

Annex

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 1-300

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1983-1984 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 6 to 10 June 1983

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Sitting of Monday, 6 June 1983	1
Resumption of the session, p. 1 — Tribute, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 2 — Speaking time, p. 5 — Action taken on the opinions of Parliament, p. 6 — Votes, p. 6 — Lead in petrol, p. 7 — Shipment of hazardous wastes, p. 16 — Annexes, p. 21.	
Sitting of Tuesday, 7 June 1983	30
Approval of the minutes, p. 31 — Welcome, p. 34 — Decision on urgency, p. 35 — Community youth — European Foundation, p. 36 — Welcome, p. 54 — Memorandum (Greenland's withdrawal from the EEC), p. 55 — Elections 1984 (Declaration by the Council), p. 65 — Right to vote and stand for election, p. 70 — Votes, p. 77 — Malta, p. 78 — Question Time, p. 80 — Annex, p. 93.	
Sitting of Wednesday, 8 June 1983	98
Decision on urgency, p. 100 — Williamsburg Summit, p. 101 — Shipment of hazardous wastes (continuation), p. 110 — Ethyl alcohol, p. 116 — Agricultural incomes, p. 128 — Topical and urgent debate (objections), p. 132 — Question Time (continuation), p. 132 — Agricultural incomes (continuation), p. 146 — Fruit and vegetables, p. 153 — Votes, p. 158 — Statement by the President, p. 160 — Votes (continuation), p. 163 — Agenda for next sitting, p. 163 — Annexes, p. 165.	
Sitting of Thursday, 9 June 1983	182
Approval of the minutes, p. 184 — Special part-session, p. 184 — Topical and urgent debate, p. 186 — Community's internal frontiers, p. 208 — Family policy, p. 218 — Seeds, p. 227 — Milk and milk products, p. 228 — Horses intended for	

(Continued overleaf)

NOTE TO READER

Appearing at the same time as the English edition are editions in the six other official languages of the Communities: Danish, German, Greek, French, Italian and Dutch. The English edition contains the original texts of the interventions in English and an English translation of those made in other languages. In these cases there are, after the name of the speaker, the following letters, in brackets, to indicate the language spoken: (DA) for Danish, (DE) for German, (GR) for Greek, (FR) for French, (IT) for Italian and (NL) for Dutch.

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

Contents (*continued*)

slaughter, p. 230 — Application of the Rules of Procedure, p. 231 — Votes, p. 233 — Horses intended for slaughter (continuation), p. 234 — Common commercial policy, p. 237 — Transport infrastructure, p. 244 — EAGGF appropriations, p. 252 — Automobile industry, p. 256 — FAST, p. 258 — European scientific and technical strategy, p. 261 — Annex, p. 263.

Sitting of Friday, 10 June 1983 271

Approval of the minutes, p. 271 — Votes, p. 272 — Fruit and vegetables, p. 273 — European scientific and technical strategy (continuation), p. 275 — Development, p. 277 — Oil refining, p. 283 — Amendments to Regulation 67/67, p. 284 — Adjournment of the session, p. 291 — Annex, p. 292.

Resolutions adopted at sittings of 6 to 10 June 1983 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 184 of 11 July 1983.

SITTING OF MONDAY, 6 JUNE 1983

Contents

<p>1. <i>Resumption of the session</i> 1</p> <p>2. <i>Tribute</i> 1</p> <p>3. <i>Agenda</i> <i>Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Veil; Mrs Vaysade; Mrs Scrivener; Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mr Collins; Mr Johnson; Mr Pearce; Mr von der Vring; Mr Bangemann; Mr Klepsch; Mr Patterson; Mr Sherlock; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Dalsass; Mr Griffiths; Mr von der Vring; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Seefeld</i> 2</p> <p>4. <i>Speaking time</i> <i>Mr Patterson; Mr Pearce; Mr Bangemann; Sir Fred Catherwood</i> 5</p> <p>5. <i>Action taken on the opinions of Parliament</i> <i>Mr Glinne; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Fernandez; Mr Narjes; Mrs Fuillet</i> 6</p> <p>6. <i>Votes</i></p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p>	<p><i>Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Prout; Mr Sieglerschmidt</i> 6</p> <p>7. <i>Lead in petrol — Report (Doc. 1-279/83) by Mr Ceravolo</i> <i>Mr Ceravolo; Mr Beazley; Mr Gallagher; Mr Collins; Mr Alber; Mr Sherlock; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Gauthier; Mr Eisma; Lord Douro; Mr Calvez; Mr Pearce; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i> 7</p> <p>8. <i>Shipment of hazardous wastes — Report (Doc. 1-370/83) by Mrs Van Hemeldonck</i> <i>Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr I. Friedrich; Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mr I. Friedrich; Mr Donnez; Mrs von Alemann</i> 16</p> <p><i>Annexes</i> <i>Mrs Pantazi; Mr Del Duca; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Patterson; Mr Pearce; Mr Provan; Mr Collins; Mr Geronimi; Mrs Lentz-Cornette; Mr Lalor</i> 21</p>
---	--	--

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

President

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

1. *Resumption of the session*

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 20 May 1983 ⁽¹⁾

⁽¹⁾ Approval of the minutes — Implementation of the Rules of Procedure — Motion for a resolution (Rule 49) — Petitions — Transfer of appropriations — Authorization to draw up reports — Referral to committees — Documents received — Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council: see the minutes of this sitting.

2. *Tribute*

President. — I should like to pay tribute to Mrs Louise Weiss.

(All the Members present rose)

She was the oldest Member of our Assembly. She died at the age of 90 years, but we all recognized in her the qualities which make youth such a splendid thing: enthusiasm, a love of ideals, particularly that of liberty, an abhorrence of prejudices and a smiling willingness to help in every good cause, which impressed all who had the privilege of knowing her.

She lived a long life, and right throughout that life she was a fighter. The causes she championed were extremely ambitious: the emancipation of women and the achievement of union between the peoples of Europe.

President

The success of her work as a journalist and writer needed no laurels to gild it. Nevertheless, her election to the European Parliament in 1979 was without doubt a kind of symbolic consecration for her, because ever since the end of the First World War she had determined to 'point the human spirit towards better solutions than bombs and bullets'.

The achievements of one who had always fought to bring about a better world culminated in the crowning joy of the latter years of her life, namely, her election by universal suffrage to the European Parliament, a parliament that could embody the aspirations of men and women from its ten member countries. The death of Louise the European — this is how she styled herself when writing her own epitaph — has brought to all of us a moment of deep emotion.

I hope that this moment will be for all of us an occasion to gird ourselves to face the enormous difficulties that lie in our path today and to take up once more the task — which is far from being accomplished — of uniting the peoples of Europe in the preservation of their identity. The former difficulties can undoubtedly be overcome if we are prepared to bring enough resolve, energy and material sacrifices to the task. The second task calls for a more deep lying commitment and a degree of spiritual force that is difficult to measure.

Louise Weiss' life and work were a mighty impulse launching her fellow Europeans along the right path. Let us pay tribute to her clearness of mind and to her beautiful spirit that might serve as models for all of us to imitate. Let us keep her memory green.

(The House stood and observed a minute's silence)

3. Agenda

President. — At its meeting of 18 May 1983 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed to you.

At their meeting this morning the chairmen of the political groups instructed me to propose to the House a number of changes to the agenda.

On *Monday's* agenda :

— the Legal Affairs Committee asked that the report (Doc. 1-117/83) by Mrs Vayssade, the vote on which is down on today's draft agenda under No 97, be referred back to committee.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, it is undoubtedly a very fine thing that we can vote during Monday's sitting on the motions for a resolution on which discussion has been closed; however, we are faced with a hundred or so amendments, some of which require careful thought. I therefore consider that it would be more reasonable to allow Groups and individual Members the time to assess these amendments.

President. — Mrs Squarcialupi, it is true that there are sometimes problems on the Monday, but if you want to change the way things are done, you have to submit your request one hour before the beginning of the sitting. The only request that has been submitted to me is that from the Legal Affairs Committee.

Mrs Veil (L), chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee. — *(FR)* Mr President, the report was discussed at the last sitting, and after the discussion Commissioner Burke said that a number of amendments put forward by the Legal Affairs Committee could not be considered, and that if they were to be adopted the draft directive adopted by the Commission would be very different from what had been proposed by the Legal Affairs Committee. There was almost nobody remaining in the Chamber when Mr Burke said this. Mrs Vayssade, the rapporteur, asked Mr Burke to express this point of view again today, before the vote.

Finally, the Legal Affairs Committee considered that it was undoubtedly preferable for Mr Burke to be heard in committee so that we could study Mr Burke's proposal there, and that a final vote should only be taken on this question when the Commission had, if necessary, been able to prepare new proposals.

Mrs Vayssade, (S), rapporteur. — *(FR)* Mr President, I will only confirm what Mrs Veil has just said, with a reminder that, in the case of this report, all the amendments except one — a rare occurrence — come from the Legal Affairs Committee, and it therefore seems to us more effective, for Parliament as a whole, to allow the Legal Affairs Committee to review this question with the Commission, so that a text can be prepared that will be easier for Parliament to vote on.

(Parliament decided to refer the Vayssade report back to Committee).

President. — Still on Monday's agenda, I have a request from the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) that the report (Doc. 1-371/83) by Miss Hooper, which is entered on today's draft agenda as Item No 111, be referred back to committee.

Mrs Scrivener (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, I think that this report must in fact be referred back to committee because the vote in the Committee on the Environment did not take place entirely as it should; because, in addition, the text is quite incoherent, and because there is no point in presenting such a text to Parliament without having revised it. You are aware that these texts concerning the environment are particularly complex. They can very rapidly become unintelligible, which is what would be the case here. In addition, therefore, to reasons regarding form and procedure, there is thus a basic reason justifying this referral back to committee.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (S). — (DE) Mr President, I am totally opposed to this proposal. I would like to remind the House that this report was on the agenda once before, on 10 March 1983, and that it was referred back to committee. It is not my place to comment on the logic of the report as it stands at present, but I would like to comment on the reasons why some members want to have it referred back to committee. Parliament ought not to respond to the type of massive lobbying that has gone on in the case of this report by giving in to it.

The Environment Ministers will be discussing this important subject next week, and they are waiting for the European Parliament's decision. We must vote on it today; there is no reason whatsoever for not debating the Hooper report.

(Parliament decided to refer the report back)

Mr Collins (S). — I wonder if we could have some clarification on this, Mr President, because normally, as I understand the Rules — although I do not have my Rules with me at the moment — there is a time limit set for a committee to report back to the plenary. I wonder if you could enlighten us as to this time limit. It seems to me to be significant.

President. — When a report is sent back to the committee concerned, Mr Collins, it is up to the committee to decide when it should be reintroduced.

Mr Johnson (ED). — Mr President, will you clarify that the delay is merely intended to enable the text to be put in order and the amendments to be properly prepared. Would you clarify that that is the only reason it is being referred back?

President. — Correct, but I cannot decide what the time limit should be. That is up to the committee.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Before you leave Monday's business, I would like to express considerable disquiet about the time available to us for the Ceravolo report. There are many views on this subject, both in my group and across the House, and the way it is working out I will not be able to speak on it because of the allocation of speaking time in my group. Yet it is in my constituency in the UK that 3 000 people stand to lose their jobs because of this regulation. I therefore propose that some means be found to extend the speaking time, either by letting the debates continue over until tomorrow or by switching speaking time between groups so that those of us that have a direct constituency interest in this have a chance to put their point of view forward. Otherwise it makes a mockery of Parliament.

President. — I do not think we have arrived at that point yet.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, Monday's agenda, includes two other reports to be

followed by a vote. We may have to continue debating one of these on Tuesday, in which case I would like to make it clear that the note 'to be followed by a vote' does not apply and that any reports that cannot be debated on Monday will be voted on at the next available opportunity.

Mr Bangemann (L). — (DE) Mr President, I disagree with my British colleague's proposal. I don't know whether you will put it to the vote, but if his own group is unable to allocate him any speaking time on a subject of such importance to his constituency, why should he expect other groups to? His group apparently doesn't regard the matter as all that important! Incidentally, this just goes to show yet again that the British electoral system is in need of reform; then he wouldn't have these difficulties.

(Applause)

President. — With regard to Tuesday's agenda:

— I have a request from the Political Affairs Committee that the debate on the Schieler report (Doc. 1-160/83), entered as Item No 118, be held over until Thursday.

(Parliament agreed to this request)

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (DE) Could you please tell us when this report will be debated on Thursday?

President. — At 3 p.m.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Mr President, when Mr Pearce, my colleague, asked you about the Ceravolo report you said we had not come to that yet. I was wondering whether we can now come to it because Mr Bangemann chose to make a party political point about a serious procedural problem. It is because the proposal in front of us allocates speaking time by days and not according to the Rule 65 by debates that we arrive at the situation where a large number of important debates have to be crammed into this Monday...

President. — Mr Patterson, may I ask you, as I have already, to wait a moment because the allocation of speaking time generally comes at the end, after we have fixed the agenda because then we know better how to go about it. So we will come back to that point and if you then raise your hand you will be called to speak.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — If I could follow up Monday's agenda and refer to the Van Hemeldonck report which I am sure a majority of this House would like to see helped through the Parliament to help the meeting of the Environment Ministers later this month. But is the material — as I think Mrs Squarcia-lupi feared — ready for us to proceed both to debate and vote upon this tonight? I am sure it is the wish of the House so to do if we can.

President. — Yes, it seems that everything is in perfect order for consideration of the Van Hemeldonck report today.

Still on the *Tuesday* sitting :

— At 3 p.m. the Council intends to make a statement on the date of the 1984 European elections and on the right to vote. This statement will not be followed by a debate.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — My group would rather like to make room for a debate under Rule 40 because we do not like the idea that the Council comes out with something and no one can comment upon it at all. It may be that no one wants to comment and that it is absolutely clear. But until they make a statement we do not want to say that we have no comment to make on the statement. We would just like to make the time available.

President. — You are fully entitled to invoke Rule 40 for that purpose, so I have to accept your request.

The oral question to the Council by Mr Maffre-Baugé, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the regulation for fruits and vegetables originally included in the Colleselli report, has now been transformed into an oral question to the Council because the Council was not able to reply during the Colleselli debate. I hope there are no remarks on that proposal.

Wednesday :

The European Democratic Group demands the withdrawal of the second Dalsass report (Doc. 1-240/83) on ethyl alcohol, Item No 92.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — Mr President, I would not like to say to colleagues in this Parliament that our group demands anything. We simply put the case to our colleagues. We do ask them to consider the Dalsass report and see whether it could not be postponed, first of all because we understand from the rapporteur that he did not feel that there was any particular urgency. That was the reason it was postponed until this time. If it was not urgent last month, it is not all that urgent this month.

Secondly, we do also understand that there are some-substantial legal objections by the Legal Affairs Committee which we feel should be discussed further by the Committee on Agriculture before this is brought up.

Thirdly, we would like to make time for a debate on the Williamsburg Summit. We do think that that is urgent and if this takes two hours to vote — as we understand it will — we think that that two hours would be better spent on the Williamsburg Summit which matters a great deal more to anyone than the Dalsass report.

President. — Thank your Sir Fred. But if you do not actually demand it, it will simply remain on the agenda, I understand.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — Mr President, we would like to propose in a polite way to colleagues that this be removed from the agenda not to make a demand. That is all.

Mr Dalsass (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, I don't know where Sir Fred got the idea that I do not feel there is any urgency about my report. I would have liked Parliament to have debated it in March, but it was unfortunately postponed at the Conservatives' request. I agreed at the time because I wanted it to be referred back to the Legal Affairs Committee. In the three months that have elapsed everyone has had time to read it. There is no reason why we should not vote on it now and I would greatly appreciate it if we could.

It will not take long to deal with the amendments ; all but five of the 119 proposed amendments have been reviewed by the Committee on Agriculture, so they are now clear. Please can this item therefore be left on the agenda ?

Mr Griffiths (S). — Mr President, I would like to speak in favour of referral back of the Dalsass report particularly in view of the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee. The Legal Affairs Committee has looked at the Commission's proposals and the amendments to the Dalsass report and they have said that is still not a legally acceptable proposal.

What I would like to see is the rapporteur of the Committee on Agriculture, the draftsman of the opinion for the Legal Affairs Committee and the staff of the Commission meeting together to hammer out this problem, so that a report can come to Parliament which is within the legal terms of the Treaty. I think it is ridiculous that we can be voting on the Dalsass report when one of Parliament's committees says that it does not have legal validity.

Mr von der Vring (S). — (DE) Mr President, if I understand Sir Fred correctly, he is not demanding that the report be referred back but merely asking other members of Parliament to request its referral back, which no one has done. Please could we therefore get back to the agenda ?

(Parliament rejected the request by the European Democratic Group)

President. — Still on the *Wednesday* sitting : at 9 a.m. the Commission will make a statement on the outcome of the Williamsburg Summit. This statement will be followed by a debate which will last a maximum of one hour.

An oral question by Mr Møller, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on protectionist measures taken by Sweden has been converted into a question to the Commission for Question Time and will be taken as the first of the questions to the Commission.

Sir James Scott-Hopkins (ED). — I was wondering, Mr President, following the remarks of Sir Fred Catherwood, whether or not there would be an opportunity to debate the Williamsburg meeting and its outcome. It looks as though our agenda is so full that we shall not have time to do it, which I regret deeply.

Have you got a proposal to put before the House, Mr President, as to how we can encompass that particular objective? I hope you have.

President. — Sir James, I made a proposal, which has already been accepted, that Mr Thorn would make a statement on Wednesday morning at 9 a.m., followed by a debate with a maximum speaking-time of one hour.

(The President read the changes to the draft agenda for the Thursday and Friday sittings)(¹)

Mr Seefeld (S), chairman of the Committee on Transport — (DE) Mr President, item No 67 on Thursday's agenda is Mr Martin's report on a pilot infrastructure programme. A little further down, item No 132 is Mr Vandewiele's report on the funding of a fixed link across the Channel. Since this is a related topic it might be a good idea to debate it immediately after Mr Martin's report. Mr Vandewiele is in agreement with this suggestion, by the way.

(Parliament agreed to this request and adopted the draft agenda thus amended)(²)

4. Speaking time

President. — Pursuant to Rule 65 of the Rules of Procedure, I propose to the House that speaking time be allocated as set out in the Bulletin.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Mr President, I would oppose that proposal as far as Monday is concerned. I will explain to you why. Rule 65 of the Rules of Procedure says that speaking time shall not be divided up by days but by debates. Now it is convenient on most days to divide the day up broadly between the groups and allow them to decide how to allocate their speaking time for the debates. This goes badly wrong on Monday when, as today, we have controversial items on the agenda like the Ceravolo report. It means that the groups are put under pressure on these matters. In this case my group has only 7 minutes to allocate among highly contentious and important matters. The fact that we have tabled 34 amendments to the Ceravolo report indicates that it is a controversial item. I would suggest that it would be much better if the Bureau actually adhered to the Rules of Procedure and allocated speaking time by debate when it comes to Monday.

(¹) See Minutes.

(²) Deadline for tabling amendments: see Minutes.

I would suggest, in fact, that the speaking time provided for Monday's agenda be allocated *in toto* to the Ceravolo report and that if it is not possible for groups to use up their speaking time today, they be allowed to continue tomorrow. In other words, I propose that Mr Pearce's suggestion that the debate be allowed to carry over to tomorrow be adopted. I think my proposal is more in accordance with Rule 65 of our Rules of Procedure and certainly more in accordance with having a proper debate on what is an important and controversial matter.

President. — Mr Patterson, I would like to make a number of observations. First of all, the agenda for the rest of the week has been accepted. That means that the groups have agreed to the reports proposed by the enlarged Bureau for today's, tomorrow's and the other agendas.

Apart from that, we have removed from the agenda the vote on the Vayssade report as well as the Hooper report. That means that, as against what was originally decided, there is now additional speaking time available. Whether you get it from your group or not is your problem, not mine. I think that is the way to solve this problem. In the light of the decisions taken there is sufficient speaking time for the reports now on our agenda, and I would not propose any other allocation than the one provided for at the moment.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, I suppose you are saying that the speaking time allocated to the groups in the draft agenda would be increased to take up the time saved by the absence of one of the votes and by the fact that Miss Hooper will not be making a rapporteur's statement.

I support what Mr Patterson said. Further, I must just say to Mr Bangemann, in view of what he said about me, that the virtue of our electoral system is that we are able to support local interests in a way which his system denies to people from his country, and I intend to exercise that right.

President. — Mr Pearce, first of all, as we have deleted a few reports, the rapporteurs need less time because there are fewer of them. The Commission also needs less time, so as a consequence of our decision, the original speaking-time of 60 minutes will be increased to approximately 90 minutes. That means that you have 50% more time than originally proposed, so there is no difficulty at all.

Mr Bangemann (L). — Mr President, I wanted first of all to address a general remark to the Honourable Member from Cheshire West, because I do believe that he is wrong. The present system gives every group the opportunity to choose freely between the items on the agenda. If we were to allocate speaking-time on each item we should force a group to speak on issues which perhaps were not important to that

Bangemann

group. So his group has the opportunity to choose the Ceravolo report and to use all the speaking-time of the Conservative Group for that issue.

Secondly, I am not against representing local interests and issues. All I was saying, my dear colleague, was that if you do not succeed in convincing your group that your local interests are so important that your group has to give you some speaking-time, why do you expect others to do so? This was my point, and I believe that it is right.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — I simply wanted to say that the position of our group was, as explained, that we thought that the total time allocated to these reports was rather short and we much appreciate the fact that you have extended it. We see no reason why Mr Bangemann should bring electoral systems into it except that his party is about to be defeated on Thursday.

(Laughter and applause)

5. Action taken on the opinions of Parliament

President. — The next item is the statement by the Commission of the European Communities on the action taken on the opinions and resolutions of the European Parliament⁽¹⁾.

Mr Glinne (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, with regard to urgent aid granted in cases of disaster, the text received from the Commission is very laconic: 'Nothing to report'. Now, several countries and regions in the Community have been hit by very serious flooding, not only on the occasions that we have discussed — that is to say, at the time of the April and May part-sessions — but again subsequently. I should therefore like the Commission to tell us something more about this.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, if my interpretation is correct, the statement to which my colleague Mr Glinne objects relates only to decisions on amounts and not to the circumstances. I am perfectly willing to ask the people concerned to review the way in which these circumstances have come about.

Mr Fernandez (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, on 24 May I sent a letter to the Commission regarding the flooding in the Burgundy region and requesting urgent aid. The European Parliament also adopted a resolution on this subject during the May part-session. Since then, the situation has become even worse, especially for the farmers. My question to the Commission is as follows: has the Commission granted this urgent supplementary aid, as provided for by the Regulations of the Community?

