackled the problems of the Community fisheries policy, without obtaining any

Seeler

positive result. The Council has also failed to take the necessary steps for the implementation of the fishing agreement reached with Canada and Norway. This has caused considerable difficulties for many deep-sea fishermen, especially on the coasts of Germany but also in Dutch, Belgian, and Danish waters. As of 1 January these fishermen can no longer fish in Norwegian and Canadian waters, since the old agreement has expired. The danger of unemployment is now threatening the shipbuilding industry and other sectors dependent upon fishing.

On 27 January of this year the Council shall once again examine this problem. It is therefore imperative that Parliament, during this month's part-session, call upon the Council in the strongest terms to implement the agreements with Norway and Canada, setting the ratification procedure in motion so as to avoid placing the jobs I have just mentioned in unnecessary jeopardy over the long term. This is even more important because, for instance, after April it will no longer be possible to catch codfish in Canadian waters, since cod will have migrated elsewhere

I therefore urgently request the House to support the resolution presented by myself and my associates. I ask also for the support of those delegates who do not come from countries or constituencies directly concerned with fisheries problems, for a further delay on the part of the Council affects the Parliament as a whole. I am aware of the existence of different opinions on this matter. I know that within my own group, for instance, every word of the resolution as I have drafted it does not command support. My group is however unanimous in believing that it is now urgently necessary to take definitive action on these problems, and in particular to apply the agreement in question for the sake of the fishermen concerned. I would like to conclude by saying that the resolution tabled by Mr Helms on behalf of his group should, in combination with mine, provide the means with which to urge the Council to work out a decision through compromise. I ask you therefore to support this motion tabled under urgent procedure.

President. — I call Mr Helms.

Mr Helms. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, first I would like to thank the last speaker, Mr Seeler, for his willingness to support my resolution, which already has the backing of the Group of the European People's Party and of the Liberal and Democratic Group. Since his resolution deals with one aspect of the problem, I believe that the combination of both resolutions would provide Parliament with a sound, practical, and fair decision. The lack of a Council decision on Community fisheries policy — with which we have been wrestling for years — has caused severe tensions and serious economic problems to the fishing sector and has led to extended strikes.

You no doubt remember the fishing war between France and the United Kingdom and the lengthy strikes which accompanied it. The situation, as it has now developed, can no longer be tolerated.

In May 1980 the Council finally agreed to formulate a Community fisheries policy by the end of 1980. We are now obliged to realize with great regret that the decision is once again bogged down. This is all the more deplorable since the competent parliamentary committee, working under extremely difficult and at times impossible conditions and with very tight deadlines, has prepared a draft of the most essential proposals to be submitted to the consideration of the Commission and the Council. The Council's persistence in delaying and blocking this decision is unjustifiable, and it is inexcusable that progress in this matter should be hindered by administrative difficulties at the expense of European fishermen. This we cannot tolerate, for we believe that the Community-oriented decisions drawn up by Parliament in October, November, and December have provided the Council with the possibility to arrive at a decision.

Ladies and gentlemen, in my view this is a matter of principle. The Council must decide this month. Should the Council continue to behave as in the past, we may conclude that the matter will be postponed further. We must see to it that the European institutions responsible behave in a trustworthy manner, for they will suffer a loss of credibility if there is no change in attitude.

I paid close attention to the remarks of the President of the Council when he made his first speech on Wednesday. I was particularly impressed with his declared intention to present parliamentary decisions to the Council personally, so that they might be examined in the course of future deliberations. This is what we desire. We want our decisions on the essential points of the fisheries policy to be taken into account. In that case the Council can decide this month, the ratification of agreements with third countries, such as Canada and Norway, can proceed, and the European fishermen will finally be able to return to fishing. We must guarantee that European citizens do not suffer through faults in the decision-making process.

I urge you therefore to support my resolution, as we are prepared to support the resolutions tabled by Mr Seeler and others. In my opinion they represent together an outstanding statement to present to the Council at its next meeting

President. — I call Mr Andriessen.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, the Commission can only welcome the fact that these two resolutions have been tabled, and sees them as an expression of support for the policy

Andriessen

which it has followed and is actively pursuing with regard to fisheries. Parliament knows that the Commission has submitted the necessary proposals for a common fisheries policy and that it regards the rapid settlement of this issue as a matter of great urgency which is in the interests of both fishermen and consumers. We can only hope that the adoption of these resolutions by Parliament will contribute to a positive solution to this problem being reached at the next Council meeting. This would also serve to honour the memory of Mr Gundelach, as I know how greatly he himself would have liked to have achieved a solution to the problems of fisheries.

President. — The debate is closed. The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting-time.

9. *'Unification' of Libya and Chad*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), Mr Fergusson on behalf of the European Democratic Group, and Mr Haagerup on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on cooperation by the Community with Chad, under the Lomé Convention, following the 'unification' of Libya and Chad (Doc. 1-821/80).

I call Mr Andriessen

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, Mr Cheysson has specifically asked me to explain our stance on this important issue to Parliament, and to give an assurance that the Commission welcomes the fact that Parliament is adopting the position on this matter which is indicated in the resolution. The problems of Chad have already given rise to serious discussions within the Commission: Chad is a partner in the Lomé Convention, and these will have to be continued. There are a number of projects in hand in the southern part of the country. The delegation from the Commission which is monitoring the course of events there has had to withdraw from these areas, but is continuing its activities in order to complete the current projects. In the meantime, the Commission has received a telegram from the Chad authorities and has replied that it is ready to grant humanitarian aid as a matter of urgency if there are grounds for doing so.

Finally, my colleague Mr Cheysson intends to hold a further exchange of views on this question at the meeting of the Committee on Development and Cooperation on 22 January.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting-time.

10. *Community information policy (contd)*

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the report by Mr Schall on the Community's information policy (Doc. 1-596/80).¹

I call Mrs Pruvot to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs Pruvot. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to begin by congratulating the author on the richness of the document presented to us. I should add that this report was the subject of extensive debates in the parliamentary Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information, and Sport, but the topic is so important that no one will be surprised by the large number of amendments tabled by the different political groups of our Assembly.

The Liberal and Democratic Group has tabled six amendments which say in essence that our Parliament should take constant pains to ensure that its decisions are better explained and publicized. What can our actions accomplish if no one knows about them? This is why we believe that the competent services of the European Parliament — particularly the branch offices — should not fail to collaborate with the press services of the political groups. The political groups — that is, the parliamentary representatives themselves — are what makes Europe live: they are the ones who, day after day, are planning the future of our Community. This being so, it is important to reinforce the current work structures of the national offices, so that they are actually capable of distributing quality information. Members of Parliament should be able to contact the national offices at any time, so that the latter may provide the necessary link between Community, national, and regional information services. However important our mission may be, we must nevertheless realize that we will make no progress if the institutions of the Community do not work together. The press services of the Council of Ministers and of the Commission in Brussels should continue to have every facility, but during the parliamentary sittings, Parliament itself should enjoy the same basic prerogatives. This is a formal demand on the part of the Liberal and Democratic Group. Progress has nevertheless been made, due no doubt to the quality of the journalists who work with us.

¹ See debates of 15 January 1981.

Pruvot

In conclusion, Mr President, I would like to emphasize that the European Parliament must show itself to be consistent regarding the positions it has adopted in favour of the Third World, its policies of information in the area of world hunger, the Lomé Convention, and its general willingness to engage in cooperation for development.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, these are in brief some of the recommendations which our group calls to the attention of the Assembly.

President. — I call Mr Skovmand.

Mr Skovmand. — (DK) Mr President, in the Scandinavian democracies, there is an unwritten law governing the supply of official information which states that taxpayers' money cannot be used to manipulate the attitudes of taxpayers. The State should provide information on factual matters of public administration, but should avoid all subjects on which there are differences of opinion.

In Denmark the EEC question is still the political issue which most divides the population. A survey carried out at the beginning of January by the Conservative newspaper 'Berlingske Tidende' showed that only 33 % of the Danish electorate now approve of Denmark's official policy on the EEC, while 48 % were opposed to it. There is therefore great resentment at the fact that the Government supports the so-called European Movement, and for this reason Mr Schall's wish that the EEC's information centres should try to obtain from national treasuries the money they cannot get from the Community is unlikely to gain much sympathy in Denmark.

The Community's information office in Denmark is paid for by the Community, i.e. with Danish taxpayers' money. This office's publications constantly glorify Community policies, launch attacks on opposition to the Community, and also interfere in other controversial areas of Danish politics, for example the question of nuclear power. Most recently, they interfered in the voting campaign leading up to the referendum in Greenland on membership of the Community.

In view of this past experience of the Community's disregard for the rules of democracy, it is with a deep sense of distaste that one reads Mr Schall's report, with its coarse blend of information and propaganda activities. Mr Schall is amazed that the press and the public show so little interest in the European Parliament. He thinks that interest can be created by drastically increasing the appropriations for information activities, but he overlooks the fact that the reason for the low level of interest is that this Parliament is not a parliament, and therefore virtually its only effective role is as an instrument of public relations. There is no

legislation here, and consequently no political reality worthy of interest. Parliament can abandon itself to dreams of union and other sectarian issues, which fade into the background in the more realistic political context of the Council and the Commission. It is wishful thinking for Mr Schall to describe Parliament as a partner with an equal share in the Community's executive power. Apart from its limited powers where the budget is concerned, Parliament has no political resources other than the argument that the citizens of Europe want the same thing as the extremists in Parliament. To spread propaganda for Parliament would be to do so for the business of spreading propaganda. We have better things to do with our taxpayers' money at a time of crisis.

President. — I call Mr Schwencke.

Mr Schwencke. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are only deluding ourselves. Even though we may present such extensive, obvious, and imaginative recommendations on information policy, nothing will change unless we alter our own parliamentary behaviour. I believe that if in the future we do not concentrate on the central issues of our work, even the best information policy will be of no avail. I have no wish to criticize the Bureau, but was it really reasonable to discuss the information policies of Parliament and the Commission yesterday evening just before midnight? As a result only a handful of journalists and an equally small number of delegates were present when this specific question came on the agenda.

When, immediately before midnight, Mr Schall, our rapporteur, took the floor, this small group continued to melt away. I think that when we handle the subject in this manner it is not to be wondered at that we do not find the support which we so badly need.

If I had been able to speak last evening, I would have begun with the prophetic line: 'Midnight is coming ever closer,' and I would have meant that not only in the literal but also and especially in the figurative sense.

We are in the process of placing ourselves in a sort of Babylonian Captivity through our own fault. I believe that each one of us bears a 434th part of the responsibility for this situation. If we do not finally concentrate our attention on doing whatever possible to develop and implement programmes for the future of Europe, we will obtain no advantage from publicity distributed through an improved information policy. The effect of publicity in the media, as everyone knows, depends on having something factual to say and on being able to concentrate on saying the right thing at the right time. The legal status of this Assembly is also extremely complicated: I think that we must always be aware of this when we examine the information policy in detail.

Schwencke

Allow me, Mr President, to mention seven short points which are especially important for me and for my group in this motion for a resolution.