⁽¹⁾ See Annex II.

Mr Narjes. — Let me assure you that you will receive a written reply.

Mrs Fullet (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should also have hoped the Commissioner could draw up for us a list of the stricken regions, since it seems to me that since the last part-session, new areas have been hit. Out of fairness, I should like all regions to be included in the distribution of funds.

President. — As we always have rain, I think that it would be better to wait for the Commission's written answer on this subject.

6. Votes⁽¹⁾

SECOND PROUT REPORT (DOC. 1-1180/82 — CONSUMER CREDIT)

President. — I would remind the House that in its sitting of 11 February, having adopted the amended proposal for a directive on the harmonization of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States on consumer credit, the directive which was the subject of the Prout report, Parliament decided, on a proposal from the rapporteur, to hold over the vote on the motion for a resolution until such time as the Commission would have delivered its opinion on the amendments made by Parliament to this directive.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, I have pleasure in informing the House that the Commission has accepted all Parliament's amendments with one exception, and that relates to the legal form of the method of calculating the annual interest rate laid down in Article 1, paragraph 2 (d). We hadn't settled this question because it was going to be reviewed by legal experts who have now established that, contrary to the opinion on which Amendment No 2 is based, a Commission decision is out of the question, and that a directive would be legally in order.

Their explanation is that the proposal on consumer credit is designed to harmonize Member States' legal and administrative provisions, and as such has to be based on Article 100. The only legal instrument provided for by this article is the directive; anything else is out of the question.

If the powers for calculating the annual rate of interest are really to be assigned to the Commission, our legal services say, this can only be done on the basis of Article 100. In other words, the annual interest calculation method also has to be established by a directive.

⁽²⁾ See Annex I.

Narjes

I wrote to the committee chairman, Mrs Veil and Mr Prout on May 30 saying that the Commission did not yet wish to commit itself regarding the legal form of the method of calculating the annual interest rate. This question has now been answered for us by a statement from our legal services. Let me emphasize that we are in complete agreement concerning the desirability of settling this matter.

The Commission's concrete suggestion for this part of the directive, i.e. Article 1, paragraph 2 (d), is, and I quote: '*Within one year after the adoption of this directive the Commission shall establish a uniform method*'. There would not otherwise be any changes. Measures would also have to be taken to ensure that Member States adopt this method. Article 6, paragraph 3, would have to contain a clause to this effect, such as: '*The annual rate of interest and the annual rate of charges referred to in the previous paragraph shall be established in conformity with the method laid down on the basis of article...*'. This is our only amendment, and we are compelled to make it for legal reasons, I must stress again.

Mr Prout (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, I am afraid that both Commissioner Narjes and myself have been put in an impossible position. At the time we discussed these amendments with the Commission in the Legal Affairs Committee last month, the Commission was of the opinion that a Commission decision under the Directive would be legally in order. Both of us have learnt this morning that the Commission legal services have now changed their mind.

Now in my view the substitution of a directive for a Council decision would substantially reduce the harmonizing effect of this directive and would also contradict the intention firmly expressed by this House at the time we voted on the amendments. It is therefore with great regret, Mr President, that I must once again ask you — this time under Rule 36 (2) — to remit the matter to the Legal Affairs Committee where we would wish to debate with the Commission legal services their interpretation of Article 100.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — (DE) Mr President, while being in favour of referring this matter back to committee, I would like to add that it is regrettable that the Commission could not come up with these finer points of legal detail during the lengthy deliberations, which went on for many months, instead of after Parliament had debated the matter. I agree to the report's being referred back but expect the Legal Affairs Committee and the Commission to put a proposal before Parliament in the near future so that we can vote on it at last, this issue being an important one for consumers.

(Parliament agreed to the request for referral back to committee)

7. Lead in petrol

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-729/83) by Mr Ceravolo, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on lead in petrol.

Mr Ceravolo (COM), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, this proposal, on which I am reporting to the Assembly on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, may be considered exemplary. In fact, both Parliament and the Council are called upon to recognise a problem concerning health and the protection of the environment, as having precedence over other special considerations.

In regard to this problem there is recognition first and foremost that a state of danger exists to public health. I do not think there are any doubts about this, and this fact underlies all the directives that have so far been approved by the European Parliament, as well as the legislative measures that have been adopted by all Member States.

Every time an effort has been made by law to reduce the lead in petrol there has been this awareness of the very harmful effects of lead in the blood. In the United States, also, and in Japan, where there is a decided move towards lead-free petrol, they are aware of the health risk that lead presents. Some people may say that in Japan and the United States the reasons are of a technical nature, but it is still true that, indirectly, the point from which it all began is to do with health. The technical considerations may spring from a concern to avoid the damage caused to petrol filters by the lead in the petrol; but the filters were fitted for the very reason that atmospheric pollution, in some Japanese and American cities, had already reached intolerable levels, so that, in the end, these 'technical' reasons still owe their origin to a concern for public health.

The investigation carried out by the Ispra Centre, which is quoted by many of those who are against the call for a reduction in the lead in petrol, was carried out as part of the biological monitoring of the population against the danger of Saturnism and, at best, left things pretty well where they were before. At all events it recognises that the lead content of motor vehicle exhaust gases accounts for 30 % of the lead in the blood: about the remaining 70 %, nothing is said. We know, however, that sufficient research was not carried out, since the lead falling in rain could, through the intake of food and drink, also account for the remaining 70 % of the blood lead level.

At all events, the medical profession throughout the world is now very worried, and this concern has recently been increased by the publication in Great

Ceravolo

Britain of the report of the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution, which emphasises the special danger to which certain sectors of the population — children, the newly-born and pregnant women — are exposed.

It should be remembered that when reference is made, in the findings of the Ispra investigation, to a level of 30 %, this is an average figure. Now we are responsible politicians, and as such we must be concerned with public health and not with averages. It is necessary to pinpoint the areas of high lead precipitation and to endeavour to defend the population.

I think we have no need to hesitate. Doubt alone should be sufficient grounds for excluding lead from petrol. You know that one of the strategic criteria of environmental policy is precisely that where there is doubt, the cause of the harm should be eliminated. We must not allow a 'doubtful' product — doubtful, that is, where public health is concerned — to remain in circulation until the harm it causes cries out for attention. We must ensure that only those products with a reputation for being harmless are allowed to remain in circulation.

Amongst other things, as I have already said, almost all the major countries in the world are moving towards lead-free petrol. Japan and the United States of America lead this trend: sales of lead-free petrol are already higher than those of petrol with lead in it. From a technical standpoint, I think that all the necessary conditions are now present for resolving the problem. It must also be borne in mind — and I want to remind those who oppose petrol reform of this — that, for example, the Community has issued a directive on the addition of alcohol to petrol, which is a step forward in the research for lead-free petrols with the same efficiency as those that contain lead.

Both the technical conditions and the health reasons are therefore present for progress to be made towards solutions of this kind. In addition, the Community is in danger of building up a handicap for itself, when competing with the Japanese and Americans — direct competitors in the car industry — for the simple fact that cars that run on lead-free petrol are classified as 'non-pollutant'. Japanese and American cars will therefore have an advantage when competing with those of the Community which, on the other hand, are 'pollutant'. Nor is it beyond the bounds of possibility that, sooner or later, imports of 'pollutant' cars may be banned by law.

I think therefore that we have to look at the problem very realistically. The proposal that we are putting forward is very reasonable. First of all, it calls for the introduction, by 1985, of a type of petrol that contains no lead, for sale alongside leaded petrol, and for cars running on lead-free petrol to be type-approved. In addition it asks for the abolition of the 0.15 minimum, which is an absurdity from the standpoint

of Community law. Finally, it asks the Commission to make an overall appraisal — taking account, that is, of economic as well as health factors — and put forward a final, radical solution to the problem, within a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner, so as to reconcile the adaptation needs of the refining industry with those of the car manufacturers, and at the same time to alleviate the very widespread concern felt by public opinion.

We must not ignore the fact that two large organizations — the Consumers' Protection Organization and the Environmental Organization — are at present conducting a campaign that is meeting with growing support, not only from public opinion — which might be called technically unqualified — but also in scientific and medical circles, where there is an increasingly strong conviction that lead discharged by cars is dangerous to public health.

We must also see to it that the directive on alcoholic additives and oxygenates is issued without delay, since it can be a help on the technological side to the fuel manufacturing industry and the car industry, to enable them to reach and maintain a standard.

It is important, however, to emphasize that what we are talking about here is the health of the public. When talking about costs and benefits we have also to consider health — all the more so, since we are faced here with an 'imponderable' that has not yet been fully assessed. Conservative members usually place too little value on the health factor. This happens regularly: every time, the health factor is almost strangled by other, economic considerations. We, on the other hand, believe that conditions are right for a change of course. Cars are changing very rapidly: a change is taking place in the way cars are made and, as a result, cars themselves are changing.

Now, if other world factors, such as the energy crisis, have forced us to discover ways of saving energy that were previously ignored, why should we not hasten technological change in response to urgent health considerations? I think this is a very fitting task for our European civilization. If there is sufficient incentive, science and technology can help us, within a reasonable time, to solve this problem. It would be a symbolic solution, because atmospheric pollution is having harmful effects even on the natural environment — on the German and Swedish forests, for example. Well then, we have the means of abating, once and for all, one element — I do not say all of them — which is harmful to the environment and harmful to public health.

We leave it to the Commission to assess the ways and means of achieving this result, and the timing of it. We do not wish to go to extremes, nor to excess. I think that all the points that we have put forward are wise, reasonable, and weighed up politically: that is, they have no disadvantages in one direction or the other.

Ceravolo

I therefore think it a responsible political action to approve this motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR : MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

Mr Beazley (ED), *draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.* — Mr President, I speak as the draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. In a field where much technical argument has been combined with much emotion on both sides of the argument, I considered that it was the duty of our committee to present an objective report dealing with those aspects of the subject which fall within the remit of our committee. Therefore, I proposed that we should take a neutral position on the health problem because, firstly, it falls specifically within the remit of the committee responsible for public health and secondly, having read all the available evidence, it was clear that a genuine health hazard arose whose exact size and effect appeared to require continuous and detailed investigation — to which our committee could add nothing — by highly specialized experts in that particular field.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs therefore conceived its task to be to concentrate on the costs and timings of whatever changes might be deemed to be necessary. Detailed estimates in both these areas were available in the case of the UK a few years ago from the submissions of all interested parties to the UK Government with regard to the investigation which led to the decision to reduce the lead content of British petrol from 0.4 grammes per litre to 0.15 over a period of 5 years. No up-to-date report was available for the Community as a whole, either regarding the reduction on a Community basis to a maximum level of 0.15 grammes per litre or of a direct change to leadless petrol. It was known that the Commission's ERGA report, that is the Emissions Research Global Approach Report was due to be published by 30 June 1983 and parts of its content were also known.

The committee, therefore, decided that insofar as the Commission has a responsibility for proposing all Community legislation, it should be required to draw up a plan including costing and timings to cover all aspects of this problem. Insofar as four Member States have not yet indicated an intention to reduce their standard levels to 0.15 grammes per litre, it is clearly necessary that the attitude of these Member States should be solicited at the start. The committee thought it eminently desirable to have a single minimum figure in order to create uniform conditions throughout the Community which would be essential

for oil refiners and motor manufacturers to plan their forward investments. It therefore recommended that the alternatives of a minimum of 0.15 grammes of lead per litre and the direct move to leadless 92 octane petrol should be evaluated, in regard to their costs and timing, opposite the health factor. At the same time, other means of overcoming the health hazard, whereby catalytic filters plus lead traps or by the use of other types of fuel whether diesel oil or petrol with other additives or extenders should be costed and timing provided for its achievement.

It was significant to the Committee's thinking that different decisions would have a considerable affect on the size of the cost increase and the energy penalty involved. Whilst low-octane, leadless petrol involved limited, although significant investment in the refinery sector which is, of course, already in heavy over-capacity and only limited cost in motor engine design, nevertheless high-octane petrol represented both a very high investment and a very high energy penalty at the refinery stage. High compression motor cars have been the feature of efficient low-cost motoring in Europe compared with the less efficient use of fuel in the USA. Even so, in the USA high-octane leaded petrol still represents approximately 50 % of the fuel used for the private motor car which very much increases the health risk compared with the low-octane leadless petrol in lower compression engines.

A decision therefore has to be made on the future of a high-compression engine in Europe which has been the trend of efficient fuel usage and modern design of European motor cars.

Since the combinations and permutations in this matter are considerable, the committee considered that the Commission should set out all the options clearly and make positive proposals on cost and timing to the Member State governments through the Council of Ministers. The committee doubted that it would be possible to achieve a position by 1 January 1985 whereby all new cars could take leadless petrol as called for in one of the resolutions which gave rise to the Ceravolo report. After consultation with the Commission, it appeared that 1988 would be the earliest date for all new cars to run on leadless petrol. Nevertheless, the committee recommended that the words 'or earlier if possible' be added to that date.

In conclusion the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs emphasized the form in which this important matter should be investigated without prejudice to the final decision.

Mr Gallagher (S), *draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Energy and Research.* — Mr President, the Ceravolo report is important because it adds the weight of the European Parliament to the momentum which has been gathering in Europe for the abolition

Gallagher

of leaded petrol. There is a pledge — I would remind you — in the Treaty of Rome to improve the living and working conditions of the people of Europe. So every time Parliament encourages the Community to take up an issue like this, it is doing something positive to live up to that particular pledge.

Now there is no doubt that lead is a poison — that has been established quite clearly — and this is something that everyone now knows. But the complexity of our modern society, being what it is, we cannot always say that we will never allow poisons to be emitted into the environment because there are times when we are emitting them unknowingly. But it must be accepted as a general rule that polluting the environment with known poisons, such as lead, is something that must be avoided and that we cannot possibly tolerate. Because if we think that we can go on poisoning ourselves indefinitely, then we are making a mistake, Mr President, which no doubt will be brought home to us at some time.

If a time limit is to be placed on the use of lead in petrol, the question arises as to what that time limit should be. It is when one comes to consider the question that one perhaps begins to regret the black and white way in which the issue of lead in petrol has too often been presented. Beyond the primary question of whether you are for or against its abolition there lies a whole series of technical and economic problems which are much too important to be overlooked. You cannot escape the fact that by eliminating lead from petrol, you will increase the amount of energy used in the refining process. I do not want to go into details of that problem. It may be that we are willing to pay that price, but we must not delude ourselves or attempt to delude other people that there will not be a price because there certainly will be and that price will have to be paid if we do adopt this report.

Now the changeover to lead-free petrol will also require changes in the way in which motor car engines are made. Design and development problems have to be overcome. I believe they can be overcome. But we must try and see that the changeover is carried out in such a way that it does not impose a crippling burden on the European motor manufacturing industry but offers it new opportunities. The fact that other industrialized countries have been changing over to lead-free petrol has been changing the characteristics of the world car market. We must help our own European car industry to be fit to trade on that market on equal terms.

Mr President, these are considerations which have weighed heavily with the Committee on Energy and Research. But there is another, namely, that lead is not the only poison emitted by car engine exhausts. Our committee considered that it was not sensible to consider lead in isolation from the others. The Commission told us that it intended to bring out a

document in June which would deal with all exhaust emissions. It was our opinion that Parliament should have waited until that document was available before proceeding with the Ceravolo report. We have not yet received the document which the Commission promised us and I take this opportunity of asking the Commission how soon it will be ready, what its scope will be and what form it will take.

In the event, Parliament has rightly decided to press on with its consideration of the Ceravolo report without delay since adopting the report will demonstrate the European Parliament's concern over this question.

This haste may not be altogether bad, but I think it is largely due to the impetus given to the movement for the abolition of lead in petrol by the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution which were published in London on 18 April. The Royal Commission did not in fact make the mistake of looking at the lead in petrol in isolation. It examined it in the context of lead pollution in general. I think the impact of its report is all the stronger for that.

Mr President, it is possible in Europe, even at the present time, to drive a car on lead-free petrol because diesel engines use lead-free fuel. But if you have been forced to sit behind large lorries at traffic lights, when they are giving out their exhaust fumes, you will know that they have plenty of polluting ingredients of their own. If we reach the stage where we take out the lead and add in fact more injurious substances, we would, I think, be taking a retrograde step. I am certain that all the members of the Committee on Energy and Research will in fact vote for the abolition of lead in petrol. I think it would be a great pity if after the campaigners against lead in petrol have obtained their goal, and public attention is diverted to some completely new topic, there were not sufficient political will left to give the general question of exhaust emissions, which is the important matter, the careful and sustained scrutiny which it deserves.

Those are the views of the Committee on Energy and Research and I thank you for allowing me to express them.

Mr Collins (S). — I would like to thank the rapporteur of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and the rapporteurs of the other committees for their work and for the reasoned arguments they have presented to the House.

I think this is a classic case where a common problem affecting all the European Community countries has been identified. The European scale has properly been appreciated and a campaign has been organized to fit in with all the complexities of the organization of the Community. This campaign has transcended any one Member State or any one organization.

Collins

So far as we are concerned in the Socialist Group we are motivated by a concern for the immediate health and safety of consumers, and in particular children. That is to say, we accept the evidence which is presented to us which would appear to suggest that lead is a potent neurotoxin which, when taken in by humans, gives rise to or exacerbates deviant behaviour, reduces intellectual performance and possibly gives rise to foetal abnormalities as well.

Now it is true that various studies have shown that social factors as well as lead-related biological factors are important, but very few people appear to have suggested that lead is anything other than dangerous. I refer, however, to Mr Pearce's amendment — No 28, I think it is — which actually suggests taking out the word 'harmful'. Presumably Mr Pearce thinks that lead is not harmful at all. I find that a quite remarkable conclusion from anyone who has read any of the literature whatsoever. But the balance of evidence would appear to suggest that about 90 % of the lead in air comes from petrol. Since lead can be ingested from a variety of sources, it is necessary to see which of these sources are the most dangerous. We notice that a number of studies have been done in the United States and in Europe and we accept the evidence that about as much as 30 % of blood lead can be traced to petrol. If we accept all of these pieces of evidence — and of course there are people who do not — then we have certainly identified a problem of some considerable concern to every citizen of the European Community, and obviously consumer interest and environmental interest is bound to be very high. It is not just the adult population because pollution of our environment is a major problem for the long-term survival of our planet and lead is one of the most sinister pollutants and health hazards and has therefore attracted the attention of a great many people. In the United Kingdom alone we are told that some 2 500 tonnes of lead are emitted into the air every year from car exhausts and there are many areas where the typical blood-lead levels are already about a quarter of those needed for classical lead poisoning. So there is a long-term interest, too.

As far as the scale of government intervention is concerned, we need to amend the 1978 directive; we need to extend our activities right across the Community — no question at all that Community action is preferable to individual Member State action in this area. We reckon that the European Parliament's view on this is crucial because we need to express political will and we need to express it in all of the Member States. Therefore, the Socialist Group believes that the Committee on the Environment and the rapporteur have listened very carefully to the evidence; they have

pondered it; they have assessed it and debated it and we believe that taking lead out of petrol is an idea whose time has come, right across party boundaries and right across national boundaries, and we believe that the European Parliament is entirely justified in taking a very important initiative on this point.

Mr Alber (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, everyone in Europe is horrified at the way our trees are dying and the tremendous damage caused to our woods. There is general agreement that action must be taken to stop air pollution and that lead-free petrol must be introduced. Everyone knows that this problem can only really be solved at Community level. When I say 'everyone', I am even including the national politicians who appear to have grasped this at long last. We recognized the problem long ago. What surprises me now is that the national politicians are suddenly in such a hurry. They are calling for regulations on a Community basis, but they might care to remember that actions speak louder than words! Had they transferred the necessary powers to the European Parliament earlier, we could have turned our attention to this and other problems by now.

I must also say that I object to Europe being treated like a menu, i.e. when it is convenient matters can be dealt with on a Community basis, but when it is not they are deemed to be subject to national sovereignty.

Of course this problem can only be resolved at Community level, but we must try to prevent it from becoming a fashionable, headline-hitting topic like the baby seals did. There are still so many issues to be clarified.

What about the costs, for example? Does a catalytic filter cost DM 600 or 2 000? How much will petrol consumption go up? What about motorcycles? What about aircraft? What happens until such time as every vehicle can run on lead-free fuel? This could take 15 years, it is said. Answers still have to be found to so many questions. Nonetheless my political group agrees that leadless petrol should be introduced as soon as possible. We cannot wait until all the studies have been completed because if we go on investigating the matter too long we may find out what has killed the trees, but there won't be any of them left. We want to look at the facts here and now and not to call an inquest afterwards to determine the cause of it all.

But if we are to tackle the problem on a Community basis we must provide the industries concerned with the necessary technical data. It is regrettable that technological innovation is invariably born of necessity and compulsion. How nice it would be if for once research efforts could be undertaken for more altruistic motives.

Alber

My political group realizes that in view of its European dimensions this problem can only be tackled on a Community basis, and we are therefore in favour of the Ceravolo report. We would like at the same time to thank the rapporteur for the good work he has done.

(Applause)

Mr Sherlock (ED). — I must begin by protesting again that 7 minutes' total speaking time for my group on an environmental matter of this importance is quite inadequate. We have been used to being stuck up the chimney of Thursdays and this is jolly nearly as bad.

But here we have a chance to support an admirable report by Mr Ceravolo which, in my opinion, is a sound political decision based upon scientific grounds of increasing certainty. We have a chance to reduce the total body-lead burden. That is beyond any doubt and is shown by the Ispra experiments. We have a chance to take one step which can be done on a Community basis and can effectively only be done on a Community basis. We also have a chance to take a step which in the whole story of an increasing lead burden is one step which the individual can in no way take for himself. No individual can order or ordain the cessation of the addition of lead to petrol. He may do something about his plumbing; he may stop his wife using lead-bearing mascara; he may remove all the lead paint from his household but only governmental decision at governmental or preferably Community level can take this step. It may well be that we shall never reach the standards of scientific proof in this particular matter that could be held to be desirable.

But the balance of evidence is shifting and is shifting continuously in one direction which shows we must take action.

Also I have been impressed, not by the campaigning, but by the quality of the witnesses who have added their voices to these pleas. Having sat and listened to evidence, very often you find yourself ultimately convinced by the quality of the witness and the evidence he gives.