First: a closer relationship between the citizens and the European institutions. I think it could be productive to increase the number of offices in the Member States. I wonder why in my own country offices besides that in Bonn are not established — in Hannover and Stuttgart, for example, and perhaps also in Munich; offices which should also be ready with information on the European Parliament, without mixing up the different types of information . . .

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Because the Socialist Group refused the budget entry for it!

Mr Schwencke. — (D) Mr Bangemann, you know very well how the matter stands. You are only trying to confuse the issue.

Second: the accreditation of journalists. We welcome the fact that more than eighty journalists have become accredited to the Parliament. They have founded a corps and are waiting for official accreditation. I believe this to be an important step, and I must urge — as we suggested in our proposed amendment — that the journalists consider the Parliament as an independent organ and not as some sort of branch of the EC institutions in Brussels.

Third: We should continue to develop the possibilities for inviting journalists and journalistic specialists, and I think that the help of the delegates has proven to be useful as well.

Fourth: the information itself — the report has much to say about this. Mr Schall submitted a whole row of suggestions in this regard. The information must be prepared better and more effectively. It must address the European citizen where he lives and where he works.

Fifth: I believe we must make an effort to furnish more information on the Brussels institutions to journalists and visitors' groups. Journalists here at the Assembly should not have to run to Brussels to find a document that should have been available here a long time ago.

Sixth: The visitors' programme is inadequate, as everyone knows. When one has formerly been a member of a national parliament, one is ashamed to invite visitors to participate in such a shabby programme. I believe we must increase the quality and quantity of our cooperation with those who are responsible for it. I think that the suggested 'Arsenal of Peace', a museum containing a documentation of post-war development, and especially the development of relations between Germany and France, will be an attraction for visitors' groups.

Seventh, and final point: we suggest the formation of a committee which can provide a preliminary orientation for journalists, and which would thereby exercise an important function.

The Spinelli report gave us some important perspectives on future development a few days ago. Most of us fully accepted it, and it is my opinion that within this restricted framework an effective information policy will be possible for the Parliament as well as for the Commission.

President. — I call Mr Patterson to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Patterson. — The last speaker but one made a most curious statement. He said that at the moment most people in Denmark were against Danish membership of the European Community, and from this he deduced that what was therefore needed was less information on the subject. I must confess that I do not see the logic of this. Indeed, if that speaker had any message to give us, it is the lamentable way in which information is not being provided. If it is possible for the Danes and indeed for some British people to be so badly informed that they are not in favour of their country's continued membership, I should have thought that that was one of the messages which ought to go out from this debate.

The second message was mentioned in the early hours of the morning by my colleague Mr Hutton and again by Mr Schwenke — namely, the fact that the bulk of this debate took place when the press itself had gone home is a symptom of the disease which Mr Schall's extensive and thorough report is designed to cure. May I also remark on the fact that the Press Bar closed yesterday evening at 8 o'clock although the debate went on until 12.30 a.m.

Thirdly, under the system by which we allocate speaking-time, I have been given something like 3 minutes, which is going to give me just about time to move the amendment in my name and shout a few slogans. I therefore start with Amendment No 49 in my name, which I hope will be adopted by this House together with Amendment No 16, by Mrs Viehoff. It refers to the reception of visitors and the mechanisms by which visitors are selected. Clearly, we need much better facilities here in Strasbourg and in Luxembourg to receive visitors, but I also think we need to pay attention to the way in which these visitors are selected. It is important, is it not, that the constituents of Members from countries in the Community remote from Strasbourg and Luxembourg should have an equal chance to participate in assisted visits with those who are closer to it. For example, a citizen of Ireland or from Greece should have the same rights to come and see what is going on here as a citizen from France or Germany. Now if the allocation of places on these

Patterson

assisted visits is made on the basis of a particular sum of money per Member, as Mr Schall's report suggests and according to current practice, you will naturally get more visitors from, say, Belgium than from Greece, which is a country with a similar population. Therefore, my amendment is designed to ensure that the allocation is based on the number of visitors per Member.

Now for the slogans. I wish to concentrate very briefly on one or two points concerning Parliament's information service, a matter on which I have had some personal experience in the past. The first question I would like to ask, or slogan I would like to shout, is: could we at last, please, have a firm guidance as to who is responsible for the Parliament's information service? Mr Natali yesterday evening made a very clear statement in reply to the debate as to what the Commission's information service should be, but who replies for the Parliament? In the past it has been the responsibility of the Bureau or a working party. We have now set up a special committee dealing with information, and there is now talk that it has gone back again to the Presidency. Unless there is clear political guidance on the Parliament's information service nothing very much will be done. Mr Schall's suggestion of a small specialist working party is the first constructive change we could make.

Secondly, publications. Please give us a properly staffed publications department providing a range of leaflets and pamphlets which can be read by the ordinary man in the European street! May I say that it is not the fault of the publications staff. The real reason is that the publications department at the moment is bogged down with all kinds of other duties which do not enable them to concentrate on their primary task.

Thirdly, give us more visual aids — films, slides, wall-charts — so that we can, in particular, reach Europeans through Europe's future generations in the schools. This was a point made by Mr Hutton yesterday. If we do not provide information of a simple sort in our schools and colleges, we are failing in our duty.

Fourthly, give us more clear information on the work of our committees and end the semi-secrecy in which so many of our committees work! Everybody knows that the bulk of the detailed practical work that this Parliament does takes place in the committees, and yet the news that comes out of them is provided on an *ad hoc* basis depending on whether the chairman wishes to issue a statement or not. That could be remedied very easily indeed.

Fifthly, please could we have a much better system of distributing agendas, working documents and so forth, so that those who wish to find out what is going on can do so? External information offices in London, Paris and Bonn, for example, are often asked ques-

tions on the work of committees whereas the agendas for those committees do not arrive in the external information offices until two days after the meeting has taken place. This is the kind of thing which brings an information service into disrepute.

Finally, next time we vote on the Community budget — a subject dear to my heart — let this Parliament end its hypocrisy and stop calling on the one hand for more information while on the other hand failing to vote the money that is needed! We have a duty as elected Members of this Parliament to tell the people who voted for us what is going on, and that is why this report by Mr Schall is so extremely important and should be voted through as soon as possible.

(Applause)

President. — This debate will now be suspended, as it is time to take the votes.

11. Votes

President. — The next item comprises the votes on those motions for resolutions on which the debate is closed.

We begin with the *proposal for a regulation (Doc. 1-701/80) by Gautier et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-813/80): Market in cereals.*

I call Mr Galland on a point of order.

Mr Galland. — (F) Mr President, I must ask you to apply the Rules. This problem is provided for in two separate rules, the first of which is Rule 26.

The debate shall be based on the report of the appropriate committee. Parliament shall vote only on the motion for a resolution.

Obviously, this does not apply here. Doubtless, therefore, you will refer me to Rule 14, paragraph 4 of which, since we are dealing with a case of urgent procedure, states:

An urgent debate may be held without a report or on the basis of an oral report by the appropriate committee.

A short while ago, Sir Henry Plumb explained quite clearly to us that the competent committee, at its meeting yesterday, had found itself unable to present an ordinary oral report; but it was on the assumption that the competent committee would be able to present this report that the Bureau yesterday considered that this item could be put on the agenda. Since Sir Henry has shown that an oral report is impossible, it is clear that Rule 14 (4) cannot be applied. According to the

Galland

Rules of Procedure, therefore, it is impossible to put this vote on the agenda.

President. — Mr Galland, I am sorry to say that I cannot agree with your argument. Once urgent procedure has been adopted, it is quite abnormal that a committee, by refusing to submit a report, orally or by any other means, should be allowed to prevent the House from expressing an opinion. In this case, the urgency of the matter is paramount. It is no doubt to be regretted that the competent committee should not have presented a report, but Rule 14 nowhere says that an oral or written report is essential.

I call Mr Martin.

Mr Martin. — (F) Mr President, on the basis of Rule 33 (4), I ask you to establish whether a quorum is present.

President. — Is your request supported by the requisite number of Members?

(More than 30 Members rose to their feet)

President. — I call Mr Von der Vring.

Mr Von der Vring. — (D) Mr President, would you please explain our position with regard to the procedure? Since the judgment on the isoglucose case, there are difficulties in deciding what provisions of the Rules of Procedure are applicable and to what extent. Further, would you please make it clear that if no decision on this matter is arrived at today, the consultation procedure is at an end.

President. — Mr Von der Vring, if a request for the establishment of a quorum means that the Parliament will have an opportunity of taking the vote at the next part-session, then the parliamentary procedure is normally still applicable.

I call Mr Gautier.

Mr Gautier. — (D) Mr President, would you please advise me with regard to an incident that took place four months ago? On that occasion, my group had requested the Chair to establish whether a quorum was present and then left the Chamber. The interpretation placed on the Rules of Procedure was that, before a quorum could be established, the doors were to be locked and then the votes counted. Pursuant to this interpretation of the Rules, may I ask you now to have the doors locked and to ask whether 30 Members are present.

(Protests)

President. — I call Mr Marshall for an explanation of vote.

Mr Marshall. — Mr President, representing the London Borough of Islington, which is the centre of the London gin industry, but, what is more important, being a member of a profession whose motto is *Verbum meum pactum*, I find it difficult to understand the opposition to this proposal, because there is no doubt that the whisky rebates were an integral part of last May's agricultural price review. They were the *quid pro quo* for agricultural price increases.

Those have been given and enjoyed, and if their whisky rebates do not occur quickly people will feel they have been let down and as soon as integrity is called into question, as soon as the word of honour of a nation is endangered, then the trust which is the basis of this Community is jeopardized. I hope that no one is going to play a procedural game this morning to undermine the trust of nations in this Community, because if they do then they endanger the whole future of this Community, the prosperity of our people and the peace of the world.

(Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)

President. — On the proposal for a regulation, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr de Lipkowski and others and replacing the second paragraph of Article 2 with the following text:

It shall apply with effect from the date of the entry into force of the common organization of the market in alcohol.

I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

(The result of the vote showed that a majority of the current Members of Parliament had not taken part in it)

This item is accordingly placed on the agenda of the next sitting.

*

* *

President. — I put to the vote the *Seeler et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-807/80): Community fisheries policy.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

We proceed to the *Helms et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-814/80): Community fisheries policy.*

I call Mr Marshall on a point of order.

¹ OJ C 28 of 9 2. 1981.

Mr Marshall. — As there was not a quorum for the previous votes, can we ask for the establishment of a quorum for this vote under Rule 33 (3)? I wish to give notice that I intend to bob up and down asking for a quorum on every vote. If people can use procedural devices ...

President. — Are there 10 Members supporting Mr Marshall's request?

(More than ten Members rose to their feet)

A quorum is present.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote. The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — We proceed to the *Glinne et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-821/80): 'Unification' of Libya and Chad.*

Are there any explanations of vote?

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Mr President, after the resolution now before us was tabled, the press published the final communiqué which was adopted in Lomé by fourteen African governments. It is evident that the governments in question hold the Lagos agreements of December 1979 to be still valid, and that in consequence the 'unification' agreement between Libya and Chad is unacceptable and must be declared null and void. In addition, any power contemplating military operations within Chadian territory or based in that territory must abandon such intentions. The population of Chad must be able to express its will through elections which can only be organized under the auspices of the OAU. The final communiqué of Lomé indicates moreover that the secretary general of the OAU possesses a mandate until April 1987 to organize free and fair elections in Chad under the auspices and the control of the OAU itself. This Lomé communiqué fully justifies the philosophy of the motion for a resolution which the Parliament is now considering. There is also a substantial difference, which there is no need for me to emphasize, between free elections such as I have just mentioned and the referendum which, according to this morning's radio broadcast, Libyan authorities are now considering.

Mr President, during the debate on urgent procedure, I indicated how important it was that our colleagues on the joint ACP-EEC committee, who will be going

¹ OJ C 28 of 9. 2. 1981.

to Sierra Leone in a few weeks, should be precisely informed of Parliament's attitude. I think it is important for us to uphold the rights of the people of Chad, and I consider that these rights are incompatible with a hasty and imposed annexation. This is the thinking behind this resolution, which we hope will be adopted by the Assembly.

President. — I call Mr Israël.

Mr Israël — *(F)* Mr President, I would like to clarify for our colleagues that it was only due to a problem of time that my group did not associate itself with this resolution. We are strongly in favour of it, however, and will give it all our support.

I do wish to make one brief remark, to the effect that I feel that the reference to the movement of the non-aligned nations is completely anachronistic, and cannot be justified. Nevertheless we will join with the majority to approve this resolution.

President. — I call Mr Habsburg.

Mr Habsburg — *(D)* Mr President: A short time ago a leading Arab political figure told me that he had been in China shortly before the death of Chou-en-lai. At that time the great Chinese statesman said to him, 'Do not forget that General Ghadafi is the spearhead of Soviet imperialism in North and Black Africa.' I believe that this statement by one of the greatest men of our time contains the truth about the invasion of Chad. We must be clearly aware that this constitutes a first step, preparatory to various further initiatives. It is high time that we took action to oppose it, even if it be only the reinforcement of a physical border with a moral one. Each European nation which is ready to act on this issue — as France is ready to do in Central Africa, in Nigeria, for example — should join with the others to offer moral support. For this reason I salute this decision.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote. The resolution is adopted.¹

IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

Vice-President

President. — We proceed to the motion for a resolution contained in the *Walz report (Doc. 1-696/80): Energy production (soft technologies).*

¹ OJ C 28 of 9. 2. 1981.

President

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 and 2)

On paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 4, tabled by Mr Coppieters and replacing this paragraph with the following text:

3. Considers that, in view of the continuing dependence upon non-renewable energy sources, every effort should be made to keep energy demand to a minimum, notably by energy conservation policies and concern for the energy-consumption impact of techniques of production; emphasizes that choices about additional energy production must allow for considerations about the health and safety of present and future generations.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Walz, rapporteur. — *(D)* I can support Mr Coppieters's amendment provided it is inserted as paragraph 3a. Mr Coppieters has said that he agrees. If this procedure is adopted, it has my support.

President. — Are there any objections to this oral amendment? That is agreed.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 3 and Amendment No 4)

On paragraph 5, I have three amendments:

— No 5, tabled by Mr Coppieters and rewording this paragraph as follows:

5. Takes the view, therefore, that the time has come to push strongly ahead with further research and investment programmes to test and develop new sources of energy, particularly the generation of heat and electricity from solar energy, wind energy, biomass and geothermal energy, in order to add to the existing range of still vital sources of energy such as coal, oil and gas and to permit the rapid abandonment of nuclear power, and in particular, an immediate halt to the development of fast-breeder reactors, whilst still offering economically viable alternatives which reduce the dependence of the European Communities on third countries;

— No 3, tabled by Mr Adam on behalf of the Socialist Group and deleting the following phrase:

such as coal and nuclear power, including fast-breeder and high-temperature reactors.

— No 2, tabled by Mrs Lizin and deleting the following phrase:

including fast-breeder and high-temperature reactors.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Walz, rapporteur. — *(D)* I am against all three amendments.

(Parliament rejected all three amendments and adopted, first paragraph 5, then paragraph 6)

President. — On paragraph 7, I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Turcat, seeking to replace this paragraph with the following text:

7. Believes that there is still considerable scope for decentralized investment and energy production in the highly developed industrialized countries even outside existing electricity grids; considers, however, that such production, on a small or medium scale, is even better suited to developing countries, towards whose progress it can make an appreciable contribution, while at the same time avoiding, through decentralized distribution, the unreasonable formation of large urban concentrations.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Walz, rapporteur. — *(D)* The wording is better than my own. It has my support.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 and paragraphs 8 to 10)

President. — I put, as amended, the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* * *

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *Carossino report (Doc. 1-708/80): Shipping safety and pollution prevention.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 6)

After paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 2, by Mr Howell and Mr Turner, seeking to add a new paragraph:

- 6a. Calls on the Council without delay, to negotiate with the international agencies a 'special rules status' for the North Sea in line with those at present enforced in the Baltic and Mediterranean Seas, particularly with a view to ensuring that means are found of identifying and bringing to justice ships polluting Community waters, whether they are destined for Community ports or not

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Carossino, rapporteur. — *(I)* In favour, Mr President.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2)

¹ OJ C 28 of 9. 2. 1981.

President. — On paragraph 7, I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Percheron and Mr Josselin, seeking to add the following at the end of the paragraph:

... urgently requests the Member States to consider ways of taking action within maritime conferences in which European shipowners play a dominant rôle so as to ensure that the application of the various safety standards provided for in these international conventions is actually taken into account in the rules for the operation of these maritime conferences.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Carossino, rapporteur. — (I) In favour, Mr President.

(Parliament adopted in succession Amendment No 1, paragraph 7 as amended and paragraphs 8 to 11)

President. — After paragraph 11, I have Amendment No 3, by Mr Howell, seeking to add the following new paragraph:

11a. Calls on the Commission to extend its recommendations on vessel safety standards to include minimum crew qualifications for all ships travelling in Community waters and flying any flag, whether or not destined for Community ports.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Carossino, rapporteur. — (I) I consider this superfluous inasmuch as what the amendment calls for is already contained in an international convention to which the proposal for a directive refers. I therefore suggest it be rejected.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 3 and paragraphs 12 to 17)

President. — I put, as amended, the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*

* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Maij-Weggen report (Doc. 1-709/80): Marine pollution.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

*

* *

¹ OJ C 28 of 9. 2. 1981.

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *Maij-Weggen report (Doc. 1-473/80): Prevention of disasters during oil and gas extraction.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 and 2)

On paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 1/rev., by Mrs Squarcialupi, seeking to modify this paragraph as follows:

3. Calls on the Commission to obtain information on the national legislation of the various states bordering on the North Sea and other waters surrounding the EEC countries on the offshore extraction of oil... (rest unchanged).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Beumer, deputy rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, the rapporteur has asked me to tell you that she is in favour of this amendment.

(Parliament adopted in succession Amendment No 1/rev., paragraph 3, as amended, and paragraphs 4 to 9)

President. — I call Mr Muntingh for an explanation of vote.

Mr Muntingh. — (NL) Mr President, I learned this morning that the dreadful oil disaster which took place in the North Sea and which we discussed yesterday was, according to the British press, caused by a Greek tanker. If that is true, it provides yet further proof of the urgent need for this resolution and of the absolute necessity of legislation on pollution due to oil, and for that reason I shall vote in favour.

President. — I put, as amended, the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *Spaak report (Doc. 1-467/80): Marine pollution.*

(Parliament adopted the first indent of the preamble)

¹ OJ C 28 of 9 2 1981

President

On the second indent of the preamble I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mrs Le Roux, seeking to replace this indent with the following text:

- having regard to the fact that oil-tankers and their owners are predominantly responsible for the repeated accidents that have seriously affected numerous coastal regions of the Community and their populations, Brittany in particular,

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Collins, deputy rapporteur. — Mr President, Mrs Spaak has given me a note of her attitudes to the several amendments.

She has asked me to say that she is against this one. She feels it is unnecessarily brutal, I think, and that we should be better to stay with the original.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted the second indent of the preamble; it then adopted the last five indents of the preamble; and paragraph 1)

President. — After paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mrs Le Roux, seeking to add the following paragraph:

- 1a. Recommends that the Commission propose to the governments of the Member States that they introduce a tax on the profits of oil companies from which to constitute a fund to finance research into the prevention of accidental pollution and help repair the damage caused by accidents involving oil-tankers;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Collins, deputy rapporteur. — The rapporteur feels this proposal is unrealistic and is therefore against it.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 2)

President. — On paragraph 2, I have Amendment No 3, tabled by Mrs Le Roux, seeking to replace this paragraph with the following text:

2. Insists that the governments of the Member States should genuinely respect the international agreements to which they have subscribed concerning the prevention of shipping accidents, and ratify the international conventions instituting a standard system of compensation for damage caused by oil pollution (1969 International Convention on Civil Liability and 1971 Convention setting up an International Compensation Fund); stresses the important part which the Community could play in encouraging Member States to adopt rules and regulations complementary to international agreements to increase shipping safety in their territorial waters with regard to all vessels carrying dangerous substances;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Collins, deputy rapporteur. — This is slightly complicated, Mr President. Mrs Spaak feels that she is against the first part of this amendment, i.e. lines 1 to 9 in the English version, but she is quite happy to accept the second part. If Mrs Le Roux were prepared to withdraw the first part, then Mrs Spaak would be happy to accept the second part.

I should perhaps clarify that. The phrase '...setting up an International Compensation Fund);' is the closing phrase of that part of the amendment to which Mrs Spaak objects. She is quite happy to accept the second part, from 'stresses the important part which the Community could play in encouraging Member States ...' to the end.

President. — Mr Baillot, would Mrs Le Roux accept this?

Mr Baillot. — (F) I suggest a separate vote on each part. It would be much simpler!

(Parliament rejected the two parts of the amendment separately and adopted paragraph 2)

President. — After paragraph 2, I have Amendment No 4, tabled by Mrs Le Roux, seeking to add the following paragraph:

- 2a. Recommends that the Commission take steps to induce the governments of the Member States to bring all research work on the prevention of marine pollution under the responsibility of the universities or public research organizations;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Collins, deputy rapporteur. — The rapporteur is against this.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 4 and adopted paragraph 3)

President. — On paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 5, tabled by Mrs Le Roux, seeking to delete this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's view?

Mr Collins, deputy rapporteur. — The committee was unanimously in favour of this paragraph: obviously, therefore, the rapporteur is against the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 5 and adopted paragraphs 4 and 5)

President. — I call Mrs Dekker for an explanation of vote.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Mr President, on behalf of D'66, I wish to say how glad I am that the resolutions concerning the occurrence and prevention of marine pollution will probably be adopted without any attempt to weaken their impact. I believe that we shall thereby be making a big step forward and, as a Parliament, we shall be making a valuable contribution towards solving the whole of this serious problem.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Alber report (Doc. 1-660/80): Research and development in the field of the environment.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the *Combe report (Doc. 1-729/80): Maximum levels for pesticide residues.*

We must first consider the proposals for directives.