We began in my group a long time ago on this problem. My colleague Stanley Johnson put down the original work which led us to the decision we reached many months ago in that group. We shall not depart from that decision as a group. I would ask you to support two small amendments which make the matter a little clearer and, if anything, a little tighter. They again are offered in the name of the group by Mr Johnson. I would beg you not to be led astray by any other amendments or by any other solutions which seem to offer cheaper, quicker, easier, simpler ways. They all end up by being environmentally equally unsound.

(Applause from the right)

Mrs Scrivener (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are entirely in favour of the removal of lead from petrol. We have to say this, frankly. It remains to be seen, of course, how that is to be achieved in fact.

If we are in favour, it is because it is quite obvious, without having any absolutely certain proof of the fact, that the lead in petrol is undoubtedly a danger to health.

It is in fact regrettable that, at present, only a minority of Member States are applying the minimum level of petrol as laid down by the Community directive, namely, 0.15 grammes per litre. If things had been done correctly, and everybody had applied this minimum level, we should not be in the position that we are in today. I think that to protect the environment properly, and to protect health, we have to find a midway solution that takes account of the difficulties facing manufacturers in the application of such measures. For this reason we think it is reasonable to ask that, as quickly as possible, the level of 0.15 should be enforced, and that, within a reasonable time, which ought to be somewhere in the region of 1988, lead-free petrol should be on sale. It should be known that in certain countries — this has never been said — particularly the United States, lead-free petrol is on sale. The manufacturers should therefore give this question some thought. They are quite capable of doing it.

We therefore look to the Commission for proposals that take account of both the medical and the economic aspects of the problem. For our part, we must stand firm as regards the target, which is to abolish lead in petrol, and we must be realistic regarding the time by which this has to be brought about. That, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, is the Liberal Group's position.

(Applause from the Right)

Mr Gauthier (DEP). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like first of all to explain that I am not speaking on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats — this is a personal speech.

If it had been established with certainty that lead from motor cars has effects on health, then, regardless of the consequences in terms of cost, I should call — as should we all, unanimously — for lead-free petrol to be available at the pumps as soon as possible. But this is a sphere in which nothing is certain, and Mr Ceravolo's report, which sets out with good intentions, represents in my view a step in the wrong direction, if not a complete mistake.

I see no need, in fact, to go along with the rapporteur when he proposes the sale of lead-free petrol by 1985. Why not? For four fundamental reasons.

Gauthier

First, from the legal point of view, the present directive in no way prevents Member States, if they so desire, from introducing lead-free petrol on the market alongside existing types of fuel. Why, then, alter it? Secondly, as regards the environment and health, the rapporteur justifies his intervention by stating that atmospheric pollution due to the discharge of lead in motor vehicle exhaust gases is very harmful to the health of children and pregnant women in particular. In fact, atmospheric pollution is estimated to account for a minimum of 10 % and a maximum of 27 % of the level of lead in the blood. This means that, in essence, the main sources of lead in the blood have not been determined. And I will quote some examples. Professor Rutter, chairman of the symposium held in London in May 1982 by CLEAR, which is carrying out a campaign for the abolition of lead in petrol, said in his concluding remarks that it had to be stated clearly that, on the available evidence, the abolition of lead in petrol would not bring about any significant improvement in the health of British children, and that any assertion to the contrary would be raising false hopes.

Professor Gething, a hospital departmental head, declared in his report that it seemed that the main sources of lead in the human body were foods, lead-based paints, lead piping and drinking water. The available evidence proved that lead in petrol was not a main source of lead in the blood.

Nor does recent research justify the belief that present blood lead levels may have any effect whatever on the IQ of children, or on their behaviour. The abolition of lead in petrol cannot therefore be justified from the public health standpoint.

Finally, Professor Neebleman, in the United States, and Professor Winneke, in Germany, who had previously concluded that lead emitted from motor vehicle engines was a health danger for children, have reversed their views and declared recently that it was improbable that the low levels of lead would have any effect on the IQ of children.

Here, ladies and gentlemen, is clear proof that the Ceravolo report constitutes a poor case to bring against lead emission from motor vehicles. Even the conclusions of the British Royal Commission emphasize that the abolition of lead in petrol would not show any beneficial effect on health.

Thirdly, from the energy standpoint, the use of lead-free petrol raises fuel consumption, which means bigger oil imports, which is contrary to the aims of the Community's energy policy. Lead-free petrol, with the octane level reduced to 92 %, would mean, for France, an increase in consumption equivalent to 1 million tonnes of imported crude oil a year. In the case of 98 % octane lead-free petrol, the increase is even more: 1.8 million tonnes and, in addition, enor-

mous additional investment costs for the refining industry, which is already in difficulties.

And, fourthly, from the standpoint of technology and automobile research, lead-free petrol represents a counter-blow to technological advance in the Community's car industry. Lead-free petrol, in fact, involves a reduction in engine compression ratios, with higher petrol consumption, whereas all European technology is directed to producing high compression engines, of small capacity, with very low consumption yet high performance. In addition, and this is very important, the European car industry is perfecting lead-resistant catalytic exhaust pipes, which neutralise the effects of lead emission but use the present type of petrol. We cannot take the risk of compromising this sector of European industry, with its hundreds of thousands of jobs.

We can therefore propose to Member States a progressive reduction from 0.4 to 0.15 grammes of lead per litre in petrol, but, in the present state of the art, to propose the abolition of lead in petrol, by 1985, would not only be a highly dangerous measure vis-a-vis industry — it would also be a mistake. I would go further — it would be a useless mistake.

Mr Eisma (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, you will soon appreciate that my opinions differ considerably from those of Mr Gauthier, who incidentally was not speaking on behalf of all of his group — fortunately, I am tempted to say, because his priorities are quite different from those of Mr Ceravolo, rapporteur for the Committee on the Environment.

We in this House welcome the fact that it has been left to us in the European Parliament to take the lead in clarifying the Council directive of 1978. But we condemn the Commission's lack of action in failing to do anything to reduce the maximum content from 0.40 grams per litre to 0.15 grams per litre. There is incidentally some confusion on whether the present minimum content of 0.15 grams per litre means that Member States may not allow a lower content. This is what the Ceravolo resolution maintains, but in a recent symposium on lead in Brussels that I and some colleagues from this House attended the representative of the Commission said the opposite. I request the Commission to clarify this point in the debate too, namely, that the 1978 directive does not allow Member States to reduce the lead content of petrol below 0.15 grams per litre.

The maximum permitted amount of 0.15 grams lead per litre of petrol must be introduced in all Member States by the end of 1985. It should not be too difficult for the oil companies to market petrol which meets those requirements long before that date, especially as ordinary petrol in Germany and Denmark already contains no more than 0.15 grams lead per litre.

Eisma

We would appreciate it if the Commission would take the initiative here; waiting for the results of new studies is unnecessary and simply holds up the decision-making process.

Furthermore, we consider the maximum content of 0.15 grams per litre insufficient. So much information has become available on the harmful effects of lead in petrol fumes that lead should be removed completely from petrol.

The United States and Japan are able to sell lead-free petrol, and close consultation between the Commission and petrol producers, engine builders and manufacturers could also result in lead-free petrol for Europe.

Lord Douro (ED). — Mr President, I am completely in favour of this report prepared by Mr Ceravolo. I believe it would be irresponsible of this House not to support this very worthy resolution.

Like other Members of this House, I live at the centre of a large city. I have had the air in my flat tested by the Westminster City Council. The results showed that over a 3-month period the lead content per cubic metre of air was 21 % above the Greater London Council's guide value. The lead in dust from the surface of the garden was 2.5 times the GLC's target value. These results were sufficiently worrying for me to have my children's blood tested. The elder one, who is five, had a lead content in his blood 2/3 of the level which, according to the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution, is a warning signal. This margin, Mr President, is too close to be comfortable or sensible.

High lead content in blood is particularly dangerous to pregnant women and children. Given that fact, it is the duty of all of us representing the population of the European Community to bring Europe into line with the United States and with Japan. We must require all new cars to run on lead free-petrol.

The chairman of the Ford Motor Company of Britain said here in Strasbourg quite recently that car manufacturers need only 5 years to produce cars which will run on lead free petrol. I therefore urge the Commission to come forward within a few months with proposals for making it mandatory for all cars sold in the European Community after 1988 to run on lead-free fuel. Our vote today, Mr President, is a major step in that important direction.

Mr Calvez (L). — (FR) Mr President, although I share the concern of all those who emphasize the dangers that atmospheric pollution presents to public health, I must say to our Parliament that I consider the conclusions contained in the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to be more realistic than the report of the Committee on the Environment.

We must, in fact, satisfy ourselves that the resolutions adopted by our Parliament can in fact be applied. This

is essential and I wonder whether the time limit set — before 1985 — for reducing the maximum lead content to 0.15 grammes per litre can be adhered to. That is why I have submitted an amendment postponing until 1988 the date by which lead-free petrol should be on sale in the Community, since what we decide has to be based on concrete facts, and not merely statements. Can the Commission tell us to what extent a lead content of 0.15 grammes per litre represents a genuine health hazard? Can the Commission inform us what the cost will be of the necessary investments in the refining industry and in the manufacture of engines that can run on lead-free petrol? These investments add up to thousands of millions, and that is also something you must know.

Has any thought been given to what will happen to the workers in firms producing lead tetraethyl, which are in danger of being forced out of production? Has any thought been given to what will become of the workers who make carburettors that will have to be replaced by catalytic devices?

The owners of cars at present in circulation will try to keep their cars, and the cars will have to be converted in order to use lead-free petrol; who will pay, and who can answer this question? The new fuel injection cars will be dearer: will there be enough buyers? And before taking a decision, we have to be satisfied that several hundred thousand jobs are not going to be threatened, directly or indirectly.

Prudence would suggest that the Commission should be asked to have a complementary study made, which we seem to lack. Undoubtedly the basic problem remains: the fight against pollution has priority, but I think that the problem calls for a certain amount of time, so that this politico-industrial battle that we are witnessing can be settled without passion and, above all, completely objectively.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President I accept that in due course there must be a move towards lead-free petrol. It is a question of when and how. We are faced with a sophisticated big money campaign designed to stam-pede the people of Europe into accepting the move to lead-free petrol at a speed which will cause great damage to certain sections of our economy.

I am a little surprised that Mr Collins of all people should be expressing his consideration for the problems of citizens and of children. I express my concern for them too, but there is not a word from him about the people whose jobs are at risk. I would like him to know that there are plenty of people who live where I live, many of them currently Labour voters, who have been noting what kind of support for the safeguarding of employment comes from his part of the British Labour Party, and they will be disappointed to find that the money they put behind that party is not getting better results for them.

Pearce

I say that we should put off the implementation of this legislation, Mr President, until a proper study of the effects of it has been made — a proper study of the cost at the pump, a proper study of the effect on the balance of payments and a proper study of the effect on employment in the factories that make the lead for petrol and in the motor industry.

None of these things have been done properly so far. I have tabled amendments which would have the effect of postponing implementation until a proper study of these things has been made. That, I believe, would be a rational way of going about this — to consider all of the facts and not just some of them, and not just to go along with a high-powered PR bandwagon.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The Commission would first like to join all the other speakers in thanking the rapporteur, the draftsmen of opinions and the members of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for this thorough and informative report. I would also like to thank all those who have taken part in this debate for their thoughtful and well-informed contributions on individual points. We are extremely pleased that Parliament has taken the initiative in debating this important matter.

Reducing lead pollution has been a priority concern of Community environmental policy, as Mr. Alber has pointed out, for over 10 years, and the Commission feels the time has come to take further forceful action on it. The Commission believes that the many members who have spoken on this subject today expect us to present a comprehensive plan of action, and it therefore resolved some time ago to direct its efforts with regard to the development of Community legislation for the automobile sector as a whole towards the complete elimination of lead from petrol. Our work on a global approach to environmental problems will soon be completed. As I have already said a number of times, we are aiming to draw up a whole set of regulations dealing with noise pollution, fuel consumption, passenger safety and exhaust emissions. These have to be closely co-ordinated with one another because they are all interconnected.

We are aware that the introduction of lead-free petrol will create problems not only for automobile manufacturers but also for oil refiners. Let me just give a brief report on our progress to date. A technical report on the problems facing car manufacturers as a result of the reduction of lead levels is being prepared by the ERGA group — that is the abbreviation for this working group — which will be published soon and made available to Parliament. At the same time as this technical report is being analysed a study must be made of the effects on the oil refining industry. This, I hasten to add, may not cause any significant delay in

the elaboration of extensive proposals for both sectors, i.e. the development of exhaust emission standards for vehicles and the amendment of the directive on lead in petrol.

A whole series of technologically feasible methods of reducing carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxide in exhaust gases were studied in connection with the ERGA report, the object being to establish medium and long-term vehicle exhaust emission levels for the Community. These tests included methods based on catalytic filters using either low-lead or lead-free fuel. In each case the reduction in emission levels was critically assessed as were the effects on petrol consumption, manufacturing and running costs, and safety. Special attention was paid to the effect on the atmosphere and the associated public health and environmental aspects. It is, however, important for both the industries concerned to make a close study of the general conditions governing the transition to leadless petrol. Reference can be made to American experience, inasmuch as it is applicable.

I would like to remind you that the majority of vehicles in Europe are currently fitted with high compression engines and consequently require high-quality — i.e. high-octane — fuel. Although oil refiners are able to produce lead-free low-octane petrol in sufficient quantities at the moment, they would have to build some new installations to produce high-octane fuels. This poses the fundamental questions of whether low-octane petrol should be made mandatory at the expense of improved engine design, which would of course cause a substantial loss of investment, or whether, alternatively, the oil-refining sector should be called upon to produce high-octane leadless petrol while automobile manufacturers maintain their high standards of engine design.

Once these issues have been decided in principle interim and provisional measures could be taken. In any case further studies will have to be carried out before any such far-reaching decisions can be taken. For this reason and because legislation would have to be passed affecting major aspects of production in both the oil refining and motor vehicle industries the request in paragraph 6c for the elimination of lead from petrol by 1985 is unrealistic. Before this conflict of goals can be resolved we shall have to consider various alternative timetables for the introduction of legislation in order to assess the impact of these dates on the partial transition to leadless petrol.

Of special relevance to the introduction of lead-free petrol is Article 3 of Directive 611/78, which stipulates that Member States must take all due steps to ensure that the reduction in lead does not lead to a substantial increase in other pollutants. The oil refiners' proposals for producing leadless fuel would also have to be reviewed in this light.

Narjes

May I comment on specific paragraphs of the motion for a resolution as follows. Re 6a, abolition of the obligation on Member States not to go below 0.15 g/l: this proposal is not acceptable as it stands, because it could cause the quality of petrol in Member States which ban lead in petrol to fall below the present Community standard. This would force car manufacturers to produce two types of engine for Common Market countries, one type for Member States which continue to permit high-octane, leaded petrol, and another type for Member States which decide to introduce low-octane, lead-free fuel. Dividing up production in this way would, however, thwart the Commission's efforts to create uniform market conditions for standardized Community products. Moreover, the considerable degree of harmonization achieved on the car market by numerous Community directives would be destroyed. A directive of this kind would interfere with motor manufacturers' long-term production planning, because they would not know which Member States would decide to legislate for lead-free petrol, and when. In the interests of market uniformity and to prevent divergence among Member States I therefore disagree with this proposal.

Re 6b and c: reduction of the maximum permitted lead level to 0.15 g/l by 1985 to be followed by the introduction of a lead-free grade of petrol. Apart from the fact that some Member States could not meet these deadlines for technical reasons related to oil-refining capacity, these proposals could only be implemented in the light of the foregoing arguments provided that Community standards for petrol grades were established at the same time. Article 3 of Directive 611/78 referred to above stipulates that the elimination of lead from petrol must not affect its quality. In view of the report's proposals it seems advisable to formulate a precise definition of the type and grade of petrol envisaged, in order to avoid partitioning the market. Regarding the timetable for reducing the maximum permitted lead level to 0.15 g/l the Commission thinks that any measures must apply to the whole Community and be enforced simultaneously, and that they will probably entail Community regulations on petrol grades. The Commission will call on those Member States that have not already done so — and I think this answers a number of your questions — to cut their lead levels to the region of 0.15 g proposed in the present Community recommendation. This will have the immediate effect of reducing lead emission from this source by about 60%. I know that this will satisfy most speakers; only one regarded 0.15 g as an absurd level. I think that, as a temporary solution — not the final one — this roughly 60% reduction in lead levels from 0.40 g represents a realistic and worthwhile goal until further action can be taken.

That brings me to paragraph 7. As I have already said, both vehicle exhaust legislation and the amendments to the directive on lead in petrol will have to consti-

tute part of our global approach. They are interconnected, and that is why the problem of air pollution from vehicle exhausts cannot be resolved before the end of this year, as demanded in paragraph 7. The same goes for passing regulations stipulating that all new vehicles must run on lead-free petrol. We believe that motions to this effect could be tabled and voted on next year. We naturally feel that this issue should be discussed with prospective Member States so that they can bring their legislation into line with the rest of the Community before joining.

Before closing I would like to comment on some aspects of the debate. It has been said, quite rightly, that blood lead levels caused by air pollution, which are largely due to vehicle exhaust, can be in the 0.2-0.3 range. We are in possession of scientific data showing that there are substantial differences between town and country-dwellers; we also have material indicating that blood-lead levels are also dependent on other sources and factors. We agree, however, with the Royal Commission's recent report on this subject in Great Britain, which recommends concentrating first and foremost on reducing and eliminating lead from petrol, because of all the known sources of pollution it is the one that can be dealt with most quickly. This does not relieve us of our obligation to study other sources of pollution methodically and scientifically, e.g. differences in the water solubility of lead depending on the nature of the water in different parts of the Community, but we do consider it essential to begin with lead in petrol because this is the factor we can control fastest. To recapitulate: we hope to be able to let you have the technical ERGA reports soon, probably before the summer recess, and to be able to bring this important debate to an early and constructive conclusion in committee and in the plenary following calculations of how to obtain optimum results and analysis of the available technical data.

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote*¹

8. Shipment of hazardous wastes

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-370/83) by Mrs Van Hemeldonck, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on the

— proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-1208/82 — COM(82) 892 final) for a directive on the supervision and control of transfrontier shipment of hazardous wastes within the European Community.

¹ See Annex I.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S), rapporteur. — (NL) Ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection examined the supervision and control of transfrontier shipment of hazardous wastes within the Community against a background of the odyssey of the 41 drums of dioxin. We therefore had the dubious advantage of being able to check our work against a specific striking example. This confrontation of theory and practice was present with us in determining clear-cut guidelines for an urgent solution to this problem.

The first guideline is that for transfrontier shipment a strict definite uniform legal instrument is necessary, a legal instrument that is applicable in the same way and in the same form in all Member States, thus a regulation which is applicable three months after publication of the texts in the Official Journal of the European Communities.

Secondly, we wanted to extend the regulations to dangerous wastes *and* hazardous substances. A distinction between waste and hazardous substances is often theoretical. Remember what happened in Seveso: the waste from an industrial manufacturing procedure became a hazardous substance called dioxin. Whether it is a dangerous waste or hazardous substance, i.e. hazardous to public health and the environment, the only important thing is that the hazard remains the same. Whatever you want to call it, whether waste or dangerous substance, we want to ensure that no one can suddenly re-name dangerous waste as substances or products and thus escape supervision and control.

Thirdly, your committee has decided that two things must be avoided, firstly, that shipments disappear without trace and secondly, that the authorities do not even know where dangerous substances are to be found. That is why we propose a procedure of permits being granted firstly by the country of origin, then by the country of transit and finally by the country of destination. All these documents accompany the shipment until the final dumping, elimination or treatment. This will put an end to all phantom shipments of dangerous wastes or hazardous substances in the European Community.

Fourthly, the regulation is not only applicable to transfrontier shipments within the European Community but also to transport through third countries. So we guarantee equal treatment of all traffic inside and outside the Community and at the same time avoid all risks.

Then the committee turned its attention to the question of packaging and labelling. The packaging must be safe and guard against the risks of transport and must specifically state the type of hazardous substance or dangerous waste, also the danger from the product and the measures to be taken in case of accidents. Vehicles transporting dangerous substances and waste must carry a standard plate bearing all these data. This

presupposes, of course, that all Member States ratify the same existing agreements, namely the ADR, RIP, IMCO and IATA agreements. Greece, Ireland and Denmark have not yet done so.

To limit the risk even further and to make control even more effective, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, with the support of the Committee on Transport, proposes that really safe routes should be specifically designated for this traffic. For the same reasons the number of frontier crossings can be limited by mutual consent. The authorities must ensure that these frontier posts are manned by the necessary trained staff. We must also be satisfied that the firms which ship hazardous substances and dangerous waste offer the necessary guarantees as to the reliability and suitability of their technical resources and the training of specialised staff.

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection also believes that the question of responsibility must be clearly defined. In principle we hold the manufacturer totally responsible from beginning to end of the operation. Article 12 also clearly defines legal liability for damage caused.

Responsibility for ensuring compliance with the regulation lies first and foremost with the national authorities of each Member State. But we also consider that the Commission has an important part to play in supervising the application of this regulation. So we put a responsibility on the Member States to notify the Commission about possible routes for this special shipment, relating to places suitable for storing, eliminating or processing dangerous substances and waste, and relating to the shipment, storage or elimination. For reasons of safety we think the Member States and the Commission should keep these records for at least ten years, to avoid all risks.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the whole of the Community shuddered at the thought that a dangerous poison like dioxin could simply vanish without trace or move through Europe like a ghost train. This regulation proposed by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection provides us with the opportunity of showing the peoples of Europe that serious problems such as the protection of life and the environment against dangerous substances can be solved, and can only be solved, by Europe as a whole.

The people of Europe are all now turned to the Council. The President-in-Office of the Council has already expressed his concern for environmental problems on several occasions. The people of Europe and the countries beyond the EEC expect the Council of Environment Ministers at their meeting on 16 and 17 June to approve and start implementing this regulation. Such a politically responsible action on the part of the Council will strengthen our peoples' confi-

Van Hemeldonck

dence in Europe much more than any great declarations and ceremonies. People expect specific action from the EEC so that Europe develops into a place where human lives and the environment are protected. It is now up to you gentlemen in the Council to speak and act; the eyes of all Europe are on you.

Mr I. Friedrich (PPE), *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.* — (DE) Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, we have all been shocked by the Seveso toxic waste scandal, but the legal position is such that a similar incident could occur again at any time. The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs therefore wholeheartedly welcomes the Commission's proposal as a first step in the right direction. The ultimate goal is clearly to bring hazardous wastes under complete Community control from the moment they arise to the moment they are disposed of. A qualification that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs would wish to make is that, instead of control powers being introduced at national frontiers, the competent authorities should be entitled to check all shipments of this kind at any time. Producers of hazardous wastes must also be compelled — and must be able — to provide information on the latter's whereabouts at all times.

There must be no repetition of the Hoffmann-La Roche case. We are thus grateful for the proposal that vehicles transporting such shipments should carry a standard plate identifying their load.

Companies must be stopped from shipping hazardous substances across European frontiers for reasons of their own, i.e. because it is cheaper to dispose of them or the regulations are less stringent elsewhere. We must aim in the medium term to harmonize Member States' legislation on the control of such wastes in order to discourage producers from shipping them abroad to dispose of them.

A further goal must be to reduce such shipments generally, i.e. to ensure that wastes are transported to the nearest dump or to a place where they can safely be disposed of.

Believing this to be a matter of some urgency, we consequently welcome the recommendation of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection that the Commission issue a regulation rather than a directive. It would be a mistake, however, to water down this regulation by extending it to all dangerous substances. This would weaken the Commission's proposal and might cause a delay because it could take the Council of Ministers years to come to an agreement. If the title of the draft is extended to include dangerous substances as well as hazardous wastes — the original title referred to hazardous wastes only, i.e. to a specific situation — as the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and

Consumer Protection has recommended by a chance majority vote, the provisions would have to be so extensive that there would be no chance of the Council of Ministers reaching an early decision.

So unless the inclusion of dangerous substances is withdrawn, we shall be compelled to reject the draft altogether. We shall only be able to agree to the proposal to turn it into a regulation provided the original title is retained, i.e. provided it relates to the most stringent control of hazardous wastes.

If the European institutions fail to resolve this vital issue, they will be sadly neglecting the safety of their citizens and the future of Europe. If we show our true colours now, if we seize this opportunity and show that we can pass common legislation to protect our citizens, then we can prove that the European Community is capable of acting in its citizens' interests. Acid rain, toxic substances and similar scourges of mankind cannot be confined within national frontiers, and that is why they must be combated on an international — or at least Community — scale.

(Applause)

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (S). — (DE) Just a point of order, Mr. President. I would like to know — because I simply could not tell — whether Mr. Friedrich has just spoken on behalf of his committee or his political group. He used the first person plural, and I would appreciate it if this point could be clarified for our benefit.

Mr I. Friedrich (PPE), *draftsman of the opinion for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.* — (DE) Mrs. Seibel-Emmerling, as you know, I have drafted an opinion for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and my speech just now represented an attempt to reflect that opinion. We did not, however, know — and I assume that is what your question refers to — when we were discussing the proposal in committee that the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection had extended it to include dangerous substances.

The general tenor of debate in the committee leads me to believe that it will vote in the way I have just outlined, unless of course its members change their minds. Opinion was that the matter was urgent, and that the regulation should relate to hazardous wastes only; nobody ever suggested extending it. That is the point I have been trying to make.

President. — To wind up this little discussion then, it is perfectly clear that Mr Ingo Friedrich has spoken on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

Mr Donnez (L), *draftsman of the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee.* — (FR) Mr President, I have to report to you, and especially to my French

Donnez

colleagues, that the French translation of my opinion contains an omission: the four last pages are missing. A corrigendum is being distributed at this moment, but it will undoubtedly arrive too late. When it does, I shall be glad if my French colleagues will refer to the written amendments that they will find in their respective pigeon-holes.

That being the case, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to say that the Committee on Legal Affairs, by unanimously adopting — for which I thank them — the amendments that I proposed, has put the finishing touches to the excellent report that the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection submitted to us.

In fact, it seemed to the Committee on Legal Affairs that the legal systems of all our countries were powerless, especially as the present Community regulations have shown themselves to be perfectly ineffective, and especially also as, whilst there are restrictions on the free circulation of products within the Community, they are obviously not concerned with hazardous wastes, as has been proved to us recently.

Before dealing — not in their totality, but in their essence — with the amendments that I have the honour to put before you, I should like to make a suggestion to the Committee on the Environment. That committee wishes the draft directive that it has put forward to be turned into a draft Regulation.

As far as the principle itself is concerned, I am personally in agreement. The Committee on Legal Affairs is also in agreement. On the other hand, if we are seeking efficiency in this matter, it is not a good idea to turn the directive into a Regulation. I emphasize, 'if we are seeking efficiency'.

As things stand at present, work on the directive is at an advanced stage, and we can hope for very quick results, as well as the application of the directive in the law of each of our Member States, in a very short time. On the other hand, if we decide on a Regulation, that will take far too much time, in our view: the legal instrument will need to be changed completely. And I am very much afraid, in particular, that certain countries, that are already slow to apply directives — I can only quote the case of Greece — may totally reject the idea of a Regulation, which the Committee responsible is putting forward to us.

For this reason, the Committee on Legal Affairs is satisfied with the draft that was presented to it, and hopes that the Assembly will take the same line and keep the directive in the form in which it was submitted to us, — as a directive, that is — without going so far as to make a Regulation of it, whilst recognising, of course, that a Regulation would have very much more coercive force.

I should like now to say a few words on the principle of the amendments that have been adopted by the

Committee on Legal Affairs. We wanted, in the first place — as did the committee responsible — the faculty of making objections or granting permits (permits for the transport of hazardous wastes) to be extended to all countries, particularly the country of transit. In the draft which was submitted to us, there was no reference to the country of transit. From this point of view, the amendment that we propose to Article 4 is particularly important.

We also wanted Member States to limit the number of customs clearance centres (amendment to Article 17). In our view this is the only means of ensuring an effective check on the declarations of the firms concerned. We also considered that the carriers of hazardous wastes ought to come under the supervision of a special body, recognized by the competent authorities of each of the Member States (amendment to Article 12).

Finally, we want the time limit for incorporating the directive into our individual legal systems to be reduced to six months. This means that we have sought to be efficient. It also means that, whilst the Legal Affairs Committee is sometimes criticized for the over-use of legal red tape, there is none of that here, as you can see. These amendments, which were passed unanimously — and this I emphasise — are only designed to put the finishing touches, harmoniously, to a report that I consider to be an excellent one, and on which I congratulate the rapporteur.

Mrs von Alemann (L), *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Transport*. — (DE) Mr President, the Committee on Transport delivered its opinion relatively early, or at least before I had read Mrs Van Hemeldonck's report. As draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Transport, I held and still hold the view that it was a good idea of the Commission's to draw up a directive.

The Committee on Transport did not query any items of the Commission's draft because we felt that from the point of view of speed and efficiency a directive was the most suitable instrument, especially if a year is allowed for its implementation, which is still too long but better than nothing. Even after the debate just now I still consider the Transport Committee's decision — as Mr Narjes will probably tell us — a sensible one. Because what is the problem? The problem is that the transfrontier shipment of dangerous substances and hazardous wastes is giving rise to uncontrollable risks. Of course we have viewed these risks from the point of view of transport, and that is what I have concentrated on in my opinion. We felt that the Commission had not phrased certain points precisely enough, and I am pleased to note that the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection has turned its attention to these. We notice, for example, that the recommendations of the Gatto report of 22 January 1982 on the

von Alemann

shipment of dangerous substances had been left out. The Environment Committee has rectified this omission.

It is especially important that transfrontier shipments of this kind are properly identified — i.e. that the shipping documents are in order — and also that the drivers are taught what to do in an emergency. Not even permits are going to be very useful in the end, because in an emergency it is the driver who decides what action to take. The Commission's proposal requires clarification in this respect, and that is why

we have suggested some amendments, which have been accepted. My view remains unchanged that this proposal for a directive is a sensible idea.

President. — In view of the time we shall now adjourn this debate.⁽¹⁾

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

⁽¹⁾ Membership of Parliament — Agenda for next sitting : see Minutes.

*ANNEX I**Votes*

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

**SECOND PROUT REPORT (Doc. 1-1180/82 — consumer credit):
REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE**

* * *

CERAVOLO REPORT (Doc. 1-279/83 — lead in petrol): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke :

- IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos. 1, 26 and 27 ;
- AGAINST Amendments Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33 and 34.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Pantazi (S). — (*GR*) The report by Mr Ceravolo stresses the seriousness of the problem of lead in petrol and the harmful effect this lead has on public health.

Let us not forget that vehicle emissions are responsible for, apart from all the other things, the appearance of lead in the human bloodstream with very often disastrous consequences for pregnant women and children. In the context of its efforts to clean up the atmosphere the Greek Government recently decided on a reduction of the lead content in petrol to the minimum proposed level of 0.15 grammes per litre, with effect from the beginning of this month. The additional refinery sector cost entailed in producing petrol for use free of lead or with a reduced lead content must not stand in the way of the effort to improve the quality of life, particularly in a matter directly related to the health of all of us.

Naturally, this effort must be accompanied by parallel research into the necessary adaptation of engines manufactured in the Community and by research towards better control of vehicle lead emissions.

For these reasons the Greek Socialists will vote in favour of the Ceravolo report.

Mr Del Duca (PPE). — (*IT*) I think that this report is very interesting, but nothing more than that, since the necessary conclusive studies, on which we have to base ourselves when dealing with the health aspects of the problem, have not yet been made.

We are talking here of possible harm due to the lead content in petrol. I have also heard the rapporteurs of the other committees talking of economic considerations : 30 million more litres a week in Italy, 170 million litres more in Europe. If we were faced with compelling and, above all, unchallengeable arguments, then, as a member of Parliament and a doctor, I should raise my hand in this Chamber and vote in favour. But we are not yet sure about what we have been told : we are not sure that petrol that contains lead is

harmful in this way. And if, moreover, we consider it necessary — as has been said — that petrol should have a high octane content, and to achieve this high octane content we use benzole, we may as well say that we have gone from petrol as a source of lead poisoning to petrol as a source of cancer : we have fallen out of the frying pan into the fire. For this reason I shall vote against this resolution.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Our Group fully approves the Ceravolo report and congratulates its author on the high level of agreement it has achieved, because of the extremely responsible nature of the proposals it contains. Timing and methods have been left to the Commission, so that account can be taken not only of the needs of health and the environment, but also the economic needs. Those who are opposed to this motion for a resolution, or who have attempted to hobble it, are looking solely at the economic side, disregarding questions of health and the environment which, in addition to being human and social problems, are also problems that, in their turn, seriously concern the economies and the budgets of our countries.

Efficient studies have been called for on the question of costs : the request is a legitimate one, and, in a reasonable world in which science can still tell us a great deal, studies should be made. However, where economic implications are concerned, studies could more reasonably be carried out on all those gadgets, those innovations that are applied to cars, and that the consumer accepts without a word, like a pig in a poke.

I think that another positive aspect of this report is that it has already won agreement outside, from the consumer associations and representatives of the environmental protection organizations. And, thanks to the impetus that they have provided, we have got as far as this reasonable proposal that takes account of the present, the past and the future — a future that comprises a number of factors that our Parliament must not ignore, since every one of them must contribute to our concern and must be taken account of in our decisions.

Mr Patterson (ED). — It is with great regret that I am going to vote against this resolution. I say, with regret, because I accept that lead is a poison and that it probably damages the health of unborn children. However, I notice that when colleagues like Lord Douro, talk of lead-free petrol, what they really mean is a lead-free atmosphere. Now it is reasonable to prevent the emission of lead into the atmosphere by car exhaust, but there are two ways of doing this.

The first, is, of course, to move to lead-free petrol. But I do not think we have recognized sufficiently in this debate that there are costs involved. There are costs in terms of efficiency and there are costs in terms of jobs. With twelve and a half million unemployed in the Community, we ought to have shown slightly more concern about job effects than we appear to have done today. Now I accept that there could be no reason why lead-free petrol could not be on sale and I voted for paragraph 6(c).

The second way, namely, laying down rigorous emission standards should be given more emphasis. I find it curious that the Ceravolo report makes no reference whatsoever of emission standards. I do point out that the IMAC opinion, which I agree is a much better opinion, states that the reason why lead-free petrol was introduced in Japan and the United States has got nothing to do with the poison lead. It was necessary for getting rid of unburned hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxide.

Emission standards would be legally a much more acceptable way of doing things. Filters are available which both remove the lead and contain a lead tolerant catalyst. I think the Commission — and I have asked the Commission to do this — when it comes to draft its directive, should examine the possibility of emission standards as an alternative to lead-free petrol.

It is with great regret that I have to vote against the Ceravolo report.

Mr Pearce (ED). — I have listened to the debate and I have read the amendments. I wish it could be said that other people who are present had actually read what the amendments say before leaping into something merely because it seems to be attractive or trendy or vote-catching.

Heavens, anybody can raise a scare and insist that something must be instantly changed. You will be leaping to ban leaded pencils next if somebody raises a scare about that.

So why are we going to lose 3 000 jobs — 3 000 jobs, Mr Collins! — in my constituency. This has to be faced in the long run. But why is this to be done all of a sudden in such a tearing hurry? What is the evidence? As Mr Patterson says, the American experience is irrelevant to what we are doing. The British experience is inconclusive as the extent of the risk, and there is a lack of data about where all the other lead in blood comes from. There is a risk. Something must be done about it but why this tearing hurry? Is it just for political effect? Are we, just for that reason, to lose 3 000 jobs more rapidly than necessary in an area which already has 20 % unemployment? I will accept this move when the facts have been looked into properly. Until then, I cannot, and I will oppose this motion.

Mr Provan (ED). — Whatever might have been said by some of my colleagues in this group, for very understandable constituency interests, let there be no doubt in this Parliament that my group will give the fullest support to the Ceravolo report.

I am delighted also that Stanley Johnson's amendments were accepted by Parliament because I think they make a significant improvement in the report. It would have been totally wrong for this report not to include all fuels that might power motor cars. At the same time it also gives motor manufacturers within the Community the required push to actually alter the design of future engines.

Mr President, let this Parliament be in no doubt whatsoever also that the British Conservative Government is giving a strong lead in this direction to the whole of Europe at the present time by seeking to ban the use of lead in petrol. I am also glad that the Royal Commission has recently reported and backed the decision that the government has taken. But, of course, the British Government, Mr President, wishes to do this in conjunction with all our European Community partners. Therefore it is very important for Parliament to take a strong stand on this issue. That is why my group is so keen to support this resolution.

One of the major issues that faces us is the pollution of the atmosphere. The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection recently had a public hearing on acid rain. It was evident from that hearing that it is the total atmospheric pollution that is the main problem and the catalytic effect of lead in the atmosphere is one of the main reasons why we have acid rain. I am glad that the Commission was able to come out so strongly and say that this was a necessary first step because I believe that filters that have been talked about in this debate today are not a good enough solution to the problem of atmospheric pollution.

Mr Collins (S). — The Socialist Group will, of course, vote in favour of the Ceravolo report because it is a report which is concerned about not just the present health but also the future health of people in Europe. We will vote for it because it has avoided falling prey to the sophisticated and expensive lobbying that has so far distinguished at least one side of the argument in this affair. We will vote for it because it recognizes the European scale and we will vote for it in spite of the fact that we heard some voices raised against it this afternoon. We are very pleased that the United Kingdom Government has joined our campaign to take lead out of petrol and we only regret that we had to wait until the general election was called in the United Kingdom in order to do it.

We believe that the European Parliament's intentions must not be ignored and we will vote for it because we believe that Mr Ceravolo has considered the employment implications of the problem; he has assessed the evidence and he has weighed it very carefully.

But I would like to finish with this one comment. When Mr Pearce and his friends have resigned from the party that has created 4 million unemployed in my country and 75 % youth unemployment in my constituency, then I will accept his concern about jobs as genuine — but certainly not until then.

Mr Geronimi (DEP). — *(FR)* Although atmospheric pollution is mainly due to oxides of sulphur, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxide and dust, the presence of lead in the air is anything but negligible. It is the most abundant and most widespread metal poison in the atmosphere.

Unlike other pollutants, lead has a very considerable cumulative effect. It causes a change in the biosynthesis of haemoglobin by inhibiting the amino-levulinic dehydratase. As soon as the concentration of amino-levulinic acid is reduced by $2\text{mg}/\text{m}^3$ it falls to between 60 and 30 % of its maximum value in individuals with a blood lead level of from 20-40mg, which is the level in all town-dwellers without any special additional occupational exposure: 1 to $2\text{mg}/\text{m}^3$ in town air, and $10\text{mg}/\text{m}^3$ in Paris, over 97 % of which is due to internal combustion engines.

Biochemical injury is thus present well before the clinical signs of lead poisoning are evident. Moreover, the danger threshold can be reached in periods of acid or oxidizing smog. The latter, which is also known as photochemical smog, is produced by the combination of strong sunlight and the emission of pollutants from cars, especially the emission of car pollutants when a sudden change of temperature occurs, which frequently happens in Los Angeles (60 days a year) and which has been reported at Genoa. The lead then acts synergetically with all the other pollutants, which have undergone a transformation that makes them even more noxious.

Health is a priority consideration, as several of the speakers have so rightly pointed out: we must therefore move progressively towards lead-free petrol, and I shall vote in favour of the Ceravolo resolution.

Mrs Lentz-Cornette (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to ask what is meant by the term 'explanation of vote'. I think what we have just had was more of a scientific lecture, and I should like if we could keep to explanations of vote.

President. — You are right, Mrs Lentz-Cornette, but the President must listen to all who wish to make an explanation of vote, even if they put it at great length.

Mr Lalor (DEP), *in writing.* — I am very much in favour of the Ceravolo report. Everything must be done to clear the dangerous lead from fuel as speedily as possible and I am with Mr Ceravolo and the Environment Committee in exhorting the Commission to press urgently forward to this end.

ANNEX II**COMMISSION ACTION ON EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT OPINIONS ON COMMISSION PROPOSALS DELIVERED AT THE APRIL AND MAY 1983 PART-SESSIONS**

This is an account, as arranged with the Bureau of Parliament, of the action taken by the Commission in respect of amendments proposed at the April and May 1983 part-sessions in the framework of parliamentary consultation, and of disaster aid granted.

A. Commission proposals to which Parliament proposed amendments that the Commission has accepted in whole or in part (April and May 1983 part-sessions)

1. Report by Mr Johnson closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation concerning Community environment schemes

The amendment to the proposal for a Council regulation concerning Community environment schemes⁽¹⁾ was approved by the Commission on 19 May 1983 and sent to the Council on 25 May 1983. It will be sent to the European Parliament next week.

2. Report by Mr Purvis closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation on the provision of financial incentives for certain types of investment in rational use of energy

The amended proposal has been approved by the Commission and will be sent to the Council and the European Parliament as quickly as possible.

3. Report by Mr Markopoulos closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the Commission proposal for a Council decision adopting an experimental Community action to stimulate the efficacy of the European Economic Community's scientific and technical potential

The Commission has begun the internal procedure for amending its original proposal. The amendment adopted by the European Parliament on the wording of paragraph 2 in Annex A to the proposal for a Council decision will be incorporated.

4. Report by Mr Petronio closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the Commission proposal for a Council decision amending Decision 82/402/EEC adopting a research and development programme (1982-85) in the raw material sector

The Commission has begun the procedure so that an amended version of its original proposal can be sent to the Council. This will incorporate the amendment to Article 2 (1) of the proposal for a Council decision adopted by the European Parliament.

⁽¹⁾ COM(83) 307 final, 24 May 1983

5. Report by Mr De Gucht closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the Commission proposal for a Council regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2779/78 on the procedure for applying the ECU to legal acts adopted in the customs sphere

The Commission will be putting an amending proposal in line with parliamentary wishes before the Council forthwith. Parliament will be informed in due course.

6. Report by Mr Nyborg closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the Commission proposals to the Council for :

- (i) a regulation laying down certain measures for the standardization and simplification of statistics on trade between Member States
- (ii) a regulation introducing a specimen declaration form to be used in intra-Community trade

The Commission will be putting before the Council forthwith an amending proposal in line with parliamentary wishes, *except for* the text proposed by Parliament for Article 1 (1).

On the substance of the question, the Commission is prepared to take Parliament's request into consideration, but it still considers that this regulation is not the appropriate place to do so.

This regulation is only concerned with the single specimen *form*, and not with the different varieties of procedure. This is clearly apparent in the preamble to the proposal, which makes explicit reference to Article 4 (1) of the basic regulation. The question of the approval of load lists, on the other hand, is an essential part of the simplified procedures which are dealt with in Article 10 of the *basic regulation*. This is where the clarification desired by Parliament should be made.

7. Report by Mr Marshall closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the Commission proposal for a Council regulation on the formation of rates for the carriage of goods by road between Member States

With reference to the three amendments accepted by the Commission at the plenary sitting :

- (a) an amendment will be drafted stipulating, in Article 7 of the proposal, that the hauliers' organizations are to *take into account* the views of transport users and employees ; (This amendment cannot be made unless the Council does not act on the proposal on 7 June.)
 - (b) the Commission can already give Parliament an undertaking to send it the Road Haulage Tariff Committee's annual report, without this involving any amendment of the legislative text (chairmanship of the Committee being vested in the Commission) ;
 - (c) Parliament's desire to see the tariff regulation reviewed 5 years after it enters into force also corresponds to the Council bodies' obvious intention, which the Commission has approved.
8. Report by Mr Rogalla closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the Commission proposal for a 13th Council directive on the harmonization of the laws of the Member States relating to turnover taxes — Arrangements for the refund of value added tax to taxable persons not established in Community territory.

The Commission is going to prepare an amended proposal for a directive (under the second paragraph of Article 149 of the Treaty) which will include the amendments it accepted at the May plenary sitting.

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

Nil

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

1. Report by Mr Cervolo on the Commission Memorandum on the reduction and re-organization of working time

The Commission considers that Parliament's resolution accords with the principles set out in the Memorandum. At its meeting on 20 May the Standing Committee on Employment discussed the reduction and re-organization of working time, and the government, employee and Commission representatives agreed with the principles in the resolution.

The question will be re-discussed at the Labour Ministers Council session on 2 July, and the Commission hopes that it will be given a brief to present specific proposals on the subject. If it is, the Commission's proposals will give due importance to the principles laid down in the resolution.

2. Report by Mr Ghergo closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the Commission proposal for a Council regulation amending Regulation (EEC) 1408/71 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons, to self-employed persons and to their families moving within the Community and Regulation (EEC) No 574/72 fixing the procedure for implementing Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71

In item 4 of the resolution the wish is expressed that the amendments proposed there should be included in the up-dating of the regulations.

The Council meeting on 2 June 1983 is expected to adopt :

- (i) the regulation amending Regulations (EEC) Nos 1408/71 and 574/72 with which the resolution is concerned,
- (ii) the regulation up-dating those Regulations, *including the amendments made to them by the regulation at (i)*.