On point 8.2 of Annex II to the second directive, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 3, by Mrs Martin:

In the second column, replace '0.02' by '0.2'.

— Amendment No 2, by Mr Delatte:

In the second column, replace '0.02' by '0.1'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Combe, rapporteur. — (F) On No 3, unfavourable.

With regard to No 2, I leave it to the wisdom of the House. Personally, but not as rapporteur, I am in favour.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 3 and adopted Amendment No 2)

President. — We now come to the motion for a resolution.

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 8)

After paragraph 8, I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Sherlock, seeking to add the following paragraph:

8a. Asks the Commission to consider amending the directive to include a requirement that the Member States should carry out regular monitoring and surveillance of foods, both as sold to the consumer and as eaten, and report the results on a regular basis to the Commission in order to ensure an efficient and similar degree of enforcement throughout the Community;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Combe, rapporteur. — (F) I am in favour.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 and paragraphs 9 to 12)

President. — I put, thus amended, the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — We now come to the *Hooper report (Doc. 1-659/80): Recovery and reuse of waste paper and board.*

We must first vote on the amendments to the proposal for a recommendation.

On the sixth recital of the preamble, I have Amendment No 1, by Mrs Fuillet, seeking to delete this recital.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Miss Hooper, rapporteur. — Against, Mr President. The committee voted overwhelmingly in favour of having a target figure.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1)

¹ OJ C 28 of 9. 2. 1981.

¹ OJ C 28 of 9. 2. 1981.

President. — On the introductory paragraph, I have Amendment No 4, by Mr Sherlock, seeking to amend the paragraph to read as follows:

Recommends that Member States define and implement policies to promote the use of recycled paper and board, and that the Community Institutions do likewise, and particularly:

What is the rapporteur's position?

Miss Hooper, rapporteur. — I am for this amendment, Mr President. It represents a clarification of the committee's intention.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 4)

President. — On the sixth indent I have Amendment No 3, by Mr Sherlock, seeking to amend the indent to read as follows:

— encourage voluntary schemes for selective recovery of domestic as well as industrial waste paper at competitive quality and prices.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Miss Hooper, rapporteur. — For, Mr President. Again a clarification.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 3)

President. — We now come to the motion for a resolution.

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraph 1)

After paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Purvis on behalf of the European Democratic Group and adding the following paragraph:

1a. In particular urges the Commission to reassess its own previous directives and regulations which militate against the use of recycled paper (e.g., in food packaging) and to make new proposals in such areas with all possible speed, taking into account up-to-date energy and timber supply positions as well as technological developments;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Miss Hooper, rapporteur. — I am in favour.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2 and paragraph 2)

President. — I put, thus amended, the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — We proceed to the *Van den Heuvel report (Doc. 1-693/80): Human rights in Uruguay.*

I call Mr Habsburg on a point of order.

Mr Habsburg. — (F) Mr President, I request a vote paragraph by paragraph — to be more precise, that the motion, except for the preamble, be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph and even, as regards the first paragraph, indent by indent.

(Parliament adopted the first five indents of the preamble)

President. — After the fifth indent, I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Fergusson, seeking to add a new indent:

— recalling also the terrorist activities of the Tupamaros Organization, including the cruel kidnapping and detention in solitary confinement for nine months of a British Ambassador, Geoffrey Jackson,

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Van den Heuvel, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, this matter was dealt with in committee, where it was considered sufficient to include this point in the explanatory statement. I leave it to the Parliament, however, to decide whether it should be included in the preamble.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 and the sixth indent of the preamble)

President. — On the seventh indent, I have Amendment No 2, by Mr Fergusson, seeking to replace this indent with the following text:

— having regard to its Resolution of 21 November 1980 on the referendum in Uruguay (Doc. 1-607/80) and the fact that, despite the efforts of the Uruguayan Government, the people did not accept the proposed new constitution.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Van den Heuvel, rapporteur. — (NL) I am in favour of this addition, since it states a matter of fact.

¹ OJ C 28 of 9. 2. 1981.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2 and the eighth indent of the preamble)

President. — Amendment No 4, tabled by Mr Fergusson, to paragraph 1 has been withdrawn.

(Parliament adopted the first,¹ second and third indents of paragraph 1, then paragraph 1 as a whole, paragraph 2 and paragraph 3)

After paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 5, tabled by Mr Van Minnen and adding the following paragraph:

- 3a. Disapproves of the fact that the Uruguayan régime took advantage of the Gold Cup tournament in Montevideo for purposes of political propaganda;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Van den Heuvel, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I did submit to the committee an amendment referring to the mini-world football tournament; but the reference was removed by a majority in committee — without, incidentally, any arguments being adduced — and so I must, as rapporteur, assume that the majority of the committee would be against this amendment also.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 5)

President. — On paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 3, tabled by Mr Fergusson and modifying this paragraph as follows:

4. Requests the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation to take suitable joint measures, both through diplomatic channels and in the United Nations, to improve the situation of the people of Uruguay and to make strong protests to the Government of Uruguay concerning the violation of human rights and to raise the matter at the next meeting in Geneva of the Commission on Human Rights (remainder deleted).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Van den Heuvel, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I should have no objection if the addition contained in this amendment were added to the text already there. If Mr Fergusson agrees to this, I have nothing against the amendment; but if it means scrapping the last sentence of my text, then I am against it.

President. — I call Mr Fergusson.

Mr Fergusson. — Mr President, I am quite happy about that.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 4, Amendment 3, as orally amended, and paragraph 5)

President. — After paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 6, tabled by Mr Coppieters and adding the following paragraph:

- 5a. Is incensed, in particular, that arms were just recently shipped to Uruguay from Belgium;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Van den Heuvel, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I have no grounds for supposing that the committee would have objected to this amendment. I am therefore in favour.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 6¹ and adopted paragraph 6)

President. — I call Mr Lomas to give an explanation of vote.

Mr Lomas. — I only want to make one point, Mr President. I shall, of course, vote for the motion as a whole, but I should like to explain briefly why I voted against the amendment in which Mr Fergusson attacked the Tupamaros as acting cruelly towards the captured British diplomat, Geoffrey Jackson. I do not condone the taking of hostages under any circumstances, but I think we could hardly describe this act as a cruel one: the Tupamaros were quite clearly not cruel to Mr Jackson while he was held as a hostage.

The Tupamaros are sincere idealists, they have honourable ethical attitudes and they are dedicated to a cause.

(Protests from the European Democratic Group)

Mr President, I am very sorry that people on the other side of the Chamber should jeer at that, because those are the words of Geoffrey Jackson, the diplomat who was held as a hostage.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

I should like to quote, if I may, just two or three paragraphs from an interview which he gave following his kidnapping. He was asked first of all about his relationship and the conditions while he was held as a hostage. They asked him about the heat in the cell, and he said: 'It is sometime hot here, but we have electric fans.' They asked him whether he read at all. He said, 'Yes. They have been very helpful with reading-matter. I have had *Don Quixote*, *War and Peace*, they have brought me the complete works of Oscar Wilde and many other books too.' They then turned to the question of music, and he listed all the records and the equipment to play them that they brought for him, including Beethoven and Brahms and other composers.

(Laughter from the European Democratic Group)

¹ By sitting and standing.

Lomas

They then went on to talk about the relationship with the captors, and this is what Geoffrey Jackson, despite what the opposition here are shouting, who know nothing about the situation between Jackson and the Tupamaros, said:

They do not want to harm me. I have already reached conclusions about the type of mentality of the young Tupamaros, which I had not been able to do before.

(Loud laughter from the European Democratic Group)

Question: What are those conclusions?

Answer: They are hard-working, serious and are completely dedicated.

Question: What are the differences between the opinion you had of the Tupamaros before you were kidnapped and the one you have now?

Answer: I found them much more human than I expected. They are people dedicated to a cause and they accept the risks involved.

Mr President, I end with these words I quoted at the beginning. They are very honourable, ethical and sincere idealists. They are quite the opposite of what was stated in Mr Fergusson's amendment, and I hope that the Parliament will take the word of Mr Jackson rather than of Mr Fergusson.

(Protests from the European Democratic Group. Applause from certain quarters on the left)

President. — I call Mr Forth to give an explanation of vote.

Mr Forth. — Mr President, I was initially going to abstain on this motion, because it is yet another example of gratuitous and unnecessary interference by the Community in a far-away part of the world which occupies an excessive amount of this Parliament's time, particularly on the very morning when we have been unable to raise a quorum on a matter vital to the Community and concerning its own business and its own citizens. This is another instance of that absurd procedure that we have indulged in before: self-indulgence and interference where it is none of our business and an inability to concentrate our minds and our activities and even our presence here on matters of the Community's own business and running and management.

That is why I was going to abstain; but I now hear our friend from across the Chamber speaking and I am now going to vote against the motion, because if we can hear a Member of this Parliament defending and justifying terrorism, who can actually stand in this Chamber and say — and apparently believe what he is saying — that he supports the holding of somebody

against his will and does not classify this as an act of terrorism, this is quite mind-boggling. I have never heard the like and I hope never to hear it again. These same people on that side of the Chamber this very week complained when somebody had been imprisoned in a Member State of this Community after due process of law and insisted on his release, and yet from that side of the Chamber we now get a justification of an act of terrorism in holding somebody in conditions of imprisonment.

For all these reasons, Mr President, having listened to the debate and particularly to that explanation of vote, I am going to vote against this resolution: I cannot possibly associate myself with it.

(Applause from some quarters of the European Democratic Group)

President. — I call Mr Hord on a point of order.

Mr Hord. — Mr President, I wish under Rule 33 (3) to request that you ascertain whether a quorum is present.

(More than ten Members rose to support this request)

President. — Under Rule 33 (2), 145 Members must be present.

I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — Mr President, we have had this situation earlier this morning, when it was decided that the quorum should be ascertained on the basis of the number of votes cast, not on the number of people present in the Chamber. I therefore request that you follow the precedent and suggest that the procedure now being followed is not correct. We should take the vote and then declare the vote valid or invalid.

President. — As there are only 118 Members present, there is not a quorum present. The vote will accordingly be placed on the agenda of the next sitting.

*

* *

President. — We come now to the Delatte report (Doc. 1-792/80): Isoglucose.

I call Mr Curry on a point of order.

Mr Curry. — I request under Rule 33 (4) that you ascertain whether a quorum exists.

President. — This must be requested by 30 Members.

I note that at least 30 Members do support this request.

I put the six indents of the preamble to the vote.

Half the Members have not participated in the vote. The vote will therefore be taken again at the next sitting.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *Louwes report (Doc. 1-529/80): Framework agreement for cooperation between the EEC and Brazil.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 and 2)

After paragraph 2, I have Amendment No 2, by Mr Vergeer and others, seeking to add the following paragraph:

- 2a. Hopes that steps will be taken to better the situation of the poorest sections of society, *inter alia* by the introduction of improved social and labour norms;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Louwes, rapporteur. — (NL) In favour, Mr President.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2¹ and paragraphs 3 and 4)

President. — After paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 3, tabled by Mrs Squarcialupi, seeking to add the following paragraph:

- 4a. Considers, however, that the EEC-Brazil cooperation agreement should contain the requirement that basic international norms on working conditions, e.g., the number of hours worked in a day, must be respected;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Louwes, rapporteur. — (NL) I am against, Mr President, for two reasons. First, the amendment amounts to interference in another country's affairs; secondly, the point has already been settled now that Amendment No 2, by Mr Vergeer, has been adopted.

President. — I call Mrs Baduel Glorioso.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso. — (F) I can state that Mrs Squarcialupi was prepared to omit the last part of her amendment — that is, the words 'e.g., the number of hours worked in a day,' if that makes it easier to get this amendment adopted.

President. — What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Louwes, rapporteur. — (NL) The meaning is not thereby substantially affected, Mr President. I therefore remain opposed to it.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 3 and adopted paragraphs 5 to 7)

President. — On paragraph 8, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Müller-Hermann on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), seeking to have this paragraph continued as follows:

8. ... , urges that the UNCTAD Agreement also be applied to shipping between Brazil and the European Community, the load being distributed in the ratio 40:40:20;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Louwes, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I have no difficulties with this amendment. It concerns a multilateral agreement under UNCTAD and is in line with the spirit of my report. I am therefore in favour.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1, paragraph 8, thus amended, and paragraphs 9 to 12)

President. — I put, thus amended, the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

12. Membership of Parliament

President. — Mr Herbert Köhler has informed me, by letter of 12 January 1981, of his resignation as Member of the European Parliament with effect from 16 January.

Pursuant to Article 12 (2), second subparagraph, of the Act concerning the election of representatives to the Assembly by direct universal suffrage, the Assembly establishes that there is a vacancy and duly informs the Member State concerned. This will be done immediately.

¹ By sitting and standing.

¹ OJ C 28 of 9. 2. 1981.

13. *Community information policy (contd)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

President. — The next item on the agenda is the continuation of the debate on the report by Mr Schall on the Community's information policy (Doc. 1-596/80).

I call Mrs Gaiotti de Biase.

Mrs Gaiotti de Biase. — (*I*) On such a tiring morning I will not have the bad taste to make an exhaustive study of the information policy. It is simply my duty to express the support and the agreement of my group on the demanding report drafted by Mr Schall on a matter to which we have given the greatest political emphasis.

I would only point out briefly that for this Parliament and this Community information policy is in no way comparable, as a Danish colleague who has just spoken seems to think, to similar policies conducted by the individual Member States. As the Schall report makes clear, Community information policy has three main tasks. Above all it is a policy which relates to the Community institutions, and therefore does not deal in information pure and simple. It has to introduce and explain the existence of the Community, yet it must provide ample scope for diversity; it is not propaganda, but it must represent a knowledgeable and critical debate on the successes and disappointments, the failures and controversies which surround the Community. We believe in fact that the more these controversial problems are discussed — in Denmark as well — the easier it is to understand the importance of this great ideal: the political commitment which is European unity.

Secondly, the information policy of the Community is based on democratic control, which is exercised differently and with different goals than is the case for national parliaments. It is necessary to bring the European citizen closer to the institutions, so that he may perform a controlling function which geographical distance often denies him.

Thirdly, the information policy must represent the Community abroad. Many Member States already conduct serious cultural campaigns in foreign countries, but we must respond to the global importance of the Community with a precise information policy.

The report deals exhaustively with a number of aspects of the information policy, including even technical details. I do not want to delay the closing of this part-session any further, so I refer you to what has been said in the report and urge Parliament to approve it, since I am convinced that, in spite of the fact that the debates occur, as many have pointed out, in silence and in a void, the acts of Parliament, because of their official nature, constitute an essential part of our activity.

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Martin.

Mr Martin. — (*F*) Mr President, during the campaign which preceded the direct election of this Assembly, French communists denounced the means adopted by the European authorities, means which led to the financing of a national campaign abroad. We denounced it as an unacceptable interference in the internal affairs of the European nations; better, we obtained in our national assembly a law against such financing. The extraordinary sum of 50 million francs, 7 % of the running costs of the Community Assembly, was devoted to flooding our country with slogans praising your Europe. Today, 5.5 thousand million centimes per year are allocated by this Assembly for what you term 'informing the Europeans'. And the Commission, on its part, spends more than 7 thousand million centimes for this purpose for publications alone. This is an enormous amount.

Now Mr Schall wants even more. The sum is not sufficient, says he, to arouse the Europeans and to produce a permanent propaganda for Europe. It is true that it is rather difficult for the partisans of European integration to project a positive and popular picture of Europe, and this report is an admission of their failure. Since the election in June, 1979, not a single popular industrial, agricultural, or social project, not a single programme oriented towards progress has been approved by this Assembly. You have preferred to set yourselves up as an international tribunal. You have preferred to support programmes of demolition and restructuring which favor certain particular interests instead of working for the benefit of the majority in the direction of progress, justice, and peace. The people's resistance has quite understandably reached a level of considerable vehemence, and their repugnance is equally apparent. Now you want to finance even more organizations favourable to your European ideas so that they may spread and advertise your policy. This has nothing to do with pluralistic and reciprocal information for Europeans about their respective countries, cultures, and traditions.

For our part, we protest against this frantic effort of propaganda and the amount of money destined for it, for it is indeed a question of propaganda, as the rapporteur himself has admitted. The best proof of this is that Commissioner Natali, whose task it is to broaden global European policy, is also responsible for information.

The Communist and Allies Group will not support this report. On the contrary, we will denounce these partisan proposals to the manual and intellectual

Martin

workers, proposals designed merely to sweeten the better pill of austerity, of supranationality, and of enlargement. We will continue to participate in the struggle for the independence and sovereignty of our country, a struggle strongly supported particularly among the workers of France.

President. — I call Mrs Lenz.

Mrs Lenz. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, most of the important points have already been touched upon. Yesterday evening the stars themselves were quoted, but I must say that the noon hour on Friday is an unsuitable time to discuss the information policy of the European Community, an issue presented with remarkable precision and detail by our rapporteur. It is unfortunate that this debate was not scheduled for the beginning of a week, as it deserved to be.

I would like to limit myself here to a few short remarks. European citizens should certainly be better informed — we have all been hearing this complaint since the direct elections. In his report, Mr Schall also refers to the matter. There is only one way to improve the information situation before the next elections, and this is through a definite EC information policy. It makes no sense to complain here if we take no steps to deal with the question in an adequate manner. I would like to request the Commission to ensure that particular attention is paid to the groups which will be our electors — and in this respect I appreciate the reference to women in point number 8 and Mr Brok's reference to young people. Only if we succeed in addressing these people in a manner calculated to give them a personal understanding of European affairs will we gain their electoral support. I would like to ask the Commission not to underestimate the work done in the Commission offices responsible for the European elections, small tasks which contribute towards more important accomplishments. I would like to ask the Commission to give these offices full support; these are demands which we will certainly make again in the report on the situation of women.

One last point: I am completely opposed to the position of our Danish colleague, who spoke a few moments ago, and of some other members. In the report the work of the branch offices was thoroughly illustrated. The branch offices of the European Community are very helpful in many ways; we as parliamentarians are in a position to confirm this. Nevertheless, I would like to call attention to one point in the Schall report where it is stipulated that the information policy of the offices of the European Community should not come under national influences. In some countries there is a tendency to pursue national politics in these offices — we could all tell a tale about that. There is a tendency towards the increasing politicization of these offices, which creates the danger that the central issues which we and the

Commission have indicated for the EC information policy will be distorted and not expressed in a manner suitable to a pluralistic political Community. The clear and proper presentation of Community affairs is for us a vital necessity which enables a citizen to make full use of his democratic rights, as Mr Schall has said in his report.

President. — I call Mr Pedini.

Mr Pedini, Chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information, and Sport. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, one of the main problems Parliament must face concerns the functioning of its own internal mechanisms. This includes information, and it is unfortunate that the report did not receive all the attention it deserved from this Assembly. I hope nevertheless that all our colleagues will read it and reflect on it, for it contains a number of proposals for initiatives which could certainly keep us occupied for the next few years.

I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Schall, for the effort he has put into the preparation of the report and the Committee as a whole for having unanimously adopted it, after having worked to clarify its conclusions. My thanks also to Mr Natali for what he said yesterday as the Commissioner responsible for this sector. Mr President, this is a question of political commitment. Contrary to what one person has stated, we are not engaged in propaganda through information: we merely seek a contact with public opinion in the electorate, in order to establish and pursue a joint policy. Any information activity consists in providing news in order to obtain a reaction; it should solicit other suggestions enabling us to honour our commitments and fulfil our tasks.

It is obvious that a Parliament, elected for this purpose, gives a wholly new character to the job that awaits us. It is my duty, as president of the competent committee, to recommend to you, Mr President, that we work together to develop the relationship between the Committee on Culture and the Bureau. We therefore recommend that the daily work of information be carried out in a more conscientious manner.

I hope Parliament itself will be the one to promote the elaboration of the information material through TV programmes, with the participation of our excellent officials and in conjunction with technicians and experts, since information is also a matter of expertise.

I share a wish which Mr Bersani would certainly have made had he been present: that together with the specific information aimed at the schools, at women, at youth, and especially at the scientific and cultural world, without which it is impossible to build a solid Community, we must keep in mind — as Mr Bersani recommended to me a short while ago — the responsi-

Pedini

bilities to be borne by Parliament and by the Commission for information programmes aimed at associated developing countries and designed to ensure their co-participation in the new international order.

Mr President, in conclusion I would like to say that it is impossible to conduct an information policy without situating it in its political context. Political inspiration allows us to utilize information channels to build the European citizen. No matter what may be said, the free circulation of men in the Community cannot be accomplished without the free circulation of men's ideas. This is the essential foundation on which to build the Community.

I wish to assure you, Mr President, that our report has not dealt with broader issues. We have simply pointed out the need for greater efficiency in the services concerned. When we ask that the Committees in Brussels be supported to a greater degree by those services whose task it is to inform public opinion about our work, or when we hold hearings, we do not mean to concern ourselves with matters outside our province. We have a right to ask for anything which is needed to improve and facilitate our work.

I conclude by inviting everyone to join with public opinion to build Community policy. I am well aware that there are indeed difficulties in involving public opinion; these are difficulties which derive, Mr President, from the fact that working for Europe means not so much working for the present but rather preparing the future. Generally speaking the future is less interesting than current events, but it does concern history, and history concerns mankind.

President. — The debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

(Parliament adopted the first four indents of the preamble)

On the fifth indent, I have Amendment No 41, tabled by Mr Hutton and rewording this indent as follows:¹

... but that at the same time it is the principal task of the information services of the European Parliament to make the citizens of the Member States of the European Community aware of the existence and rôle of the Parliament...