3. Report by Mrs Tove Nielsen closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on :

- (i) the Commission Communication to the Council on new information technologies and vocational training : new Community action for the period 1983-87,
- (ii) the draft Council decision on vocational training policies in the European Community during the 80s

The report presented by Mrs Nielsen to the European Parliament (16 May) and the resolution it adopted are concerned with two Commission texts (communication and draft resolution) :

- (i) New Technologies and Vocational Training (COM(82) 296 final),
- (ii) Vocational Training Policy for the 80s in the European Communities (COM(82) 637 final).

Item (i) should be adopted at the Social Affairs Council session on 2 June 1983. Item (ii) will be taken at the Joint Labour/Education Council session on 3 June 1983.

The draft resolutions presented to the Council (via COREPER) take Parliament's suggestions into account to a considerable extent, particularly with regard to women. It will be noted that the emphasis placed by Parliament on the importance of education in relation to new technologies has in a way been anticipated by the resolution the Council and Education Ministers are expected to adopt on 2 June on measures relating to the introduction of new technologies in education.

4. Report by Mr Gabert closing the parliamentary consultation procedure on the proposal for a Council decision on the commercial independence of the railways in the management of their international luggage and passenger traffic

Items 1 and 2: Proposal for a Council decision on the commercial independence of railways

The Commission has taken note of Parliament's opinion in favour of its proposal.

The proposal is on the agenda for the Council session on 7 June 1983 and likely to be adopted.

Items 3-5: Railway cooperation

The Commission is continuing its efforts to have its action programme of 7 May 1983 implemented.

Proposals for draft recommendations on commercial management and technical operating conditions in particular will be put before the Council by the end of the first half of 1983.

Item 7:

The Commission monitors the activity of railways in the same way as other forms of transport to ensure that Community rules are strictly applied.

Item 8:

Back in January 1981 the Commission put a proposal before the Council for the achievement of budget balance by the railways. As stated in Annex A to its communication of 9 February 1983, this proposal is going to be withdrawn and replaced in the course of the year. The new proposal will probably include:

- defining the limits of the State's responsibility for railway infrastructure,
- partial re-organization of railways' capital structure by the owner State,
- measures to enable the grant of budget-balancing subsidies to be more strictly controlled.

Item 9:

As already stated at 8, the Commission is also trying to arrive at a new definition of the limits of the State's responsibility for railway infrastructure. There are already Community rules governing activities undertaken by railways in the public interest. The new proposal mentioned above will also cover the various aspects of separate accounting, a field where other existing Council regulations could usefully be referred to.

Item 10:

Allocation of infrastructure costs

The Commission is currently preparing the proposal on the allocation of infrastructure costs referred to in its Memorandum on the common transport policy. An initial exchange of views with the committee of government experts has already taken place and a number of meetings are planned for the near future.

D. *Disaster aid supplied since the last part-session*

I. *Emergency aid within the Community*

Nothing to report.

II. *Emergency aid for third countries*

(b) *Financial aid*

320,000 ECU for flood victims in Peru

200,000 ECU to the Government of Botswana for Zimbabwe refugees

2,000,000 ECU for famine victims in Ethiopia :

500,000 ECU to the Government for specific projects

750,000 ECU to the ICRC

200,000 ECU to UNICEF

550,000 ECU to a consortium of Protestant NGOs

900,000 ECU for dysentery sufferers in Burundi

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 7 JUNE 1983

Contents

1. <i>Approval of the Minutes:</i> <i>Mr Bangemann; Mr Pflimlin; Mr Galland; Mr Patterson; Mr Aigner; Mr Janssen van Raay; Mr Bangemann; Mr von der Vring; Mr Aigner; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Aigner; Mr Gontikas</i>	31	7. <i>Council statement on the 1984 elections:</i> <i>Mr Mertes (Council); Lord Douro; Mr Bangemann; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Barbi; Mr Patterson; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Mertes; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Patterson; Mrs Boserup</i>	65
2. <i>Welcome</i>	34	8. <i>Right to vote and stand for election — Report by Mrs Macciocchi (Doc. 1-121/83):</i> <i>Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Malangré; Mr Tyrrell; Mr D'Angelosante; Mrs Veil; Mr Vié; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mrs Vayssade; Mr Bournias; Mr Kyrkos; Mrs Gredal; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	70
3. <i>Decision on urgent procedure:</i> <i>Mr Poniatowski; Mr Cohen; Mr Lange; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Collins; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Früh</i>	35	9. <i>Votes</i> <i>Mr Fich; Mrs Viehoff; Mrs Macciocchi; Mr D'Angelosante; Mrs Veil</i>	77
4. <i>Community Youth-Exchange Programme — European Foundation — Report by Mr Bocklet (Doc. 1-78/83) — Oral question, with debate, by Mr Schwencke to the Council (Doc. 1-353/83):</i> <i>Mr Bocklet; Mr Schwencke; Mr Mertes (Council); Mr Gontikas; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Brok; Mr Hutton; Mrs Pruvot; Mr Vandemeulebroucke; Mr Eisma; Mrs Pery; Mr Lalor; Mr Beumer; Mrs Nielsen; Mrs Hammerich; Mr O'Mahony; Mrs Gaiotti De Biase; Mr Bangemann; Mr Estgen; Mr Hahn; Mr Kallias; Mr Mertes; Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Bocklet; Mrs Hammerich; Mrs Boserup; Mr Bangemann; Mr Fich; Mrs Nielsen; Mr Schwencke</i>	36	10. <i>Malta — Report by Mrs Van den Heuvel (Doc. 1-368/83):</i> <i>Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Schmid; Mr Habsburg; Mr Haferkamp (Commission)</i>	78
5. <i>Welcome</i>	54	11. <i>Question Time (Doc. 1-389/83)</i> <i>Questions to the Council:</i> <i>Question by Mr Maffré-Baugé (Doc. 1-1352/82):</i> <i>Mr Mertes (Council)</i>	80
6. <i>Memorandum on Greenland's withdrawal from the EEC — Report by Mr Janssen van Raay (Doc. 1-264/83):</i> <i>Mr Janssen van Raay; Mr Mertes (Council); Mr Burke (Commission); Mr Janssen van Raay; Mr Burke; Mr Glinne; Mr Jakobsen; Mr Tyrrell; Mrs Boserup; Mr von der Vring; Mrs Veil; Mr Vié; Mr Lynge; Mr Helms; Mr Møller; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Alavanos</i>	55	— <i>Question No 1, by Mr Cousté: Amendment of the Social Fund arrangements, and Question No 17, by Mr Pattison: Results of recent Social Affairs Council meeting and Social-Education Jumbo Council meeting:</i> <i>Mr Mertes; Mr Cousté; Mr Mertes; Mr Pattison; Mr Mertes; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Mertes</i>	81
		— <i>Question No 3, by Mr Kallias: European younger generation:</i> <i>Mr Mertes; Mr Kallias; Mr Mertes; Mr Gontikas; Mr Mertes</i>	82

- Question No 4, by Mr Israël: Free circulation of ECU coins:
Mr Mertes; Mr Israël; Mr Mertes; Mr Rogalla; Mr Mertes; Mr von Wogau; Mr Mertes 83
- Question No 5, by Miss Quin: Obligation of the Council to respond to European Parliament Resolutions tabled under Rule 49 of the Parliament's Rules of Procedure:
Mr Mertes; Miss Quin; Mr Mertes . . . 85
- Question No 6, by Mr Van Minnen: Elimination of the butter mountain:
Mr Mertes; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Mertes; Mr Schinzel; Mr Mertes; Mr Hord; Mr Mertes 85
- Question No 7, by Mr Radoux: European Parliament-Council liaison group:
Mr Mertes; Mrs Van Hemeldonck; Mr Mertes; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Mertes; Mr Hutton; Mr Mertes; Mr Alavanos; Mr Mertes; Mr Eisma; Mr Mertes 86
- Question No 9, by Mr von Wogau: Proposal for a 14th Directive on the harmonization of turnover taxes:
Mr Mertes; Mr von Wogau; Mr Mertes; Mr Rogalla; Mr Mertes; Mr Langes; Mr Mertes 87
- Question No 11, by Mr Galland: USSR as observer at GATT:
Mr Mertes; Mr Galland; Mr Mertes; Mr Alavanos; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Kaloyannis; Mr Alavanos 88
- Questions to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs:
- Question No 18, by Mrs Schleicher: Bitterfield (GDR) 'Death Squad':
Mr Mertes (Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs); Mrs Schleicher; Mr Mertes; Mr Sherlock; Mr Mertes 89
- Question No 19, by Mr Israël, and Question No 20, by Mr Cousté: Agreement between Israel and the Lebanon:
Mr Mertes; Mr Israël; Mr Mertes; Mr Cousté; Mr Mertes; Mr Nordmann; Mr Mertes; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Mertes; Mr Ephremidis; Mr Mertes; Mr Kaloyannis 90
- Annex:
Mr Alavanos; Mrs Boserup; Mr Fernandez; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Muntingh; Mr D'Angelosante; Mr Cottrell; Mr Alavanos; Mr Van Minnen 93

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)

1. Approval of the Minutes

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

Are there any comments?

Mr Bangemann (L). — (DE) Mr President, the Minutes refer to a report by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, drawn up at the President's request. May I ask whether approval by the Assembly of the Minutes also means approval of that report? If that is the case, I would ask for this report to be taken out of the Minutes and discussed as a normal item of the agenda, for I do not think...

(Applause)

that in view of its importance, or in view of the fact that quite a number of Members have taken the trouble to work on a particular question, this matter can simply be dealt with through the Minutes. I therefore request you, Mr President, in case this creates a precedent, simply to state that this report will be taken out of the Minutes and will be discussed at a later date.

President. — Mr Bangemann, on this subject I have the following statement to make to the House:

Pursuant to Rule 111(3) of the Rules of Procedure, the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions has forwarded to the President an interpretation of Rule 49(3 and 6). The President, again pursuant to Rule 111(3), informed Parliament of this at the beginning of yesterday's sitting and arranged for the interpretation to be published in the Minutes of that sitting, which were issued this morning.

President

Again pursuant to the Rules of Procedure, if a political group or at least 10 Members oppose the interpretation proposed by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure, the matter is referred to Parliament, which gives its opinion by simple majority.

That is the point raised by Mr Bangemann.

Parliament must then vote and decide whether it accepts the interpretation proposed by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions or wishes the matter to be referred to the committee.

In order to avoid any misunderstandings and to allow all Members sufficient time for reflection, I propose that this matter be put to the vote at voting-time this afternoon — that is to say, at 4.30 p.m. If the House agrees, it will thus have a whole day to make up its mind whether it accepts the interpretation or refers it to committee.

That is the Bureau's proposal. If there are no objections and no further comments, the Minutes of Proceedings may be taken as approved with the exception of this one point, which will be taken up again at 4.30 p.m.

Mr Pflimlin (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, I must say that I was very much surprised to learn, somewhat by chance, that a matter of such importance could be settled merely by adopting the Minutes of yesterday's sitting. Many of our colleagues have not yet seen the Minutes, and those who are absent could naturally not foresee that such an important question would be thus dealt with in a few seconds at the beginning of the sitting. I thank Mr Bangemann for having raised this problem.

After having consulted Rule 111, I submit to you a statement signed by 10 Members of our Assembly who are opposed to the interpretation given by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to Rule 49 of our Rules of Procedure.

I would like to add that I believe a matter of such importance should be referred to this committee. I do not want to go into the merits of the question at this point. Some of us are familiar with them, while others are less so. It is a complex and important issue. To treat it so hastily would be unworthy of this Assembly.

Now there is the time-limit to be considered. You have proposed that the vote be held this afternoon at 4 o'clock. This seems to me to allow very little time, for the report of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions is long and complex. It raises a number of legal problems, and it might be desirable for the groups themselves to be able to discuss these problems. This in turn presupposes that the text will be distributed...

(Applause)

I suggest, therefore, that the vote be postponed until Thursday, for example.

(Applause)

President. — On the Bureau's behalf, I can accept your request and accordingly put to the House your proposal that the vote be deferred to 6 p.m. on Thursday.

Mr Galland (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, I still wish that you would clarify this matter a little. What method will our Assembly adopt? On such an important matter, we cannot hold a simple vote at 6 o'clock on Thursday without a modicum of debate beforehand.

I have here the Minutes of yesterday's sitting and the interpretation of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. I should say, as a substitute member of this committee, that the committee did not provide a simple interpretation, but rather a new and different formulation of a rule which has not been adopted by our Assembly. Therefore, a debate on the substance should be held in order to clarify the issue.

Can you tell us what method will be used, either on Thursday before the vote or at any time during tomorrow's sitting before the vote, in order that we may go into the matter more deeply and hold a debate upon it?

President. — Mr Galland, we shall first propose the reference to committee before preparing this debate. Apart from that, we shall be examining this matter today with all the groups.

Mr Patterson (ED). — My point refers to a different matter. On page 3 of the English Minutes, there are three circles and then a separate paragraph which does not appear to constitute an interpretation of Rule 71. Could you tell me whether this separate paragraph is or is not a ruling by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions under Rule 111? In this case, will it therefore also be voted on on Thursday if your suggestion is taken up?

President. — The text you refer to is one of the disputed texts on which the Parliament will have to make a decision. Mr Bangemann is perfectly right: such an important text cannot be adopted in the course of a routine decision on the Minutes. We shall have to consider the matter together with President Dankert and the rest of the Bureau and then on Thursday decide whether we are to open a full-scale debate or refer the matter to committee so as to have more time to arrive at a more precise interpretation. If you agree, I would ask you therefore not to open a debate now.

Mr Aigner (EPP). — *(DE)* Mr President, we have before us a report by our Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions which, quite apart from this

Aigner

specific case, for the purpose of which it was drawn up, is extremely important. If this report were now adopted by a chance majority — and it could only be a chance majority now — then it would be possible at any time to manipulate the absolute majority of this Parliament by tricks involving the Rules of Procedure.

(Applause)

I do not want to leave this eminently important question of whether the Bureau or a group can manipulate this Parliament's majority to a chance decision. That is why I insist that we should not vote on it this week but that first the report should be translated into all the official languages...

(Applause)

so that all the groups can study it carefully and consider its implications. Only then should we vote, in full knowledge of what we are voting on.

Let me say something else, and I put it very cautiously. The suspicion that Parliament's majority is being manipulated here has gradually become a talking point in the corridors of this House. The Bureau should do all it can to prevent such rumours from spreading...

(Applause)

so that the view of the majority of this Parliament can really prevail. I warn the Bureau! Otherwise I think we should consider amending the Rules of Procedure to prevent such machinations.

(Applause)

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to point out once more that the Bureau itself has said that the Parliament must decide if the interpretation is disputed. The Parliament is not the Bureau, and here there can be no talk of manipulation, Mr Aigner. The vice-presidents, President Dankert and the entire Bureau will study the matter carefully, but please, we want no debate about the subject now. On Thursday, we shall vote on the question of referring the matter to committee; if Parliament rejects this, then the text will be put to the vote. Will no one ask for the floor on a point of order to call the House finally to order? We do not want a debate: that will come on Thursday.

Mr Janssen van Raay (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, I asked for the floor because I agree with Mr Galland's proposal not to decide on Thursday whether or not a debate precede the vote on reference to committee, but to decide now that a debate must precede the vote under Rule 111 (4). So we should decide now that first we shall have a debate and then the vote, and see later when the vote will be taken.

President. — Mr Janssen van Raay, I would ask you not to press the point any further. All we are concerned with is the interpretation of a particular passage in the Rules of Procedure, and that does not

need to be the subject of an exhaustive debate. If it turns out on Thursday that the interpretation we asked for — and President Dankert asked for an interpretation from the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions — is unsatisfactory, one speaker can speak in favour and another against and then the vote must decide whether the question is to be referred to committee. Let us not hold a debate now; that is not logical behaviour; it is the Bureau's wish that the Parliament should have sufficient time. Let us now get on with the agenda.

Mr Bangemann (L). — *(DE)* Mr President, you know that I have always supported the Bureau in its difficult task, but — and I am not addressing these words to you and not making any personal criticism of you — the fact that you have now discussed this matter here for twenty minutes is something for which not the House but in fact the President or the Bureau is responsible. Surely it was patently obvious that this matter would be taken up immediately. In order not to waste any more time, and in the interests of those who, as Mr Aigner said, want more time, surely we can proceed in the way you suggested: on Thursday at 6 p.m. we put it to the vote: either we refer it to committee, then we should have more time in any case; or we say: no, we have not discussed this long enough, we want to discuss it properly again in July and decide then. We can decide this on Thursday, and that would also give us a chance to hold a preliminary discussion of this matter in the groups. To be quite honest, I am as surprised as anyone else and will also have to talk to my group about it first this evening. That seems to me to be the proper procedure, for if the losing minority feels it has been tricked in this matter, that would also seriously prejudice the majority. That is why we should deal very fairly and decently with one another.

President. — That is a clear suggestion. Mr Bangemann proposes on a point of order that we vote on Thursday on all the questions raised in this connection. I beg you not to carry this debate any further. The vote will take place on Thursday at 6 p.m.

Mr von der Vring (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, you cannot give preference to individual groups in this discussion. It is not a question of the dispute which has arisen here. What Mr Bangemann said can be accepted in full. There are no objections as regards the Rules of Procedure. It is a question of the intolerable remarks made by Mr Aigner, which are an insult to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and which call for a reprimand. Mr President, you too could have made this statement to protect the honour of this Parliament.

We have Rule 111, which provides a simplified procedure for amending the Rules of Procedure, provided there is a consensus in the House. Whether or not

von der Vring

there is such a consensus will first depend on whether a group or a certain number of Members raise objections. My group has the document — other groups are not so well organized and do not manage to produce these papers so quickly in the House; but, ladies and gentlemen, this is a common occurrence. We decide on an organization of the market in sugar without having even seen the documents, and the gentlemen on the other side make good use of that. A chance majority in this House votes. If you try to make that part of the Rules of Procedure, we might as well shut up shop. The gentlemen on the other side regularly do everything they can to prevent votes on agricultural questions being taken on a Friday. Why? Because they fear a loss of majority, once they have gone away, and do not want others to vote. Is that not 'manipulation'? I would like the concept of 'manipulation of this House' to be rejected.

Mr Aigner (EPP). — (DE) May I just put one question, surely that is allowed! I would like to know whether the report of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions can be made available to the Members in all official languages by tomorrow, and I ask, regardless of the present incident, for this document to be examined thoroughly with a view to establishing what it would mean for this Parliament if this precedent really led to an interpretation of the Rules of Procedure.

(Applause)

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, we are concerned, not with a report, but merely with the wording of an interpretation which you can find in the Minutes of yesterday's proceedings. If this text fails to give satisfaction — and that the Bureau fears and that is precisely why the statement was read out — then the matter will be put to the vote in Parliament on Thursday at 6 p.m. That should be clear.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — (DE) Mr President, I would like to make a personal statement, pursuant to Rule 67, on the remarks made by Mr Aigner. It was of course very nice of Mr von der Vring to take the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions under his wing, but I am a member of that committee and feel extremely taken aback at what Mr Aigner has said. We have considered this interpretation very carefully in several meetings. We appointed a rapporteur, and I find it monstrous for words such as 'manipulation' to be applied here. My view as regards Mr Aigner is that he must at least withdraw that word in relation to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

President. — Mr Sieglerschmidt, you must think again about what has just been said. The Chair has no such objections. If Mr Aigner wants to say something

more, he can do so, but I ask him not to open a further debate with Mr Sieglerschmidt.

Mr Aigner (EPP). — (DE) Mr President, may I quite calmly make a personal statement. I in no way meant the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, but the history of the matter, how this procedure came to be used. Nor did I say that I analysed manipulation in that way; I only said that the word 'manipulation' is being used throughout the House and that a Bureau must beware of such talk. If Mr Bangemann had not paid attention, then, without the House having any awareness of it, a decision would have gone through by chance, unbeknown to us, and that would have been tantamount to manipulation.

Mr Gontikas (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, just three minutes ago you said that the document forwarded by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions is not a report, not even a petition, but simply a statement. I would like you to tell me on the basis of which provision in the Rules of Procedure you have entered this document in the Minutes, and in such a manner, indeed, and on the basis of which provision the Bureau will rule admissible the debate on such a document on Thursday.

I would also like to point out that there is a clear breach here of the Rules of Procedure, and allow me to agree with Mr Aigner that this breach is perhaps deliberate, at a time when Members have not got copies of such an important text in their own languages.

President. — At the beginning of my statement on behalf of the Bureau, I said — and this is the answer to your question:

Pursuant to Rule 111 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions has forwarded to the President an interpretation of Rule 49 (3 and 6).

That is the text that you will find in the report of today's plenary sitting. We shall accordingly have an opportunity at 6 p.m. on Thursday to discuss the matter further after proper preparation. That is the end of the matter for now.

I ask you to approve the Minutes, with the exception of that item to which objections were raised.

Are there any comments?

The Minutes, with the exception of the item just referred to, are approved.

2. Welcome

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I have the pleasure of welcoming to our Parliament a delegation from the Spanish Cortes led by Mr Manuel Medina.

(Applause)

President

The Spanish Delegation is visiting us in order, among other things, to prepare for the forthcoming meeting of the European Parliament-Spain Joint Committee. This meeting is due to take place in September in Madrid. The European Parliament has repeatedly expressed itself, by a large majority, in favour of Spain's rapid accession to the Community, and I am sure that the work of the Joint Committee will contribute to the realization of this goal.

On behalf of the Parliament, I wish Mr Medina and his colleagues much success as a result of their stay here in Strasbourg.

*(Applause)*¹

3. Decision on urgent procedure

Regulation laying down implementing rules on food-aid management (Doc. 1-60/83):

Mr Poniatoski (L), *chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation*. — (FR) Mr President, there is a delicate issue which is at present the object of a slight disagreement with the Council. This issue is that of food aid, particularly emergency food aid, and we have urgent requests. On the other hand, the Council has impinged upon Parliament's budgetary powers in this matter, and I have therefore asked President Dankert to invite the Council to lose no time in sending us a letter promising to respect these budgetary powers in the future. I was informed yesterday that this letter was to be sent immediately, and therefore, if you agree, Mr President, we can debate this question and vote on it on Friday.