What is the rapporteurs' position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — I am in favour of the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 41, the fifth indent as amended, the sixth and seventh indents and the first indent of paragraph 1)

President. — On the second indent of paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 36, tabled by Mr Coppieters and rewording this indent as follows:

— notes that knowledge about Community policies is best conveyed to the citizens of the Community in their homes, schools and places of work;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I agree.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 36)

President. — On the third indent, I have Amendment No 42, tabled by Mr Hutton and adding at the end of this indent, after the words 'the regions affected', the following phrase:

and that Community authorities should insist on constant publicity for the Community contribution while a project is under way.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I agree.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 42 and the third indent, thus amended)

President. — On the fourth indent, I have two amendments:

— No 11, tabled by Mrs Viehoff and others and replacing the words 'and to report to the European Parliament by June 1981' by the phrase 'and to make a written report to the European Parliament by September 1981'; and

— No 4, tabled by Mrs Pruvot on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and adding, after the phrase 'and report', the words 'in writing'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I agree to both amendments, although No 4 will fall if No 11 is adopted.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 11, as a result of which Amendment No 4 fell. It then adopted the fourth indent, thus amended)

President. — On paragraph 2, I first have Amendment No 12, tabled by Mrs Viehoff and others and deleting the whole of this paragraph.

¹ Amendment No 35, by Mr Coppieters, had been withdrawn.

President

What is the rapporteur's position?

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1)

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) This amendment was discussed at length in committee and rejected by a majority.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 12)

President. — I have further Amendment No 37, tabled by Mr Coppeters and deleting the third indent.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I leave the decision to the House.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 37 and adopted paragraph 2)

President. — On paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 43, tabled by Mr Hutton and adding the following phrase at the end of this paragraph:

and that material put together by the Commission's services should be more readily available to national and regional radio and TV services.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I approve of the addition.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 43 and paragraph 3, thus modified)

President. — On paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 13, tabled by Mrs Viehoff and others and deleting the following phrase:

considers in this connection that a compromise must be found between the requirements of the Staff Regulations governing recruitment procedures and the need where appropriate to recruit expert staff from outside the institutions.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) This amendment was rejected by a majority in committee.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 13 and adopted paragraph 4)

President. — On paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Schall and replacing the words '1981 budget' by the words '1982 budget'.

President. — I call Mr Hutton.

Mr Hutton. — I withdraw Amendment No 44, Mr President.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 5, thus amended)

President. — After paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 14, tabled by Mrs Viehoff and others and adding the following new paragraph:

5a. Calls on the Commission to make its documentation and appropriate publications available during part-sessions and other parliamentary meetings, in order to ensure complete information for Members, journalists and visitors;

What is the rapporteur's view?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I agree.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 14)

President. — I call Mr Hahn.

Mr Hahn. — (D) I withdraw Amendment No 25, Mr President.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 6)

President. — After paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 45, tabled by Mr Hutton and inserting the following new paragraph:

6a. Calls on the Commission to recognize the important rôle of Members of the European Parliament in increasing the level of information about the Community at local and regional level and to increase its cooperation with Members;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am against. The idea is good, but it is already mentioned elsewhere.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 45 and paragraph 7)

President. — After paragraph 7, I have Amendment No 46, tabled by Mr Hutton and inserting the following two paragraphs:

7a. Emphasizes that the external offices must be much more energetic in distributing their publicity material (e.g., in the United Kingdom, to all public libraries) and in updating it whenever necessary;

President

7b. Emphasizes also the very great importance of distributing publicity material to teachers and to schools and colleges as widely and as generously as possible, and deplores the fact that financial constraints are making this difficult.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I accept paragraph 7a but oppose paragraph 7b. I therefore ask for a vote paragraph by paragraph.

(Parliament adopted the first and second parts of Amendment No 46 severally, then paragraphs 8 to 10)

President. — After paragraph 10, I have Amendment No 29, tabled by Mr Brok and others and inserting the following paragraph:

10a. Proposes that the Bureau, when establishing the timetable and the main areas of work for a part-session, should take into account the time and other limiting factors affecting the work of the press, radio and television (e.g., the respective timing of debates and votes);

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour, since this is a valuable addition.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 29 and paragraph 11)

President. — On paragraph 12, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 5, tabled by Mrs Pruvot on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and adding, after the phrase 'information services for Members', the following words: 'journalists and groups of visitors'; and

— No 26, tabled by Mr Brok and others and adding the following text:

12. ...; in this context, requests the publication of a daily information sheet during plenary sessions giving advance details of all meetings running parallel to the plenary sittings, including room-numbers and the subjects under discussion; suggests the issuing of short, duplicated reports on the progress of debates to facilitate the work of journalists;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour, since this is a useful addition.

(Parliament adopted Amendments Nos 5 and 26 and paragraph 12, thus amended)

President. — After paragraph 12, I have Amendment No 15, tabled by Mrs Viehoff and others and adding the following paragraph:

12a. Believes that the Parliament's services should cooperate fully with the corresponding services of the political groups;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am against. The amendment was rejected by a large majority in committee.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 15 and subparagraph (a) of paragraph 13)

President. — On subparagraph (b) of paragraph 13, I have Amendment No 18, tabled by Mr Schwencke and rewording this subparagraph as follows:

(b) developing the Bulletin so that it becomes a genuinely informative publication on the work of the European Parliament and distributing this to the accredited journalists. The following items should be included:

1. answers to Members' questions,
2. European Parliament publications, including information pamphlets and studies by the Directories-General,
3. a list of appointed rapporteurs,
4. deadlines for amendments to reports of the European Parliament,
5. important speeches,
6. reports on the work of the committees and the inter-parliamentary delegations which have undertaken visits on behalf of the European Parliament,
7. publications of the Commission and other institutions of the European Community,
8. the Briefing and Diary on the part-sessions in the respective languages,
9. informative reports, background documents and short articles published for the part-sessions, e.g., on budget legislation.

The Bulletin might possibly be divided into an official and general information section;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) In favour.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 18)

President. — On subparagraph (c) of paragraph 13, I have two amendments:

— No 19, tabled by Mr Schwencke and rewording this subparagraph as follows:

- (c) the introduction of a single-edition press review, initially on a monthly basis and later fortnightly, reproducing in full important articles on the development of European integration and the European Community, particularly the European Parliament. Consideration should also be given to radio and television scripts;

— No 38, tabled by Mr Coppieters and adding the following at the end of this subparagraph:

... in which the views of the minority are also expressed;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am against.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 19¹ and rejected Amendment No 38)

President. — On subparagraph (d) of paragraph 13, I have Amendment No 20, tabled by Mr Schwencke and rewording this subparagraph as follows:

- (d) a range of publications dealing with particular aspects of the work of the European Parliament, written not only by officials but also Members, journalists or academics;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 20)

President. — On subparagraph (e) of paragraph 13, I have Amendment No 21, tabled by Mr Schwencke and replacing this subparagraph by the following text:

- (e) setting up an article and features service (to provide photographic and graphical material on demand) employing specialist journalists as authors to present the major issues in the European Parliament in a readily understandable form;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am in agreement.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 21)¹

President. — On subparagraph (f) of paragraph 13, I have Amendment No 22, tabled by Mr Schwencke and rewording this subparagraph as follows:

- (f) Appointment of a public relations consultant to be responsible for producing graphical material (wall-charts, maps, posters, etc.) and other PR work (competitions, improvement of the service to visitors, advertising material, etc.).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am against, as this is superfluous.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 22 and adopted subparagraph (f))

President. — After subparagraph (f), I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 6, tabled by Mrs Pruvot on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and adding the following new subparagraph:

- (g) a list of rapporteurs;

— Amendment No 27, tabled by Mr Brok and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 6¹ and adopted the last two subparagraphs)

President. — Still on paragraph 13, I have Amendment No 47, tabled by Mr Hutton and adding the following text at the end of this paragraph:

It should also look closely into the possibilities of computerizing the transmission, storage and retrieval of information so that, eventually, information — e.g. on the progress of legislation through the Parliament — should be readily available *via* computer terminals in the Parliament's Information Offices throughout the Community;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am against. The idea is a good one, but this big computer system is already in existence and is working for us.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 47 and paragraph 13, thus modified)

¹ By sitting and standing.

¹ By sitting and standing. Amendment No 27 was withdrawn by Mr Hahn.

President. — On paragraph 14, I have Amendment No 7, tabled by Mrs Pruvot on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and replacing this paragraph by the following text:

14. Stresses the need for a constant flow of information on the work of the committees and considers that the information services in the places of work at which parliamentary meetings are held should be considerably reinforced to this end;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I agree.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 7)

President. — On paragraph 15, I first have Amendment No 39, tabled by Mr Coppieters and rewording this paragraph as follows:

15. Considers it of the greatest importance that Parliament's external offices should continue to have their own news agency and remain independent *vis-à-vis* the external offices of the Commission. There should, however, be closer cooperation between the external offices of Parliament and the Commission as regards the supply of background information;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 39)

President. — On paragraph 15(a), I have Amendment No 24, tabled by Mr Pedini and amending this subparagraph as follows:

- (a) Asks the Bureau to examine the extent to which there should be Parliament facilities in Commission external offices ... (rest unchanged).

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 24)¹

President. — On the third indent of paragraph 15 (g), I have Amendment No 8, tabled by Mrs Pruvot on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and deleting the words 'where these also exist at national level'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 8 and adopted paragraph 15, thus modified)

President. — After paragraph 15, I have Amendment No 30, tabled by Mr Brok and others and inserting the following paragraph:

- 15a. Calls for a regular information service to be provided for the editorial staff of newspapers and radio and television networks (information being supplied separately to the various editorial departments of a newspaper or radio/television station and to the Press Clubs at national Parliaments), giving details of the timetables and main areas of work of the committees and the plenary assembly,

proposes further that this service should be made available to journalists accredited to the European Parliament and to Members, to facilitate communication with editorial departments in the Member States;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 30¹ and adopted paragraphs 16 and 17)

President. — After paragraph 17, I have Amendment No 28, tabled by Mr Brok and others and inserting the following paragraph:

- 17a. Calls for the press rooms to be resited, and better equipped at the same time, to make it easier for journalists to contact the Chamber and the Members;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) In favour. A useful addition.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 28)

President. — On paragraph 18, I have first of all Amendment No 16, tabled by Mrs Viehoff and others and rewording this paragraph as follows:

- 18 Calls emphatically for an intensive expansion of reception services for visitors as a means of organizing the Community-wide exercise of the European citizens' fundamental right of access to meetings of their Parliament; in particular, calls for the content of the information programme for groups of visitors to be expanded, general information seminars ... (remainder unchanged);

What is the rapporteur's position?

¹ By sitting and standing.

¹ By sitting and standing.

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) In favour.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 16)

President. — I then have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Schall and replacing the words '1981 budget' by the words '1982 budget'.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2)

I also have Amendment No 49, tabled by Mr Patterson and amending this paragraph as follows:

... points out that provision must now be made in the implementation of the 1981 budget for the necessary funds, staff and office-space and that the Directorate General should bring the existing system and criteria as regards access and financing into line with the new requirements; believes that the number of visitors must be distributed between the geographical sectors on a percentage basis in line with the number of MEPs from each country and that the budget appropriations should be allocated accordingly; and considers the consultation ... (remainder unchanged)

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) Against.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 49)

President. — Finally, I have Amendment No 31, by Mr Brok and others.

I call Mr Hahn.

Mr Hahn. — (D) I withdraw this amendment, Mr President.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 18, thus modified)

President. — After paragraph 18, I have two amendments:

— No 32, tabled by Mr Brok and others and inserting the following paragraph:

18a. Proposes that reception services for visitors should operate in Brussels and also between part-sessions in Strasbourg, not only to make organized arrangements but also to supply specific information by means of talks, literature, films and other visual and audio-visual methods;

— No 48, tabled by Mr Hutton and inserting the following paragraph:

18a. Recommends that care should be taken to ensure that implementation of arrangements to receive visitors' groups sponsored by Members does not

prejudice support and access for other visitors' groups;

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I am in favour of Amendment No 32 but against Amendment No 48, as this seems to me to go without saying.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 32 and adopted, first Amendment No 48, then paragraph 19)

President. — On paragraph 20, I have three amendments:

— No 17, tabled by Mrs Viehoff and others and replacing this paragraph with the following text:

20. Welcomes the creation of the Association of European Parliamentary Journalists and calls for the creation of a system of permanent accreditation in the near future which should take due account not only of the Association of Parliamentary Journalists but also of the International Press Association in Brussels; calls on the subcommittee on information policy (see paragraph 21) and DG III to maintain ongoing links with the association and the permanently accredited journalists in order to facilitate their work;

— No 9, tabled by Mrs Pruvot on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and replacing this paragraph by the following text.

20. Welcomes the way in which European parliamentary journalists have organized themselves and requests the competent services of the European Parliament to set up as soon as possible the facilities required for active and close cooperation with all journalists.

— No 33, tabled by Mr Brok and others and rewording this paragraph as follows:

20. Calls for the creation of a system of permanent accreditation of journalists to the European Parliament, welcomes the founding of the Association of European Parliamentary Journalists to facilitate relations between the mass media and the Directorate-General for Information, and calls for close cooperation with the Association of European Parliamentary Journalists and the International Press Association;

What is the rapporteur's position on Amendment No 17?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) I accept.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 17, as a result of which Amendments Nos 9 and 33 fell)

President. — On paragraph 21, I have three amendments:

President

— No 3, tabled by Mr Schall and replacing the phrase 'Calls for the setting up of' by the words 'Decides to set up':

— Amendment No 40, tabled by Mr Coppieters and modifying this paragraph as follows:

21. Calls for the setting up of a subcommittee, in which all the groups are represented, of the Committee on Youth, Culture, ... (rest unchanged);

— No 23/rev., tabled by Mr Pedini and amending this paragraph as follows:

21. Calls for the setting up of a subcommittee of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport which, in conjunction with the relevant officials, would maintain a constant reappraisal of the information policy of the European Parliament and its constantly changing requirements, and which would report regularly, with proposals for change, to (4 words deleted) the committee;

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 3)

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) Against No 40, for No 23/rev.

(Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 40 and 23/rev.¹ in succession and adopted paragraph 21, thus amended, and paragraphs 22 to 24)

President. — After paragraph 24, I have two amendments:

— No 10, tabled by Mrs Pruvot on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and inserting the following paragraph:

24a. Wishes to see cooperation established between the press offices of the Community institutions.

— No 34, tabled by Mr Hahn and Mr Brok, and inserting the following paragraph:

24a. Considers it appropriate for a working-party to be set up to monitor the information policy of Parliament and the Commission. This working-party should include members of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, representatives from the Commission and independent experts from the fields of publicity and research. The aim is to assess existing information policy. This is only possible on the basis of a detailed study. The following should be examined:

- the effectiveness of the information policy in terms of its quality;
- the extent to which the various target groups are being reached;

— the differences in the European policy of the Member States;

— the scope for providing information in competition with the deluge of information with which the citizens of the Community are confronted;

— the scope for using existing information media such as television, radio and the press but also the facilities provided by news agencies;

— the involvement of educational institutions, particularly those concerned with teacher-training, universities and schools;

— the financial cost in relation to the results achieved.

Such a comprehensive study can only be carried out by one or more academic institutions — if possible in the various Member States — which will provide the material for the joint working-party's report. The appropriate contracts should be placed and funds made available for these studies under the budget.

On the basis of this report, the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport will draw up guidelines for the information policy of the Commission and the European Parliament.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Schall, rapporteur. — (D) Against No 10 and for No 34.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 10, rejected Amendment No 34 and adopted paragraph 25)

President. — I put, thus amended, the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

14. Social situation of cultural workers

President. — The next item is the interim report by Mrs Pruvot, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on the social situation of cultural workers (Doc. 1-558/80).

I call Mrs Pruvot.

Mrs Pruvot, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this interim report is a request that consideration be given to the little-known socio-professional sector constituted by the cultural workers of the Community. A resolution on the same subject, unanimously adopted on 18 January 1979 by the Parliament designate, has remained a dead letter.

¹ By sitting and standing.

¹ OJ C 28 of 9. 2. 1981.

Pruvot

In point number 6 of this resolution it was indicated that Parliament is of the opinion that 'it is necessary, in order to improve the functioning of the different activities to be undertaken on the Community level, to possess information concerning the social situation of workers in the cultural sector, and invites the Commission to request its Bureau of Statistics to carry out the work necessary for this purpose.'

Two years later, almost to the day, the directly elected European Parliament solemnly repeats this request made in 1979 by the Parliament designate and underlines its urgency. I stress the fact that it is a question of applying Article 22, second paragraph, of the EEC Treaty, where it says that the Assembly may call upon the Commission to draw up reports on particular problems concerning the social situation. It should do this — it is important to stress this point — without occasioning any supplementary expense, for the carrying out of such research is part of the Bureau's official responsibility. The data available to us on this socio-professional sector is very scanty and imprecise and informs us of only two facts. Firstly, little attention is paid to the cultural sector by the Member States, and the Community has yet to take it into consideration. Secondly, the status of these workers differs widely from country to country, but in general their social situation, which differs from one profession to another, is very unsatisfactory. This raises various complex problems. We know that the unemployment rate for cultural workers is always considerably higher than that for other socio-professional categories. This is saying quite a lot. In this sector as well, women are the most affected by unemployment. We also know that, according to the latest ILO statistics, salaries for these workers are often below mere subsistence level. As far as their social protection is concerned, whether they are salaried or independent cultural workers, they are forgotten by the law. Must we conclude that a poet has no right to social security? Research in this field and the publication of statistics regularly kept up to date have become indispensable and urgent. Such research would provide a sociological and scientific instrument to be used for legal and social purposes, and for cultural ones as well. The life, the very survival of culture depends on the working and living conditions of creators and performers. Figures are informative, but they also change, and that is why a continuous updating of the requested statistics is necessary. The objective of this report is to lead the Commission to undertake this investigation so that we may have for cultural workers data as precise as that concerning workers in the agricultural or industrial sectors. How is such discrimination justified? I ask you to analyse this report as a matter of social justice. Since 18 January, 1979, when the members of the former Parliament, some of whom are still here today, judged it a matter of social, human and European interest to support such a request, no work has been started. The problems have remained, however, aggravated by the recession and the delay. I will conclude by saying that

there can be no culture without creators, and they must have help. Society must give artists a sense of their importance. The man of culture must play a double role which is in itself essential: to protect society from forgetfulness and to imagine society's future.

Ladies and gentlemen, I request today your full approval and I stress the importance and the urgency of this task. And, though I am sorry that there are not more of us here to ask that this work be done, the essential thing is that those of us who are present put our request in a forceful manner.

President. — I call Mr Schwencke to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mr Schwencke. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have all become accustomed to turn to the works of the artist and the writer and to let them enrich for us the so-called best hours of the day. The same names usually come up again and again, the pictures by the same artist, the books by the same writer, the same pieces of music by the same composer — all well-known names. Thousands of artists and writers never enjoy wide publicity, and their pictures or books are difficult or impossible to buy. Frequently they only receive posthumous recognition, which is useless for all practical purposes.

Brecht said in his *Three Penny Opera*, 'some stand in the light, but those in the darkness cannot be seen'. In this report, it is a question of those who are in the darkness, not of those who are in the spotlight of publicity. It is a question of doing for them what we have done for farmers, miners, and steel workers, that is, to assure their social status in this Community so that they may lead a decent life and not be obliged to resort to social assistance in old age.

When we described the Pruvot report, which we fully appreciate, as only an 'interim report', we meant that we call upon the Commission finally to furnish us with some statistics, and we urge the statistical service to draw up the figures for these groups in the Member States so that we may draw conclusions from them. Our committee had become aware, through several reports and discussions, that in some Member States, as in Germany, corresponding investigations into the social situation of artists have been undertaken. The results concerning the social security or insecurity of artists, writers, and free-lance workers were so negative that we were all shocked. We are obliged to institute a social policy for artists, after having elaborated social policies for the various other spheres.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in some countries these questions are dealt with adequately, and in others they are not. We should not consider modifying an excellent solution, such as that existing in the Neth-

Schwencke

erlands, for example, but we can at least provide for the necessities of this group — artist, writers, freelancers, actors, etc. — as far as medical care and old age services are concerned. This is the objective of this interim report. The committee itself has planned a hearing with the representatives of former artists' groups for the purpose of studying these questions further, so that we may also hear clearly from that side what possibilities we have as European Parliament in the area of Community cooperation. We support some of the efforts of UNESCO and the Council of Europe, and we feel it imperative to put an end to a shameful situation in the richest part of the world by finally introducing a social policy for cultural workers.

President. — I call Mr Pedini.

Mr Pedini, Chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information, and Sport. — (I) Mr President, as chairman of the committee, I wish to add my particular thanks to the Commission for having declared its willingness to apply Article 122 of the EEC Treaty. The Committee became convinced of the need to present these requests, especially during our meeting in Florence. We would of course welcome a confirmation of this initiative from Parliament, an initiative which is not aimed at innovation but rather at exercising our right to be informed about a Community sector of fundamental importance such as work in the cultural field.

Mr President, we know everything about the workers employed in industry, in agriculture, and in the professions, but we still do not have sufficient knowledge of the cultural sector, which will be so important in the future. The investigation will reveal certain elements which will allow Parliament and the other institutions to make their own judgment.

I also welcome the fact that Mr Thorn, the new president of the Commission, has taken directly upon himself the responsibility for the cultural sector.

Our debate today is thus also a response to the special attention given the matter by Mr Thorn.

President. — I call Mr Hahn to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

Mr Hahn. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mrs Pruvot deserves our thanks for her report. The Group of the European People's Party fully supports this report and its recommendation to obtain statistics on the social situation of cultural workers. The report's objective is a Community initiative in favour of cultural workers, both creators and performers.

We know that there is considerable diversity in the situations of cultural workers: there are those, as Mr Schwencke has already said, who earn very well — I am referring to writers of bestsellers or to stars. The vast majority, however, are struggling for recognition. How many actors live a barely acceptable existence! I don't want to make the mistake of thinking that a schematic solution would be suitable in this sector. Goethe said once that artists are the most difficult persons of society. Artists believe themselves to be the freest members of society — or at least they wish they were — and the most independent, and they resist being pressed into one mould.