Mr Cohen (S). — (NL) Mr President, in view of Mr Poniatoski's statement I really would urge the House not to agree to urgent procedure. I disagree with Mr Poniatoski's line of argument. What is the situation at the moment? During the last part-session, when the Council also asked us to deal with this under urgent procedure, we decided not to because we are indeed at loggerheads with the Council. This concerns our budgetary powers, one of the few powers this House enjoys, and without as much as giving us a second thought the Council took decisions unacceptable to us. On that occasion, a large majority in this House decided to ask the Council firstly for more information on its intentions now that we had refused urgent procedure, and secondly we asked for further opportunities for discussion with the Council. So far we have received no information from the Council. Admittedly, I have been given to understand that a letter is on the way, but we have no idea what this letter says, and if it does not come up to our expectations, then we must immediately, on Friday, repeat what we said last month and refuse urgent procedure.

¹ For the announcement of motions for resolutions tabled for the topical and urgent debate, see the Minutes of Proceedings of this sitting.

I think, Mr President, that we should do that now. We are still awaiting the information from the Council. The Council should review its internal procedure and accelerate matters. We want nothing other than to reach agreement with the Council as quickly as possible. We also want to put the Council's proposals into practice as soon as possible, but in such a way as does not infringe Parliament's powers. That is the least we can ask of the Council, Mr President, and that is why I believe we must refuse the Council's request, in spite of Mr Poniatoski's proposal. We shall wait for this letter, see what information it contains and then take the necessary decision in July.

President. — Mr Poniatoski, chairman of the committee concerned, has now given his view, Mr Cohen has spoken against. Does anyone wish to speak in favour?

Mr Lange (S), *Chairman of the Committee on Budgets*. — (DE) Mr President, if you will let me speak, you will soon hear what I am in favour of. I support Mr Poniatoski, while taking due account of what has been said by Mr Cohen. If no letter arrives, Parliament owes it to itself to reject the request for urgent procedure on Friday and not deal with the matter; if the letter is unsatisfactory, the same treatment is called for, as Mr Poniatoski has pointed out. If, therefore, Parliament handles the matter sensibly, as I hope it will, no difficulties can arise.

In these circumstances, we should grant the request of the chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation.

(Parliament decided to adopt urgent procedure)

Directive on air pollution by motor-vehicle gases (Doc. 1-192/82):

Mr Tyrrell (ED). — Mr President, the position is simple. Under the Treaty of Rome no law can be made relating to the exhaust fumes of motor-cars without consultation of Parliament. In 1970, despite Parliament's protests, that power was taken away from Parliament by a directive on petrol engines. Now the Commission comes forward with a proposal, asking that we not only continue to forego our right to be consulted on petrol engines but also forego our right to be consulted on diesel engines. Last month Parliament said: 'Hold on! We are not going to go that far, but we will meet you half-way. We will agree to a limit on our power of consultation in relation to diesel engines, provided you give us back part of the power you have already taken away in relation to petrol engines.' On that basis we refused to give an opinion at that stage. Now, only three weeks later, before the Commission has had an opportunity to meet us, the Council comes along and asks for urgent procedure. The letter of request for urgent procedure

Tyrrell

is, if I may say so, an insult to this House. It gives no reason for urgent procedure. All it says is that delay would risk calling the implementation of the directive into question. Mr President, that is no reason.

My group wants this directive, and so we will vote for urgent procedure. However, we couple it with this warning to the Commission and to the Council: unless they come along, when this matter is voted on later in the week, with an assurance to Parliament that our powers of consultation will in some way be maintained, then they are unlikely to get the opinion they want.

Mr Collins (S), rapporteur. — Mr President, before we vote on this, it would be as well if the House were to hear from Mr Narjes himself, because I think that he has something very interesting to say to the House, following on Mr Tyrrell's intervention. By and large the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection would accept the view that Mr Tyrrell has expressed. If Mr Narjes can assure us that he is willing to engage in discussions on the horizontal point raised, then I think we should be able to vote for urgent procedure. On the other hand, if he says he is not prepared to discuss this with us at all, then we may take a very different view.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, on behalf of the Commission I wish to support Mr Tyrrell's request and that of the Council of Ministers. This is an important and urgent problem, nor are there any differences of opinion on this matter between the Commission and this House. It is a horizontal problem, and the Commission intends to make a brief statement on it before the vote on the Collins report.

(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)

Regulation on the market in fruit and vegetables (Doc. 211/83):

Mr Früh (EPP). — (DE) Mr President, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture I request that we do not decide on this request for urgent procedure now. The Committee on Agriculture would like to discuss this proposal. We have called a meeting for 3 p.m. today and surely it would be appropriate if I could tell the House the results tomorrow morning and we voted then — not now but tomorrow.

(Parliament agreed to this request)

4. Community Youth Exchange Programme — European Foundation

President. — The next item is a joint debate on — the report by Mr Bocklet, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on a European Community Programme to promote youth exchange (European Community Youth Exchange Programme) (Doc. 1-78/83); and

— the oral question to the Council, with debate, by Mr Schwencke, on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, on the European Foundation (Doc. 1—1353/83):

Having regard to the intergovernmental agreement establishing a European Foundation signed on 29 March 1982,

Having regard to the agreement signed the same day setting up a Preparatory Committee,

Having regard to the resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 17 June 1982 (Doc. 1-216/82), which, in particular:

— regretted that the European Foundation was based on intergovernmental rather than Community cooperation,

— expressed reservations about the objectives, structures and methods of the Foundation,

— protested about the lack of any European Parliament control over the activities of the Foundation, even though it is partly financed by the Community budget,

— requested that the European Parliament be consulted on the appointment of those Members of the Council of the Foundation whose appointment is the responsibility of the Commission of the European Communities;

1. Can the Council say how many States have already ratified the agreement signed on 29 March 1982 and whether those States which have not yet done so intend to in the near future?

2. With regard to the Preparatory Committee, can the Council give an assurance that the coordinator provided for in the annex to the agreement will be appointed soon?

3. Does the Council, as Parliament has requested, intend to consult it before appointing this coordinator and, subsequently, before appointing those members of the Council of the Foundation who are to represent the European Communities?

4. Asks

(a) Why the Preparatory Committee has not yet submitted proposals for a work programme on which Parliament could deliver an opinion?

(b) Whether the Council can tell Parliament how the funds included in the 1983 budget have been allocated?

(c) Whether the Council can say what financial resources the European Foundation may have at its disposal in 1984, and how they are divided between Community contributions, contributions from Member States, donations and other resources?

President

- (d) Whether the Council is in favour of regular meetings between the Foundation and the Committee on Culture, to guarantee that the European Parliament will be kept informed about the activities of the Foundation ?
- (e) Whether the Council is willing, as was mentioned in the discussions prior to the signature of the agreement, to enter into talks with the European Parliament and the Commission with a view to the signing of an additional agreement institutionalizing relations between these two Community institutions and the European Foundation ?

Mr Bocklet (EPP), *rapporteur*. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, with today's resolution on promoting youth exchanges in Europe, the European Parliament is making a second attempt to set in motion wide-ranging youth exchange projects in the European Community. Seventeen years ago, in May 1966 to be precise, the European Parliament, at that time not yet directly elected, called for the creation of a European Youth Foundation as a public-law body, to supplement the Franco-German Youth Foundation, which had already existed for three years, at European Community level. Little has happened since then which could deserve the title 'Community promotion of youth exchanges'. There are only the exchanges of young workers, pursuant to Article 50 of the EEC Treaty, which have given a few thousand young people the privilege of a stay in another Member State, assisted by the Community, in the framework of two pilot projects.

The first question we must therefore answer is why, in a period when the public coffers are empty and we have to economize everywhere, we are putting this project back on the agenda of European policy and again attempting to promote a wide-scale youth exchange system. Tourism among young people has increased markedly in the past fifteen years in Europe. Young people think in cosmopolitan terms, thanks to the media ; indeed, it has become the fashion to get involved in things happening far away. So what is the point of public promotion of youth exchanges in Europe ? The paradox of this situation is that the worldwide interests of young people go hand in hand with a curious indifference towards their own continent and its nascent political order.

Today the younger generation tends to regard Europe as having nothing to do with it. To a large extent, the political and economic success of integration to date has been politically absorbed, and the manifold difficulties of the present do not exercise any fascination. The creeping process of renationalization, which we can see on all sides in Europe, is partly the result of a dwindling interest in integration, because we are tending increasingly in our daily political affairs to

lose sight of the higher aim of European union. In spite of their great mobility and the flourishing tourism, people are once again withdrawing into their own national shell. This shows why it is so necessary to make a new attempt to build a more European Community.

Europe has to be fought for afresh with every generation. Youth exchanges mean something more than tourism ; they mean personal encounters and a serious attempt to come to terms with others. Hence the promotion of youth exchanges and youth encounters has always been a strong element of the policy of European integration. It was born of the realization that a lasting political integration of Europe was possible only if the links between people could become increasingly close and mutual understanding be increased. Seen in this way, the promotion of youth exchanges is a good investment for the future of Europe, even in times of money shortage, because the positive experience gained by the younger generation is a solid foundation for further work on European integration. Instead of neighbouring peoples living side by side and regarding each other with indifference, we must foster an awareness of our mutual dependence and of the interdependence of our destinies.

Today, the prospects for these youth exchanges are better than seventeen years ago. For one thing, Parliament now has budgetary powers which it did not have then. Under the agreement between the Council, the Commission and Parliament, the expenditure to be earmarked for youth exchanges under the European Foundation is regarded as non-compulsory, and Parliament has the final say on that expenditure.

Secondly we already have a European Foundation, or at least we have signed an agreement on it. Individual countries have not ratified it yet, but at least we are moving towards it. However, I must say that the way Parliament is excluded in this matter does make us rather sceptical now about the implementation of youth exchanges under the European Foundation. That is why our committee has proposed that the administration of this youth exchange programme should initially be entrusted to the Commission and transferred to the European Foundation once the conditions set by Parliament have been fulfilled.

Although other speakers too will be discussing the European Foundation, I should like at this point to draw attention to the recently published and very interesting essay by Leo Tindemans, in which he makes it clear that he fully agrees with Parliament's opinion as regards the European Foundation and youth exchanges and considers that Parliament could influence the implementation of youth exchanges by the European Foundation through its say on the funds allocated to it. Good — we hope to be surprised and find this is the case !

Bocklet

Now we come to the youth exchange programme itself. We want multilateral youth exchanges because bilateral exchanges are already part of the bilateral relations between individual Member States. We do not want to take over from any existing institution — neither the Franco-German Youth Foundation nor the European Council's Youth Foundation. What we want is merely to create a parent organization which is less bureaucratic but has more resources, to give millions of young people in Europe a chance for serious meetings with one another. We want to organize these youth exchanges in three concentric circles: first they should be concentrated in the European Community, then they should be extended to the Europe of Twenty-one and to the European countries behind the Iron Curtain, if this proves possible. Only then will our Community be open to people in the other Europe and in those parts which do not belong to the Community. We also propose setting up a special programme for youth exchanges with the ACP States under the Lomé III Agreement. I think that would usefully supplement our present plans for the third part of the Lomé Convention.

What steps will we take to do this?

First we want to create an information office to ensure the provision of more complete information on the supply and demand in this sector; and the next step will be to promote the projects. Since the first step is a modest one, we do not need so many funds in the first year. We have suggested 200 000 ECU. We are aware that eventually far greater resources will be needed for exchanges of young people on a large scale in Europe, but it is of course easier to enter 200 000 ECU in the budget initially, instead of, say, 10 000 000 ECU. To give you an idea of the eventual scale of appropriations, may I point out that the Franco-German Youth Foundation at present costs DM 36 000 000 a year. If we want to have effectual youth exchanges at multilateral level, we must also be prepared to make the corresponding funds available.

To conclude, may I make a few remarks on the five amendments that have been tabled. Four were tabled by Mrs van Hemeldonck, and we have agreed that three will be accepted and that she will withdraw the fourth. Unfortunately, I must reject the fifth amendment, because it says exactly the opposite of what the committee unanimously decided.

May I warmly thank all those who have contributed to the preparation of this report, and especially the European Youth Forum. I do not think there is any other report in this Parliament which responds in such detail to the wishes of the European Youth Forum. I would like to make one last remark: anyone who wants to promote the political integration of Europe must vote in favour of this youth-exchange programme on which you have to decide today in

order to supplement and expand what Adenauer and de Gaulle achieved in such exemplary fashion twenty years ago with the creation of the Franco-German Youth Foundation.

Mr Schwencke (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this is the second time the European Parliament is addressing critical questions to the Council with regard to the European Foundation. Why are we doing this? Because we consider the tasks of that Foundation sufficiently important — Mr Bocklet has dealt with that — and because we are not at all satisfied with the legal form proposed for it to date.

If we take seriously, and Parliament is more than willing to do so, what Foreign Minister Genscher said in justification of the European Act, that the European Act must bring together all that has been achieved so far in the way of European integration, that full use must be made of all the possibilities for further development indicated in it, and that this must be the joint task of all three institutions, we emphatically agree; but we also think that this further development can only take place and will only be meaningful if it occurs with the participation of the European Parliament instead of going against it. The ministers' decision in favour of a European Foundation as an inter-State institution does not correspond to that view. Such a contribution to cultural policy — i.e., not a Community agency and without Community responsibility — would be a very fragile construction, and the European Parliament will certainly not accept it until its own rights have been assured at the very least by an addendum to the agreement.

It is mainly because of its legal status that the European Parliament, the Council of Europe and public circles interested in cultural and youth policy have greeted the setting up of this Foundation with so little enthusiasm, even though with it one feature of the Tindemans report of 1974 is at long last to be realized. The deed of March last year setting up the Foundation ignores the European Parliament, which has the mandate of its citizens, and provides for no cultural-policy cooperation with either the Parliament or the Council of Europe. So this new Foundation of the 10 Member States is not subject to any control on the part of the European Community, and yet most of the funds are to come from its budget.

The constitutive deed makes no provision either for participation by the European Parliament in formulating the content of the Foundation's programme or for its participation in the Foundation's supervisory and control bodies. So the Foundation cannot contribute to the development of greater cultural and political democracy in Europe. On the contrary, we may even see a reversal of cultural and youth policy, a reversion to ways of thinking that have been, we hope, well and truly buried.

Schwencke

I have drawn up for the committee a list of the points which interest us most and can summarize them in five questions, as an introduction to this subject. First, what approach are the parliaments and governments of the Member States currently taking in their discussions on the European Foundation — in other words, which of them have ratified the agreement and which ones will do so in the foreseeable future?

Secondly, what progress has been made in determining the policy of the European Foundation, its programme, aims, etc. — i.e., what has the Preparatory Committee which you appointed done so far and what will its approach be as regards the public. Thirdly, who will pay for this? What lasting guarantee is there that this European Foundation, with its wide range of tasks, will continue to be financed? I have already pointed out that the European Parliament will certainly not be interested until it has guaranteed rights.

Fourthly, whom do we — the European Parliament and in particular the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport — approach during the setting up of this Foundation? We have not found anyone yet. No one has been able to give us the name of a coordinator. We request you, Mr Minister of State, to give us as definite a reply as you can on this point.

Fifthly, does the German Presidency of the Council consider it conceivable that to the agreement signed in March last year an addendum can be added which guarantees the European Parliament rights in that Foundation?

(Applause)

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, may I first say a few words on Mr Bocklet's statement. The Presidency fully endorses the aims and intentions reflected in Mr Bocklet's statement. There is perhaps no more important task in our time than to bring the young people of our countries together.

What you, Mr Bocklet, said is also consistent with the words of the Solemn Declaration on European Union. The chapter on cultural cooperation states that we must promote exchanges of experience, especially among young people, and extend teaching in the languages of the Member States of the Community. Languages are the means of expressing people's feelings and desires, and that is why learning a foreign language is not just a technical business but also the mental exertion that is required to move within the same area of feeling and thinking as one's partner.

Another reason why I personally agree with you is that an understanding of the need for European integration is largely lacking among young people today. When we were still very young, we almost spon-

aneously sensed the need for European integration. This feeling was part of the motor driving us towards European integration. This motor has become rather slow and weak now, and so I emphatically agree with what you said, given the need for a spiritual *relance européenne*. Without knowledge there can be no understanding, and without understanding there can be no communication. In this way, what you have just said acquires a very important political dimension.

Mr Schwencke, may I answer your question as follows. The United Kingdom was the first to ratify the Agreement establishing a European Foundation. The ratification procedures are well advanced in several Member States — France, Ireland and Luxembourg. The delay in the Federal Republic of Germany is connected with the change of government and the elections there.

It has not yet been possible to appoint the coordinator provided for in the Arrangement annexed to the Agreement; contacts concerning his appointment are continuing. However, the fact that there is as yet no coordinator does not prevent the Preparatory Committee from undertaking the rather limited activities provided for in the Arrangement — I understand your smile of amusement, Mr Bangemann. The Arrangement stipulates that the signatory States will appoint the coordinator 'by common accord and in close cooperation with the Commission'; there is no provision for consulting the European Parliament. I will now step out of my rôle as representative of the Presidency and as national representative and say that I personally, as a Member of Parliament, do not think that is a good thing. But I shall have something positive to say about this matter in a moment.

I return to what I was saying as representative of the Presidency. As regards the members of the Board of the Foundation, possibly to be appointed by the Community under Article 10 of the Agreement, the honourable Member's attention is directed to the Council's reply to Oral Question No 0-17/82, that the Council has authorized the Commission to negotiate an exchange of letters with the Foundation once the latter has been set up; this exchange of letters will concern the possibility of the Community's appointing 10 members of the Board of the Foundation and making a financial contribution to the Foundation. Once these negotiations have been completed, the Council will be called upon to conclude the exchange of letters by a decision based on Article 235 of the EEC Treaty. This procedure entails consultation of the European Parliament.

The Preparatory Committee is working on a draft programme for the European Foundation, which it will submit to the future Board of the Foundation. At present, it is evaluating the results of the hearing held in February 1983 to provide suggestions for this programme. The Preparatory Committee has been in touch with representatives of the European Parlia-

Mertes

ment, in particular the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, and the Council understands that these contacts will be maintained.

In the general budget of the Communities for the 1983 financial year (Section III: Commission), a sum of 200 000 ECU in non-differentiated appropriations is entered under Article 676 to cover the expenses of the Preparatory Committee. As the Commission is responsible for implementing the budget, I would ask Mr Schwencke to approach that Institution regarding the state of commitment of these appropriations. As the honourable Member knows, Article 16 of the Agreement establishing the Foundation provides for voluntary contributions from public and private funds in addition to the Community's contribution. No decisions have yet been taken on the 1984 budget of the European Communities, and the Council has no information about any other financial resources which might be available to the Foundation in 1984.

On points (d) and (e) of the question, the Council and the governments of the Member States are in favour of the idea of regular meetings between the Foundation and representatives of the European Parliament as part of the future cooperation between the Foundation and the European Community.

(Applause)

Mr Gontikas (PPE), *draftsman of an opinion for the Legal Affairs Committee*. — *(GR)* Mr President, attaching importance as it does to the unimpeded association of young people, and especially of young people in the Community, the European People's Party can do no other than unreservedly endorse the Bocklet report.

There is, however, another reason which makes it imperative for us to take this stance.

In recent years there has been a movement of young people away from the periphery, with the result that the youngest of them are often unaware of the vital problems of the outlying areas of the Community, or, worse still, learn about them through various politically motivated channels.

The report by Mr Bocklet — whom I congratulate on his excellent work — does not limit itself to proposals for bilateral exchanges only but stresses, and rightly so, the need for the extensive multilateral exchange of young people up to the age of 25, not only within the geographical confines of the Community but further afield as well.

Furthermore, the idea of strengthening the European Foundation in order to promote exchanges in the Community of young people from all social classes is undoubtedly an element in the consolidation of the policy of European unity.

It is not possible for us to speak about the political unity of Europe while human ties remain loose, and until a spirit of understanding is achieved which will

make way by degrees for the disappearance of the different mental outlooks that exist among the citizens of Europe.

Just now the representative of the Council, Mr Mertes, told us, very rightly, that mutual understanding presupposes knowledge, and the exchange of knowledge must be, and is, a basic element in the Bocklet report.

Adoption of the Bocklet report is the best investment for the future of Europe. It is a fact that material assistance, of whatever kind, is forgotten with the passing of time. What remains, however, is the experience of human approach and the mutual understanding of the problems of our peoples.

I am clearly in favour of a Community initiative in this matter, and I stress the need for this youth exchange programme to be worked out and put into effect initially by the services attached to the Commission so as to give it status and a pan-European character.

I also find reasonable the observation made by Mr Bocklet in his report and by the representative of the Council that 200 000 ECU should be earmarked for this purpose as a first step, and I ask the Commission, which in fact shows such sensitivity in matters concerning young people — and I hope the Commissioner is listening to me now — to ensure that greater resources are made available for the following year.

Mr President, the Legal Affairs Committee has dealt at great length with the examination of the legal basis of this motion. I believe that my proposal as accepted by the Legal Affairs Committee with regard to the implementation of Article 235 of the Treaty *lato sensu* is correct. Furthermore, in matters that relate more specifically to the problems of young people we must all show greater understanding and sympathy.

(Applause)

Mrs Viehoff (S). — *(NL)* Youth exchanges are part of a youth policy, and youth policy has been neglected for ages in Europe, both by the European institutions and by the Council of Europe; when any attention was paid to it, it was as part of an overall cultural policy and without any involvement of young people themselves. The institutions used any actions for young people more to promote the European idea and the integration process without giving too much thought to young people's interests. That such an approach was not greeted with enthusiasm by the young should be obvious to everyone.

But that is nonetheless how the institutions continued. A typical example is the Kreyssig Fund, specially set up for youth but used for information and publicity. This Fund has no clear-cut guidelines or criteria, so money is granted arbitrarily. Instead of deciding exactly what this Fund is to be used for, an unfortunate decision was made to put most of it under the budgetary heading for general information and publicity.

Viehoff

But to return to the question of involving young people, it was really only with the establishment of the Youth Forum that a start was made on a youth policy of participation rather than paternalism. That is why we think it most important that the Youth Forum should be concerned in implementing the programme. We do not take it for granted that it should be taken over by the European Foundation even if it does get off the ground properly. The fear of paternalism does not seem unfounded in view of the proposed composition of the Foundation, irrespective of Mr Tindemans' personal opinion. The limited means available force us to make a choice. My group agrees that that choice should be groups from the periphery of the Community, young unemployed persons, young women, the handicapped and children of migrant workers. Nonetheless, we wish to stress once more that we think it very important to extend it to non-Community countries, precisely because our major aim is not that of European integration but the development and experience of young people abroad, which encourages mutual understanding, cooperation and peace. This aim goes beyond the frontiers of the Community.