It is therefore essential that the Commission inform us as to the various social models existing in this area in the Member States, and that it inform us further of laws and solutions which may already exist, or if discussions have been held where artists themselves had the opportunity to present their points of view.

An important question is whether an initiative for the social security of cultural workers properly belongs in the European Community's sphere of responsibility. It is evident here that separation between culture and economics, between art and labour, is impossible. The artist is a worker and he has a social existence. Art, science, technology, and economics are all closely linked together. They work together to form our culture. *Homo faber* and *homo ludens* are not two vastly different types, but rather they complement one another to keep our culture alive. There is a widespread uneasiness about the Community's limited view of itself as only an economic community, to the neglect or exclusion of the cultural sphere. Art overcame the national and linguistic frontiers in Europe long ago. A separation of work from the material effects of cultural activity is impossible. One has only to think of Michelangelo, Le Corbusier, or the great master-builders. The great styles of architecture are to be found with national variations in the whole of central and western Europe, from Roman times to the present. No one nation can claim the great composers as exclusively its own. The great painters express what all Europeans recognize as their own vision. European literature and philosophy is the source of our collective, multifaceted, political, intellectual and social life.

When we attempt to investigate and improve the social position of cultural workers, we are strengthening the creativity of Europe. No continent in the history of mankind has been as creative as Europe. This creativity is worth preserving.

President. — I call Mr Hutton to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Hutton. — Mr President, Mrs Pruvot has, as she said, presented Parliament with a request that we

Hutton

should find out something about the way in which cultural workers live.

We cannot over-emphasize the role of culture in building Europe. As Mr Hahn has just reminded us, the contribution of the great European creative artists of the past is all around us in the paintings, music, literature, drama and buildings which they have left us. I do not think it would be going too far to say that we could build Europe a good deal faster and with a good deal less aggravation through culture than by some of the other means we are using at the moment. The success of the European Youth Orchestra is, I think, a good example of what I mean.

Part of the interim report I find unpalatable. There are some assumptions made about what the survey will find before it is carried out, which I find irritating. But in essence Mrs Pruvot's report is perfectly reasonable and, as she told us, much of the work has already been done.

My group will support this report and watch with interest what the survey reveals and, I think, with even more interest, what the Commission wants to do with it.

President. — I call Mr Estgen.

Mr Estgen — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I must first congratulate Mrs Pruvot on her excellent report and regret, as she does, that there are so few of us present here at the moment. But, as virtue does not wait upon the number of years, I think that the importance of the problems does not wait upon the number of parliamentarians . . .

Certainly no one here, not even those who are absent today, is unaware that the social situation of cultural workers is, in general, in all of our countries and in most of the cultural sectors, truly inadequate, and that although appreciable differences exist between one profession and another, it is indispensable, on the national as well as on the Community level, to take certain social measures immediately.

Although only a relatively small part of our populations is concerned — artists will always make up a tiny proportion of the population — I feel that they should not be excluded from the social range of our Community action. It is precisely because of their particularity that one can and should apply in their case, as did Mrs Pruvot, Article 122, paragraph 2 of the Treaty, which deals with specific problems concerning the social situation. Mrs Pruvot's reference to it in her report was very much to the point. Parliament must urge the Commission to take action on our report. We presented it once in 1979, and we present it again today with increased urgency, emphasizing that we

cannot allow cultural workers to be considered as the misfits of our social system.

We were elected to represent and defend the interests of all our citizens at the Community level. We must not forget those who, through their creation, constitute what is most precious in our European civilization, as Mr Hahn has very rightly said. It is true that one can hold the opinion, as I do, that artistic creation cannot be confused with productive labour in the common use of the term, and that cultural workers should not be organized into a sort of Community civil service. That would mean — the staff will excuse me — the death of creativity.

We are obviously in favour of the complete freedom and independence of cultural workers in whatever field it may be, but this does not mean that we must not be concerned with their social situation: it is a question of social justice which we cannot ignore. The long and rich tradition of cultural values which characterizes our European civilization obliges us to intervene. We cannot be guilty, at a time when aristocratic or plutocratic rule has given way to collective responsibility, of letting cultural talents die. Life and survival are still the driving forces of all creative activity. But there is always the imperious *primum vivere, deinde filosofare* — or *creare*.

With Mrs Pruvot's excellent interim report and the resolution we are debating, we are nevertheless far from concrete action in favour of cultural workers. It will be necessary to proceed with caution and discernment. In order to do this, to obtain a clear and correct picture of the situation, we must diversify our lines of inquiry. We must have exact data concerning unemployment, income, and social facilities for cultural workers in the different sectors. Only the Bureau of Statistics of the European Community can give us this data: this is its function, and it possesses the means necessary to perform it. We must see to it that the nomenclature adopted is appropriate and clear enough to give us a precise idea of the facts. This is what we are asking for.

Without underestimating the difficulty of such an undertaking — and I reserve the right, at the proper time, to make proposals here concerning the reorganization and extension of the Bureau of Statistics — I think that the benefits to be gained for the Member States as well as for the Community are well worth the effort. I hope that a heightened awareness of the problem and an arousal of the general social consciousness will result, thus facilitating the integration of artistic creation in the mainstream of social life.

A society such as ours, which is passing through a period of radical transformation, has an intense need for creators of every sort. We take pleasure in envisaging the democratization of culture. Such democratization is also to be effected through a rapid improve-

Estgen

ment in the social situation of workers in the cultural sector.

I hope that the report Mrs Pruvot will give us will take us an appreciable distance in this direction.

President. — I call Mr Andriessen.

Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission. — (NL) Mr President, important as culture may have been for the development of Europe, and interesting as the remarks were which Mr Hahn, for example, made on this subject, I would like to limit myself, in my brief statement, to the actual subject of this document.

This is a particularly welcome report, and in general the Commission is therefore able to agree with the recommendations it contains. The report shows quite clearly that the situation of cultural workers, whose particular nature is rightly distinguished from that of other workers in Europe, is unsatisfactory and varies greatly both from one country to another and between the different fields of artistic endeavour.

When things go badly in the economy, it is inevitable that the blows are felt more severely in these sectors than in others. We know this to be so in general terms, but we do not know the details. And it would certainly be useful and appropriate, with a view to mapping out a policy, if much more accurate information and statistics were available. This is a question of the Commission instructing the Statistical Office to collect precise data on unemployment, pay, social security and so on. I therefore support the general tenor of the report and gladly undertake to discuss this matter further with the President of the Commission, Mr Thorn, and my colleague Mr O'Kennedy, who is responsible for the Statistical Office. In doing so, we shall consider in particular how, when and through what procedure these proposals could be implemented.

President. — The debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 4)

On paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Schwencke and others and adding the following text to this paragraph:

'so that the European Parliament can draw the necessary cultural-policy consequences'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mrs Pruvot, rapporteur. — (F) I am in favour.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1, paragraph 5, thus amended, and paragraph 6)

President. — I put, thus amended, the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

15. *Linking work and training for young persons in the Community*

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Prag, on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on linking work and training for young persons in the Community (Doc. 1-460/80).

I call Mr Prag.

Mr Prag, rapporteur. — Actually, Mr President, I rise on a point of order under Rule 32 to move the adjournment of the debate on this subject, and in doing so to protest vehemently at the order of priorities of this Parliament. Every month, Mr President, to quote one example, great shoals of fish pass through this Parliament — frozen fish, fresh fish, big fish, little fish, fish that pass through nets and fish that don't pass through nets, imported fish, domestic fish, coastal fish, catch-quota fish, non-conserved fish, submersal fish, pelagic fish. We might become the European fish parliament, Mr President. But there is much worse than fish. At least fish and the fishing industry are a legitimate Community interest, but if we look at the agenda yesterday, we find we had an urgent debate about a conscientious objector who apparently does not exist, a motion about the Irish rugby team's South African tour, another urgent motion on the situation in El Salvador and yet another one on the fate of six Corsican prisoners.

Mr President, there are 6 Corsican prisoners, but there are nearly 3½ million young people under 25 unemployed in our European Community. We spent our time in a fearful shambles yesterday morning, since much of our time went on matters which are barely related to our activities and our competence. If you look at those urgent motions, Mr President, that were submitted yesterday, three of them came from those empty benches over there who should be concerned with the 3½ million young people unemployed in the Community.

It is with a feeling of very deep disappointment at the way this Parliament behaves and arranges its work that I move the adjournment of the debate on my report, so that we can let it at least take its chance of getting a better showing at a more suitable time at a subsequent part-session.

¹ OJ C 28 of 9. 2. 1981.

President. — I call Mr Boyes.

Mr Boyes. — The rapporteur has quite rightly called for a postponement of this debate, and I am speaking, Mr President, to support the postponement of this debate to the next part-session. Whilst we may not agree on who is responsible for the fact that there are massive unemployment problems in Britain and in other European countries, it is a matter that has to be spoken about in this Parliament. I for one, when I speak on behalf of the Socialist Group, want to make some remarks about the causes of unemployment and the problems faced by youth because of the policies of the British Government and other governments in Europe. So, though not at all for the same reasons as Mr Prag but for the fundamental reason that unemployment has to be debated in this Chamber, that its causes and its effects on youth have to be debated, I would support the adjournment of this report under Rule 32 (d).

(Parliament decided to adjourn the debate)

16. *Dates for the next part-session*

President. — There are no other items on the agenda. I thank the representatives of both Council and Commission for their contributions to our debates.

The enlarged Bureau proposes that our next sittings be held at Luxembourg during the week from 9 to 13 February 1981.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

17. *Approval of the minutes*

President. — Rule 17 (2) of the Rules of Procedure requires me to lay before Parliament, for its approval, the minutes of proceedings of this sitting, which were written during the debates.

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

18. *Adjournment of the session*

President. — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 1.45 p.m.)

Price

	United Kingdom	Ireland	Belgium and Luxembourg	Denmark	Germany	France	Italy	Netherlands	Other countries
	UKL	IRL	BFR/LFR	DKR	DM	FF	LIT	HFL	BFR
Annual subscription 1980—1981	21 25	23.25	1 400,—	252,—	87,50	204,—	39 100	96,—	1 400,—
Single copies:									
up to 32 pages	0 60	0 70	40,—	7,20	2,50	5,80	1 120	2,80	40,—
up to 80 pages	1 20	1 40	80,—	14,40	5,—	11,60	2 240	5,60	80,—

more than 80 pages: price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprises:

- 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 Secretariat of the European Parliament or the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Secretariat of the European Parliament

Centre européen

Plateau du Kirchberg

Boîte postale 1601 — Luxembourg

Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg
and 5, rue du Commerce — Luxembourg

Postal cheque account: 19 190-81

Bank current account: B.I.L. 8-109/6003/300

Price UKL 7 20 / IRL 8 40



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

ISSN 0378-5041

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg

Catalogue number: AX-AA-80-013-EN-C