Mr President, some Members suffer from the illusion that this exchange programme is to replace the exchange of young workers. I trust the Commission is not labouring under that misapprehension. It is quite clear that the two are complementary and that the structure of the exchange programme for young workers is to be improved, for we are dissatisfied with it. On the financing, my proposal is to consider releasing the money which was originally part of the Kreyssig Fund from the general heading of information and publicity; then we have, in addition to the 200 000 ECUs from this year's budget, a considerably larger amount with which to start this important work.

Mr Brok (EPP). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Christian-Democratic Group of the European People's Party welcomes the Bocklet report and thanks the rapporteur for taking such a decisive initiative in this field. I share the view of the President-in-Office of the Council that this is indeed a highly political matter, that it is an important instrument for achieving the integration of the European Community and that it is also in the tradition of bilateral measures such as the Franco-German Youth Foundation. We think the multilateral measures proposed in the report should be implemented with the help of direct Community promotion and that, in line with the criticism which Mr Bocklet and Mr Schwencke have rightly expressed with regard to the European Foundation, organizational responsibility should lie with the Commission at this point and the Commission should set up an information office and ensure project promotion on that basis.

This European youth exchange programme should not, however, be a closed shop for the EEC Member

States alone, but other European countries should also have access to it — perhaps also other democracies such as, for instance, the United States of America, under an associated programme. This is a matter that could be discussed at a later date. At all events, let me say clearly here that if countries outside the Community are involved, they would also have to contribute to the financing, and this must be formally stipulated.

It is important in view of the close cooperation with the ACP countries that this report proposes a special programme for the ACP countries. We also think that existing contacts, such as town-twinning and cooperation between schools in different countries, should be included as already offering sensible starting-points for the multilateral promotion of projects to bring groups of young people together. Such a programme of exchanges can have really widespread effects only if the national authorities responsible for youth activities produce the necessary funds.

Incidentally, I think that the present exchange controls imposed by the French Government achieve exactly the opposite of what we are aiming at today. I know that many events planned between twinned towns in the Federal Republic of Germany and France have had to be abandoned this year because of these exchange controls by the French Government and that these national measures clearly run counter to the idea of European integration.

We aim to achieve understanding between peoples and European integration at one and the same time. The Treaties of Rome refer to freedoms. The Helsinki Final Act calls for freedom of the individual, of information and of opinion. We must create the right conditions for this in many fields, by means of this youth exchange programme, by the mutual recognition of diplomas, by the creation of a European vocational training certificate. This exchange programme offers a chance to achieve understanding of the mentality of people from other countries, understanding of the similarities but also of the differences.

Such a programme offers a very good opportunity to overcome the increasing provincialism of the younger generation. We find that more and more young people are not travelling abroad and that this results in narrowness of outlook and in the end has adverse effects on economic competitiveness.

We need European integration in order to dispel prejudice. We want to make it plain to people that we have not only a Europe of the bureaucrats and of market organizations, but also a Europe that brings people together. An exchange programme of this kind is the best imaginable policy for peace. When young people can meet each other freely, they do not make war, they can no longer be manipulated into wanting war, because they know one another and can no longer be provoked into aggression. While it was still a matter of course for my father's generation that Germans and

Brok

French would go to war against one other every 30 years, my generation can no longer understand it. That is also the doing of the Franco-German Youth Foundation. We should extend that model. Therefore, and because we want to learn from history, we should take practical steps to this end even in the 1984 budget.

I thank the President-in-Office of the Council for his positive words. Perhaps the two budgetary authorities, Council and Parliament, could cooperate and make the initial financial resources available. The European Parliament sees itself as a mediator between the Europe of the institutions and the citizens of Europe, and this youth exchange programme might well prove an important means of fulfilling that task.

Mr Hutton (ED). — Mr President, my group is very glad to welcome the general guideline on youth exchanges which Mr Bocklet's report gives. We have no doubt about the value of travel and exchanges among young people. Once upon a time in Great Britain the Grand Tour of Europe was part of the education of all well-to-do young men. In the country where I spent my teenage years, in Australia, I not only found the value of travel and working abroad myself but I was very aware of the value which large numbers of young Australians and New Zealanders attach to travelling and working and experiencing life abroad before they settle down to careers and families.

There are many adventurous young people who set off across our Community with rucksacks and without much money, just to experience the life of other countries. I do not think that anybody doubts the value of foreign travel and experience. I have no doubt, therefore, that this is a valuable activity which the Community can undertake; one where, I think, the value of the Community as a whole will far outstrip whatever money is spent to encourage youth exchanges.

Later in the year we shall be bringing to this Parliament detailed proposals for a voluntary service scheme under which young people could give voluntary social or cultural service in another Member State. We are particularly anxious that this scheme should attract young people from all levels of society regardless of their financial resources.

Mr President, if our Community is to grow strong in the hands of future generations, then those generations must feel part of the whole European Community and not just think of it from their small corner as a place full of foreigners. I am sure that a widening programme of exchanges among young people, particularly given the encouragement of the Community can only bring us a rich return in understanding, tolerance and continuing peace in years to come.

(Applause)

Mrs Pruvot (L) — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Liberal Group is pleased that this report exists and offers its thanks to Mr Bocklet, who was saying yesterday that this report was not intended to settle specific problems such as unemployment, more particularly youth unemployment. But couldn't the problem of unemployment affecting young people be solved much more easily at the Community level?

This report deals with youth exchanges, and its purpose is rightly to encourage Europeans to form a much more effective and more united Europe. Youth is the time of learning, of disinterested friendship, of open-mindedness and enthusiasm. The young are ready to give and receive freely; youth is the ideal time of life for mutual understanding. Only 40 years ago, 95 % of all young Europeans attained working age without having had the opportunity to visit any foreign country, and most of them never having left their native town or village. Much has changed over the last few years. Young Europeans travel, study foreign languages, spend their holidays abroad. The education of a new generation with a truly cosmopolitan and European mentality can represent an important contribution to the effort to make our Community a true union. If we want progress for Europe we must first make its citizens more European.

Mr Bocklet's proposal represents the first step towards the development of a Community policy for youth exchanges. We approve and support this initiative, which follows in the wake of the resolution on youth activities adopted by our Parliament in 1980, on the basis of a report of which I myself was the author.

The Community policy for youth exchanges that we hope for should be aimed at assisting the least-favoured groups of young people, who would otherwise not be able to take advantage of the programmes which already exist.

However, the policy for young people should be administered with the participation of young people, using the system of joint management already in use by the Council of Europe, granting an important advisory rôle to the Youth Forum of the European Communities. The measures we are calling for in this resolution should be only the first step toward a Community policy for youth exchanges endowed with ample technical and financial means, so that exchanges will not be restricted to members of youth organizations, but can also interest young people who are not organized. I particularly hope that especial attention will be paid to paragraph 12, for since the partners have already begun to prepare for negotiations for the next ACP-EEC Convention it is essential not to overlook the young people of these countries with which we already have economic and commercial relations.

Pruvot

Lastly, in the course of developing a Community programme for youth exchanges, it is necessary to take into account the experience and the results already obtained on the bilateral level, particularly by the Franco-German Youth Foundation. However, Community action should not be restricted to coordinating the various programmes conducted by the Member States at the bilateral level; it should rather encourage the multilateral aspects of the exchanges, which are its true *raison d'être*.

In conclusion, Mr President, I wish to confirm the support of the Liberal and Democratic Group for the motion for a resolution presented by Mr Bocklet, which represents the first step toward this true Community policy. The young people of today, faced with the drama of unemployment and the crisis affecting the values which are the foundation of our civilization are not touched by the rhetorical appeals to a European ideal which aroused so much enthusiasm during the 50's; they ask for practical measures. In the field of youth exchanges, the Community can act now to launch practical and direct action of great utility. It is our duty to induce the Commission and the Council to act as soon as possible to implement the measures necessary to accomplish it.

IN THE CHAIR : MR JAQUET

Vice-President

Mr Vandemeulebroucke (CDI). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen we really ought to have combined this report from Mr Bocklet, whom I warmly congratulate, with Mr Hutton's report on voluntary community service. Mr Bocklet refers in his report to the possibilities of voluntary community service, and we would have done well to debate that subject seriously. Fortunately, this report has been combined with Mr Schwencke's oral question on the European Foundation, an issue on which we wish to put forward some ideas and ask some questions on possible cooperation in youth exchanges.

Mr Bocklet's report boils down to extending the present system of exchanges under the Franco-German Youth Foundation to the European Community. In itself that is praiseworthy, but nonetheless we have some practical questions on it.

First and foremost, is this project feasible financially? The Franco-German Youth Foundation already absorbs 60 million French francs, or some 10 million units of account, whereas we have only budgeted for 200 000 units of account for all the European Community programmes listed in Mr Bocklet's report. That is only one-fifth of the Franco-German enterprise, and it means that this report should really be limited to proposing a possible inventory or perhaps organizing an information centre.

A second question is, what criteria should govern the financing? The report has no answer to that one either. The danger of duplication is also quite considerable, in view of the mushrooming of international youth associations. This brings me to the question of the timeliness of this report, which may seem somewhat premature. A number of projects are already being supported by the Council of Europe and others. Are we not running the risk of not seeing the wood for the trees? Next year, for example, Strasbourg is hosting a colloquium, to which all organizing bodies have been invited, with the purpose of drawing up an inventory on everything that already exists in this area. And all these bodies themselves are somewhat uncertain as to how all these projects and subsidies fit in together. Even Mr Bocklet says in recital E of his report, 'considering that many people lack basic information concerning the numerous exchange activities...'

I think the Commission would be better advised to await this colloquium and draw practical conclusions from it as to the feasibility of its projects and the certainty that there will be no overlapping of work. Even at the Williamsburg summit, which we are to debate this week, an exchange project was floated for four countries of the European Community, leaving others out in the cold. That is another example of duplication. I think that the Commission would have been better advised to introduce a uniform youth passport entitling a young person to travel reductions for multi-cultural contacts, free admission to museums and aid for participating in cultural activities.

That would not have cost the Community budget one franc and would have been a more realistic form of support.

Mr Eisma (NI) — (NL) Mr President, Mr Bocklet's motion for a resolution has five recitals and nineteen paragraphs. So it is not surprising that there is no explanatory statement: that would have been superfluous.

We consider that paragraph 9 of the motion is the most important, as it speaks of priority being given to youth exchanges for unemployed young people, among others. It is regrettable that this is not emphasized more, for, important as exchanges of other youth categories may be, financial restrictions force us to opt for the young unemployed. There are no reasonable prospects of the labour market being able to absorb most school-leavers in the next few years. On the contrary, the duration and magnitude of youth unemployment will increase, and precisely those who have not yet begun to work will need particular attention, including help from exchange programmes. The EEC is unable to offer these young unemployed people continuous training or vocational experience, and so top priority must be given to measures to counteract the demoralizing effects of youth unemployment.

Eisma

This international problem must find an international solution. Hence our preference for European exchange projects for unemployed young persons. We urge the Commission to give priority to unemployed young persons in its proposal on promoting youth exchanges.

Finally, Mr President, on Mr Schwencke's oral question, we are just as dissatisfied as he is that the Commission and Parliament have hardly been concerned in the Foundation's various activities and even less so in drawing up the budget so that we could influence the work of the Foundation in that way. Even the President-in-Office of the Council indicated in his reply that contacts between the Parliament and the Foundation were possible but that neither side was committed in any way. Our parliamentary impotence is evident. From the Council's answer to the third question put by Mr Schwencke, it seems that the German Minister is in favour of consulting Parliament on the appointment of a coordinator and those members of the Council of the Foundation who represent the European Community. As President-in-Office of the Council, however, he had unfortunately to put forward another view. I appeal urgently to the German Minister to convince his EEC colleagues of his personal opinion, so that this House can have a little more influence on this European Foundation.

Mrs Pery (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to give especial support to student exchanges within the Community, as called for by the rapporteur in subparagraph e) of the first paragraph of his motion for a resolution. This is also the subject of a chapter of the report I am preparing on higher education in Europe.

In 1980, 53 000 students were pursuing their studies in a European country other than their own — that is to say hardly more than 1 % of the total number of students. In four years, this figure has risen only by 2.9 % while the total number of students in the EEC has risen by 8.8 %. It is true that there are many reasons for this sedentary behaviour: financial reasons, first of all; difficulties in obtaining recognition for a diploma when the student returns to his native country (an additional risk at a time of economic crisis); poor knowledge of languages.

Nevertheless, these exchanges should be encouraged, and financed as joint study programmes. The demand for such programmes now far surpasses the possibilities of the EEC. This form of exchange is clearly successful. There are now 269 joint study programmes covering 450 institutions of higher learning, mostly in the form of a multilateral exchange. I could mention the exchanges between Arlon, Luxembourg, Metz and Saarbrücken, in preparation for a European diploma

in environmental science, or the exchanges between Göttingen, London and Reims in preparation for a diploma in business administration. However numerous problems exist: administrative, linguistic and financial. EEC aid is subject to time restrictions. These problems are overcome only by the ingenuity, the perseverance and the personal commitment of the participants. We can only regret that such productive cooperation is confined to the pilot projects.

We must be able to develop particularly flexible programmes through adequate financing and the official recognition of diplomas on a European scale. Thus, a true Community policy would be created, one capable of influencing cooperation in the field of higher education in the direction of a greater mobility of students, knowledge and ideas.

President. — I have received from Mrs Boserup and others a motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-412/83), with request for an early vote, to wind up the debate on Oral Question Doc. 1-353/83.

The vote on the request for an early vote will take place at the end of the debate.

Mr Lalor (DEP). — Mr President, I wish to support fully the Bocklet motion for a resolution and to express the hope that it will get such an endorsement from the whole Parliament here that both the Commission and the Council will ignore our firm resolution at their peril. We want the Commission to submit immediately a workable proposal for youth exchanges following the Bocklet criteria. Then we call on the Council to adopt the Commission proposals immediately and to set up the action.

There are voluntary youth organizations in each of our countries bubbling over with workable ideas for educational youth exchanges. Never was there greater need for such an initiative. In each State, exchanges involving educational, social, cultural and sporting activities are seriously restricted or made impossible by financial constraints. At present, they can be undertaken only by the limited few who can loosely be described as the 'haves', as against the 'have-nots', and this at a time when there is surely enough social unrest and in general what we may describe loosely as 'establishment-knocking'.

I found myself raising the question with the Commission a couple of months ago in relation to a query I had had from home. I asked the Commission if it agreed that an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe could be achieved if EEC aid were to be granted to organizations such as the Irish Council of Community Games and the Danish Youth Organization. I got a full but rather unsatisfactory reply and I think I should refer to this, because it says that the Commission shares the view that the exchange of young people between countries results in increased

Lalor

and increasing understanding between the young people concerned. It is thus a direct contribution to ever closer union among the peoples of Europe. It is clear that cost factors play an important part in determining the number of exchanges between different countries and that countries geographically widely separated will be disadvantaged in consequence. The Commission then said that it does not at present have any funds out of which exchanges of the type mentioned by me could be supported. It goes on to say: 'However, the Commission services are at present examining the possibility of Community support for youth exchanges in the context of the resolution on youth activities approved by the European Parliament on 6 April 1981, and hope to make proposals in this sector in due course.'

This is the point I want to make, Mr President. Is that good enough? A resolution of two years ago, and the Commission are still examining the possibilities! I think that the adoption of the Bocklet report should have a far more satisfactory outcome and that is why I say that the Commission cannot afford and should not be allowed to ignore our recommendations in this regard.

Mr Beumer (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, I welcome this joint debate on the report of Mr Bocklet, whom I congratulate, and Mr Schwencke's question on behalf of the Committee on Youth, as the Foundation's aims also include the promotion of youth exchanges. But even without the Bocklet report I would welcome the opportunity of discussing the questions raised by Mr Schwencke.

Mr President, we see that the preparations for the Foundation totally disregard the European Parliament's observations, even though Parliament voted in favour of the initial financing. This underlines yet once more how useful and timesaving it would have been to have chosen Article 235 of the EEC Treaty. There has admittedly been a discussion with the representatives of the Preparatory Committee, but really we had so little mandatory power that there was little point in continuing the contacts when it came to action. I must also say that when the President-in-Office of the Council states that there is close consultation I just wonder how great the flow of information is from the Preparatory Committee back to the Council.

We learn, Mr President, that there has been great difficulty in appointing a coordinator, that too much importance has been attached to national preferences and that not enough has been done on the programme and organization side. In fact it is only proper basic information and a constant flow of information on the situation that can throw light on these important issues. My first question therefore takes up Mr Schwencke's point: Can we have proper informa-

tion on the present situation in the Preparatory Committee and can this information be kept up to date, and can someone from the Preparatory Committee be appointed to maintain regular contact with the Parliamentary committee, for example?

My second point is that we discussed with the representatives of the Preparatory Committee the desirability of an addendum, a kind of additional agreement between the Community and the Member States who were party to the Foundation agreement. What is the point of that? Well, the Foundation is linked to the Community, first and foremost; its business is also linked to that of the Community, as so many economic activities have cultural aspects and *vice versa* for example, the film industry. That is the second point. Furthermore, we are concerned in the financing. According to the agreement between the Council, the Commission and the Parliament, this expenditure is non-compulsory expenditure, so Parliament is directly concerned in the financing of the European Foundation: yet one more reason for concluding a proper agreement between the Community and this European Foundation.

And here we must delineate jobs very carefully. When we look at the aims of the European Foundation, Mr President, then we see how easily duplication of work can occur, even within the Community itself. So it is useful to demarcate areas of work. Similarly, I would welcome institutionalized contacts between the Foundation and the European Parliament in particular, and I gather that the German President-in-Office personally would also favour that. I hope this view will soon be shared by others.

A third important point, Mr President; an arbitration clause should be included for cases of dispute over competence.

In conclusion, I wish to say on behalf of my group that the answers to these two points, on the present situation and on the addendum, the additional agreement, will to a large extent determine the kind of cooperation with the European Foundation.

Mrs Nielsen (L). — (DA) Mr President, I am very happy that the European Parliament has the opportunity today to discuss youth exchanges, to secure the creation of better possibilities for young people from different countries to meet, for the fact is that we only really understand the values in our society the moment we personally experience what is happening. It is an approach to the teaching of these values which is entirely different to the method of getting them across by having others talk about them.

In the country I come from, I often have the pleasure of receiving approaches from teachers asking whether it is not possible to set up better economic arrangements to enable young people at school, students and teachers to travel in order to learn for themselves what

Nielsen

is happening in other countries and mix with people from other countries. I think it is a fine thing, for it is a genuine expression of the fact that the need is there. There is a desire that more should be done about it. For that reason I am very glad that we are now calling for resources to be set aside. This is a first step; once it has been taken, we can go further, as and when more resources become available.

I should like to say as a Dane that, when some people at home thought it the most natural thing in the world that young people, teachers, schoolchildren and students should take part in exchanges, the countries concerned were those of Eastern Europe. I am well aware that the exchanges considered here are not confined to Europe or the Community, but also extend to countries beyond the Iron Curtain, and Lomé comes into the picture, too. But in my short contribution, I would like to concentrate exclusively on what is important, i.e., that better facilities be provided within the present Community of 10 Member States for young people at school, students and teachers to meet one another. The need is there. It is very clearly expressed. We must therefore do something about it. For we must not forget the starting-point from which our cooperation has ultimately evolved. It is that twice in this century West European countries have gone to war against one another. So that this will never happen again, we must enter into binding cooperation, within which we respect each other with our differences but also with all that we have in common. Happily the new generation never experienced the war, it is history for them. In Denmark they may not even have heard of it in their history lessons, because the schools do not have to include it in their curricula if they do not want to.

It is therefore our duty to enable young people to travel round the Member States, to mix with schoolmates, fellow students and colleagues so that they can find out for themselves how much we have in common in our various countries. We may have problems in common, and there may be tasks which we would like to accomplish jointly. We have hopes and dreams in common and, in my view, they constitute the very best basis for cooperation beyond the frontiers.

Mrs Hammerich (CDI). — (DA) Mr President, it is our opinion that culture is something which arises in the context of community politics and in real concrete situations, but also that culture is of course a global phenomenon and that free exchanges of culture across frontiers are a very good thing. I am referring in the first instance here to Mr Schwenke's question and wish to say that in our opinion the European Foundation has nothing whatever to do with culture, quite the contrary. For in the Rules of the European Foundation, we can see how culture is to be harnessed to a propaganda campaign intended to

promote the idea of European union. This emerges from Article 2, for example, which states that the purpose of this cultural foundation is to establish better understanding of European integration, and also from Article 5, which states that it is to promote understanding of the European Idea and efforts to secure union. We consider that, if culture is captured and pressed into service to promote specific political objectives, it will wither and die. We do not agree with Mr Schwenke that the European Foundation is too much of an inter-State affair. It is paid for and operated partly by the Community; in our opinion, it is too supranational. We also do not agree that the European Parliament should have an influence on cultural questions. We have seen and heard time after time here today how people in this Chamber are prepared to use culture for propaganda purposes, and we do not care for that.

We have therefore joined with the Socialist People's Party (Socialistisk Folkeparti) in tabling this amendment, in which we point out that there is no authority in the Treaties for a cultural experiment such as this, and we deplore the fact that the agreement of March 1982 was entered into. Our Government should never have signed it. We say that no money should be paid from the budget, we call upon the Member States to stop the project and refrain from ratifying the agreement, and we hope that the whole thing will be stopped at Stuttgart.

We hope that the Danish Social Democrats, who must be in full agreement with the motion tabled by the Socialist People's Party, will also vote for it on factual grounds. We call on all others in the House to do the same — all who consider that culture should develop freely and not be harnessed to a propaganda machine.

Mr O'Mahony (S). — Mr President, I have very little time available, so I would like to use it to make just two points. Needless to remark, I do of course, together with all but one or two of the other speakers, welcome this report and urge its speedy implementation.

My two points are these. I think we should note in particular the proposal in paragraph 9 that priority in youth exchanges be given to groups from peripheral regions of the Community — unemployed young people, young women and handicapped young people as well. We all know that it is relatively easy for children or young people from high-income groups to travel through the Community; it is also relatively easy nowadays for young people who work to travel through the Community. It is, however, still impossible for the groups mentioned in paragraph 9 to do so without the kind of support which this proposal envisages; I think we should take due note of that and give it priority in implementation, as suggested in the report.

O'Mahony

My second point is that while the report correctly suggests that the Commission should supervise the programme at Community level and the European Youth Forum should be consulted in both the preparation and implementation of it — I think this is eminently sensible, certainly in a situation in which the European Foundation does not exist and its form is unclear — it is not clear from the report — and this is my only point of mild and, I hope, constructive criticism — how the exchange programme can be implemented in the Member States. There is, it seems to me, no institutional arrangement for this. That is why responsibility for implementation within Member States, within a framework of Commission and Youth Forum advice and organization at Community level, should be given to national youth councils. These are representative, as we know, of youth organizations and in most cases are given support and recognition by the member governments themselves.

So, I think it would be in accordance with the thrust of the report if we accepted the amendment to allow the responsibility for national implementation to devolve upon the youth councils and so avoid paternalism and integrate young people into the programme.

Mrs Gaiotti de Biase (PPE). — (IT) Mr President, I wish to point out immediately that the somewhat disconcerting statements made by the representative of the Council lead me to think that the more this institution talks about our being in the right, the more it reveals its own impotence and inability to take decisions. My group has always distinguished itself by its firm conviction that Community action should be more incisive in the cultural sector in general.

Today's debate juxtaposes two different issues which are nevertheless connected in an important way. The question of the cultural foundation and the youth exchanges in the Bocklet report and the concerns expressed in the Schwenke question find us in full agreement. As chairman Beumer remarked, the cultural foundation was ill conceived from the beginning, and the small improvements effected by Parliament, which won the modest battle for recognition of the allocation of the pertinent budgetary funds as non-compulsory expenditure, are not enough.

In one of the preceding speeches it was made quite clear how fear can lead to the disregard of the obvious: the Community can be built with culture, understood as a means of communication, more rapidly and more vigorously than with politics. Our societies are societies of communication, of geographical mobility, and what we need is a common policy to help young people to become integrated in a society which is supranational for objective reasons transcending any political decision.

We are nevertheless convinced that cultural policies should remain matters of national competence and be

based on the greatest possible freedom of initiative for cultural workers. The problem is when to introduce the ever-more-necessary feature of cooperation. We believe that it should be introduced in the Community framework in order to ensure coordination of cultural policy with other Community policies. However, one should avoid the useless proliferation of bodies where this coordination understood as a political decision on priorities — is developed. The Foundation is an essential instrument for the realization of this cooperation, and not an object of political decisions. With polite condescension, contacts have been planned between the Foundation and the Committee on Youth and Culture of this Parliament; does this imply an amiable exchange of superficial ideas, or the recognition of the formal competence of a parliamentary body by virtue of its democratic legitimacy? This is the fundamental issue.

The same can be said for the policy on youth exchanges, to make it more effective in the Community context, the only one where priorities should be established; the criterium of the multilateral approach, supporting the experience of groups from the peripheral regions; increased participation of young workers and disadvantaged groups; emphasis on independent youth initiative and direct Community support.

We expect the Commission to present specific proposals in this area after the Bocklet report has been approved, but we are well aware that without an increase in the Community's own resources all these policies which are the symbol of a Europe *in fieri* are destined to remain a luxury which we cannot afford. As if the future of our young people were a luxury!

Mr Bangemann (L). — (DE) Mr President, some of our Danish Members, who are against the Community, have tabled a motion to wind up the debate on the oral question by Mr Schwenke. I formally welcome the fact that they have done so and wish to announce that my group will urge that we vote on this motion by roll call, for I find it astonishing how far nationalism can be taken in pursuit of a political aim.

What their motion aims at is not just provincialism — for that could be overlooked — and not just isolation from a cultural development which is taking place around them. These are exactly the same principles — and that may give them some food for thought — which Fascism follows throughout the world. Throughout the world Fascist movements try in this way to keep people's minds shut to the developments taking place around them, with two aims: first, so that people will not be able to criticize the Fascists' own doctrinaire aims and, secondly, in order to provoke tensions which they will then exploit in their internal policy. I find it indicative that they think in the same way as these Fascist movements, and they should explain that publicly here.

Bangemann

A further remark on the Tindemans Foundation. The French have a good expression : in addition to *'formation professionnelle'* they also have *'déformation professionnelle'*. After Mr Bocklet, I think it was, pointed out that Mr Tindemans had suddenly discovered that Parliament must after all have some say in this Foundation, the President-in-Office himself speaks first, it has to be admitted, as President of the Council, then takes two side-steps and says, speaking as Mertes, I take a totally different view of course, and I must say that obviously there is not only *'déformation professionnelle'* but also such a thing as *'schizophrénie ministérielle'*. First, speaking as a minister and representative of the Council, he says incredible things which he does not even believe himself. I think that is bad, and if we take a look at the fate of the Tindemans Foundation we can see what it can lead to. That Foundation — and I am speaking quite seriously, because I want us to have an instrument of European cultural policy — was an ill-designed structure. It will not come to life and will hinder rather than help us in our cultural activities. One might almost speak of a prodigy of nature : there was a father, Mr Tindemans, and now everyone is desperately searching for a mother ! No one will feed this child, it will fade away, for the first discussions in the guidance and coordination committee have already shown to what fate this Foundation is condemned.

I think Parliament should look at this for a while. We have called on the Commission to do something more sensible about youth exchanges. If that does not work, I think we should take the matter into our own hands. What is to prevent us from organizing and financing this sensibly, so that at last we can have a European cultural policy ?

(Applause)

Mr Estgen (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, it is well known that most young people of our countries are disillusioned with the idea of European Union. The lack of a true European policy is to a great extent responsible for this. But there is another reason : a lack of motivation on the part of young people themselves. The generation of today has not known the revulsion provoked by absurd and fratricidal wars, a feeling which gave rise to the enthusiasm of young people after World War II for the construction of a united and free Europe. Nothing great can be done without enthusiasm, without the spiritual uplift which is so beautifully expressed in Beethoven's Ode to Joy, which has become the European anthem : 'Seid umschlungen, Millionen, diesen Kuß der ganzen Welt'.

The surest ways of giving new dynamism to our generation are assuredly contact, dialogue and organized cooperation among young people from different countries.

This is the philosophy underlying the Bocklet report, and I believe in it. It is said that we only hate what we do not know. Contact with people from another country or another civilization improves the mind and encourages tolerance ; it promotes solidarity and the mutual understanding, both intellectual and emotional, which favours peace.

In associating the ACP countries with this vast movement of cultural intermingling and migration, our rapporteur has made an important contribution to the fight against racialism, which is also rooted in fear and prejudice, based in their turn on ignorance and misunderstanding of our brothers on other continents.

As co-author of a motion for a resolution to this effect, I support another fundamental Community principle : that of democracy. Opportunities for fruitful contacts should not be reserved for the privileged as to intelligence or means, or to established militants. In pursuing our object, we must take care not to favour the formation of exclusive groups made up only of people from a certain socio-professional level.

I am thinking above all of the young people from the 'fourth world', who must at all costs be included in the operation.

It has also been said that priority should be given to young unemployed people and to the handicapped. This gives me the opportunity to urge that these youth contacts should not be made in an uncommitted spirit of superficial tourism but in a spirit of emulation in the fields of culture, sport, and professional and social activities. They should also provide an opportunity for youth cooperation in Community projects designed to promote culture, education and public service, in a sort of 'voluntary community service,' as well as for studying the civilizations and languages of our Member States. In this connection, permit me to make an appeal to my colleagues of the Bureau of Parliament and to our quaestors, who have just drawn up strict regulations for the use of parliamentary buildings and facilities in our three places of work : Strasbourg, Luxembourg, and Brussels. I should like young Europeans, through the agency of the European Youth Forum, to be able to make liberal use of these facilities when Parliament does not need them for its own work.

In conclusion, I wish to underline the importance of the official introduction of a European student's and apprentice's pass, the forerunner of European diplomas. This is but a corollary of a basic principle of our Treaties : the free movement of persons.

Let us always remember what was said by Antoine de Saint-Exupéry : 'The finest profession is bringing men together'. A programme for youth exchanges is certainly directed toward this end.

(Applause)

Mr Hahn (EPP). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, allow me first to say a few words to those Danish Members who are opposed to including culture in the process of European integration. They always assume that we intend to create a uniform European culture. No one in this Parliament is dreaming of that. European culture means unity in diversity! We are well aware that Denmark has made a great contribution to culture and that that must be preserved. We are resolved to promote the specific features of the individual cultures within the European culture and to strengthen them, but we also want close cooperation and real understanding for one another, and that is precisely the aim the youth exchanges are designed to serve.

That is why we warmly welcomed Leo Tindemans' idea of creating a European Foundation, for we need an institution to integrate the cultural initiatives of the European Parliament and the Council of Europe; there is no institution yet which consistently and expertly carries out what we are beginning to do here.

So we are all the more disappointed at the way in which this Foundation has come into being. I would not think in quite such negative terms as you, Mr Bangemann, and say, let us therefore wash our hands of it from the start. Instead, we urgently ask or rather call on the Council to rectify this situation. We are aware that the process of ratification is under way. We are also aware that the legal form of the Foundation cannot be amended in the foreseeable future, but we must have an additional agreement that is binding under law and gives the European Community and especially the European Parliament influence over the activities of the European Foundation.

We must coordinate the activities and have an influence on the various bodies and the appointments to them. We want to be represented on those bodies, and we believe that is possible. We have already held preliminary talks, but they were in no way binding. We ask the Presidency of the Council to take action now and to ensure that this situation is cleared up. Then we shall have cooperation. We in the European Community cannot afford to carry out the same activities in opposition to one another or even independently of one another or even to pursue different aims in the cultural field; instead we must achieve the closest cooperation, and we urgently request you to take steps to that end.

(Applause)

Mr Kallias (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, our interest in youth exchanges constitutes an aspect, but not just a detail, of our relationship with the younger generation, because the exchange of young people can have very important results. I will enumerate a few.

For the attainment of European political union it is essential to win over the minds of the people, and this

presupposes deep acquaintance and reciprocal understanding between the peoples of Europe and, following on this, mutual respect. The most effective process of acquaintance is that which begins at an early age, when the human consciousness is taking shape and is receptive to first impressions and forms judgements based upon them.

Here, then is a first and direct contribution of youth exchange to the building of that politically-united Europe which is one of the present-day ideals of the peoples of free Europe.

Youth exchange helps to widen young people's horizons. The youngster broadens his range of acquaintance. He enriches his knowledge. He becomes aware of the differing spiritual make-up among peoples. He learns about the rate of progress of other peoples, and about the variety of civilizations or cultural shadings. He acquires and stores up additional ways of living. He becomes more mature.

Youth exchange facilitates the learning of foreign languages, and in turn the knowledge of languages brings fuller communication and provides the young person with the opportunity to savour the intellectual achievements of other peoples.

It is right that the exchanges should begin within the framework of the present Community, of tomorrow's united Europe. Gradually, however, they must be extended to the rest of Europe and, perhaps, at a final stage, embrace the whole of our small planet. The European Foundation, the Youth Forum and the other European youth organizations will make a most valuable contribution in the area of these exchanges.

My dear colleagues, the problem of the younger generation is many-sided. It is not enough just to tackle unemployment. It is also necessary for there to be a psychological *rapprochement* with young people. For this to be effective, however, we must respect the personal responsibility of the young person and his right to decide on his own life. Then, I believe, he in turn will deem our proffered knowledge and experience to be of great value and will avail himself of them.

Every measure, every item of expenditure, in support of youth constitutes the most fruitful investment in moral, social, political and economic terms.

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council — (DE) Mr President, may I revert to a few points that were touched on here, especially to the role of the European Parliament in this connection. I can only say, with Mr Bangemann and Mr Brok, that the disease of Europe is provincialism. Unless we ensure that the younger generation in particular, which shares this tendency, overcomes its provincialism, we shall sin against the political future of Europe.

Mertes

The Federal Republic of Germany wants to respond to the European Parliament's legitimate demands for an extension of its rights. The Solemn Declaration follows the same lines. The European Parliament has the specific task of representing the will of the people and asserting the vitality and importance of the European ideal *vis-à-vis* the general public.

Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, whom I have always liked, once wrote this admirable line: *Le plus beau métier des hommes c'est unir les hommes*. By analogy I would like to say: *Le plus beau métier du Parlement européen est de rapprocher les nations*. How better can we do so than by a *rapprochement* between the next generation of our peoples? Here you have a legitimate opportunity and a legitimate task.

Now, Mr Bangemann, I wanted, if I may put it that way, to avoid being schizophrenic. I fully endorse this joint text, which, like all texts in politics, is a compromise; but when I read out that consultation of the European Parliament was not envisaged, then I suddenly became a Member of Parliament again.

It is true that here I represent a government and the Council of Ministers, but those words did make me angry. So I had to announce quite openly, in order not to be schizophrenic, that I do not approve of that sentence and that we are working to remove its substances. This makes me all the keener to endorse what you said to the Danish Members. So I did not act schizophrenically in this case but tried to overcome the schizophrenia.

'Le plus beau métier du Parlement européen est celui de rapprocher les hommes.'

(Applause)

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — Mr President may I say at the outset that I think this has been a very useful debate. There are certain things which it will not surprise Parliament to find the Commission remembering. In particular I will remember what Mr Bangemann said about Parliament being in a position to give the Commission the resources to do more in this field. And I will remember even more, if I may say so, what the representative of the Council of Ministers has just said about the attitude of the government of the Federal Republic of Germany. I look forward with some enthusiasm and delight to the next time that this issue comes in front of the Council of Ministers, and I look forward indeed to the strong support of the government of the Federal Republic.

I was about to say something to Mr Lalor but I see he is not in his place. He criticized a letter that I wrote to him about this subject. All I will say, Mr President, is that the letter was meant to be helpful. I hope he reads it again, and if he does so — perhaps in the light of what I am about to say to the House — I think he may come to the conclusion that it actually was helpful.

May I deal first of all with the oral question and then say one or two words about the report? As far as the question itself is concerned, can I make it clear to the Parliament at the outset, and particularly I suppose to some of our Danish colleagues, that it is not the Commission's intention to replace national activity or indeed what is now done by the Council of Europe or by other international bodies. The task of the Commission as we see it should be to assist in improving the quality and quantity of exchanges; in widening their scope; in supporting the existing structures and helping to create appropriate new structures where required. As far as the European Foundation is concerned which has a specific mandate to operate in this field, a specific area of exchange activity, such as the field of school exchanges, might be most suitably developed by the Foundation, leaving the other major sectors of youth exchanges to be developed by the Commission.

As far as the financing and the money is concerned, in answer to Mr Schwencke's question, the Commission has so far drawn 157 000 ECU out of the total appropriation of 200 000 ECU under Article 676 of the 1983 budget. Apart from the expenses arising from the normal functioning of the preparatory committee — that is, meetings and secretarial costs — the bulk of the drawings are to cover the cost of the hearing organized by the preparatory committee in February 1983 and the other consultations required for the preparation of the draft programme for the future foundation. The Commission could provide details for Mr Schwencke if he wishes; we can also provide the appropriate parliamentary committee with those details and particularly the use made of the appropriations.

I now turn to the report and the debate on Mr Bocklet's resolution. First of all, may I say how much I welcome the Parliament's initiative in debating this important subject today. I also welcome very much the tone of the debate. It seemed to me that almost every speaker, with one or two possible exceptions, at least agreed with the main thrust of Community policy in this direction, and the call was that we should do more more often for a greater number of people rather than that there should be a questioning of the basic thrust of it.

Increasingly, I think, around Europe the value of exchanges for young people is being recognized. In weaving a network of friendship and of links between young people of different Member States, exchanges and meetings create the reality of what the Community should actually be. Since the early beginnings of the Community, all those concerned to promote an ever closer unity among the peoples of Europe have recognized the importance of creating those links and building mutual understanding between the younger generations of European citizens.

Richard

Mr Bocklet's report also mentions another aspect of youth exchanges to which the Commission attaches particular importance. This is the contribution of those exchanges to the personal development of the people who are involved and the creation of life skills: communication, self-confidence, acceptance of differences among others. Youth exchanges should in the Commission's view be considered in the same light and with the same urgency as other policy initiatives more specifically related to vocational training and to employment.

Now the framework created by these various aspects defines more broadly what we would include in the term 'youth exchange': straightforward exchanges of groups of people, visits, group meetings — all these I think, can reasonably be included provided that they embrace some educational element such as I have mentioned. Without this element we have found that exchanges and visits decline into tourism. And while I have nothing against tourism, and indeed that is a worthy end, it is a different one.

I would not attempt today to describe all the exchanges which exist at present within the Community. The report itself lists many of them. But the truth is, Mr President, that no reliable figures exist, since many exchanges, although organized originally with official help, continue in subsequent years alone.

I would like, however, to take up the point contained in E (e) of the preamble to the resolution: that the intensity of youth exchange activities declines the nearer one gets to the geographical periphery of the Community. Well, this is undoubtedly true. It is also the case that youth exchanges are strongest where there exist organized structures to help them and are weakest where there are none. In France, Germany and the United Kingdom, for example, there are recognized centres from which information, advice and sometimes funds can be obtained by teachers and youth leaders. Such centres exist or are being developed in certain other countries too, but on the whole there is room for expansion here, and for this reason I welcome the recognition in the resolution of the importance of creating such information services for young people.

But apart from these supporting structures, the resolution puts forward a very substantial programme of activities. It calls for the direct support by the Community of individual exchanges. It calls for the use of Community funds to pay for travel and for language costs. It provides for innovatory work on structures and on methods of youth exchange. It requires the direct use and the coordination of existing bodies currently active in the field. It is, indeed, an operational programme. But while it is certainly very desirable, it must be said — and I have to say it — that it would require the commitment of very substantial

resources, both human and financial. Now the sum of 200 000 units of account mentioned in the report is, of course, envisaged only, I think, as an initial pump — priming amount. Were we to operate the full programme we should be talking in terms of not less than 2 to 4 million units of account a year over and above the 2 million units of account available currently to the Commission for running the second programme of young worker exchanges. I hope I make it clear to the House — as was raised by one of the participants opposite — that as far as we are concerned this report is additional to and not in substitution for the young worker exchanges.

It should, I think, not be forgotten that the Commission has been active in this field now since 1963, when the first programme for the exchange of young workers was agreed. Over the last 20 years, the numbers of young people in the programme have steadily grown. They reached about 1 000 last year. We managed to achieve greater diversity as regards the sectors of activity from which the young workers have come. The Commission has also been concerned with other types of exchanges. We held a conference in Venice, for example, in 1977 on school and pupil exchanges, gathering data in the field, giving experimental support to a few exchange and innovative projects and supporting the transfer of information to those who most need it. We shall be publishing later this year what I hope people will agree is an informative guide to help young people who wish to move around Europe, to participate in exchanges or to spend a period of time working abroad. This will be a companion volume to the existing handbook for students in the Community, which has proved extremely popular. We have also started some experimental support for the creation of a resource centre for school exchanges in Denmark.

Once the infrastructures exist in Member States we can move on to the central information unit Mr Bocklet proposes, which would, in a sense, be the linchpin of the local structures, which could not function satisfactorily without it. Clearly we should do more to promote innovatory and demonstration projects with a built-in element for the wide diffusion of the results and experiences in a very practical way to those interested. Projects such as these might include exchanges of handicapped young people, of the unemployed and of other disadvantaged groups, bearing in mind always the need to channel support so as to obtain a balanced geographical representation. They might also examine in more detail the contribution that exchanges can make within the framework of structured training programmes, of which a small number, each time an integral part of a wider training course, have already been financed on an experimental basis by the European Social Fund.

Richard

These are some of the ideas that the Commission has been working on following the parliamentary resolution contained in Mrs Pruvot's report with a view to preparing — and I can tell the House this — a new political initiative in the field of youth exchanges sometime towards the end of this year. The Commission has already held discussions on this question with representatives of the organizations specializing in youth exchanges. We shall in due course also be meeting and discussing this with governmental representatives as well. I did, in fact, have the opportunity to raise the issue on the occasion of the Joint Council of Employment and Education Ministers last Friday. This was the first Joint Council of Education and Employment Ministers to have been held and was also, I think, rather a successful meeting. Although no details were discussed, I think we can look forward to a fairly positive response from the Council in due course.

This debate therefore for the Commission has come at a very apt time. It has provided a forum for the very many interested Members to express a whole range of ideas. I have listened carefully to the various ideas and suggestions and comments made. The Commission will certainly take account of all that has been said when drawing up its formal proposals. I am also particularly pleased to see the link made in your draft resolution between the programme and the budget.

It seems appropriate in conclusion to mention that 1985 is the United Nations International Year of Young People. I think we should already have 1985 in view as a year in which we can give a push to these developments within the Community. It also marks a practical Community contribution to the wider efforts of the United Nations. I very much hope that by 1985 the Community will be in a position, with the cooperation of Parliament and the Council, to launch a full youth exchange programme with all the resources that that entails. By working together in this way, I hope we can succeed in moving youth exchange a little closer to the centre of Community activity and so open up the freedom of movement to the young, build even better bridges between our people and encourage the process of mutual understanding on which the Community must depend if it is going to develop as a community of peoples and not simply as a somewhat mechanistic and soulless common market.

(Applause)

Mr Bocklet (EPP), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, Mr President of the Council, Mr Commissioner, honourable Members, may I thank you very warmly for what you have said here and merely conclude by giving my position on a few slightly unclear points.

Mr Vandemeulebroucke said that such a youth-exchange programme might further increase the confusion in Europe, the variety of promotion

schemes, etc. This report states quite plainly that the Community contributions are subsidiary, secondary, and that initially the resources available in the private and national sectors, i.e., in the non-State and the State sectors, should be used. Only then can Community funds be used. I hope this has dispelled Mr Vandemeulebroucke's anxiety.

Secondly, Mr O'Mahony found that my report had nothing to say about the administrative structure for implementing the youth exchange programme in the Member States. Paragraph 5 of my report goes into this very matter and rejects the model which the Commission currently follows for exchanges of young workers. I refer specifically to the reports presented by the Commission on the experience gathered, according to which national coordinators should be interposed. We believe that would lead to further bureaucracy and risk weakening the Community impact. For we see what happens in the Regional Fund, where Community funds are used as a substitute for national resources and used to pursue a national and not a European structural policy. We want to avoid this happening with youth exchanges. We want to learn from these experiences.

Now to the question of the 200 000 ECU. It has been said again and again that this is not enough to finance youth exchanges. That is true, but remember we are proposing two steps for getting this programme going, and I am extremely grateful to Mr Richard for picking up the ball as regards the information offices and kindly wanting to pass it to Denmark first — precisely, that is where they are needed most. The information offices are designed first of all to provide a clear picture, so that the resources needed for project promotion can then be made available. I say to you quite openly, that if we really want to set up a sensible system, then 10 million ECU is a sum that could easily be spent on project promotion, given that this year, as I said, DM 36 million were earmarked for the Franco-German Youth Foundation.

A word to the Presidency of the Council. This Parliament likes to bandy about declarations and consents, but the figure of 200 000 ECU was also fixed in view of the fact that we must be able to earmark these resources in the budget estimates for next year, rather than leaving an empty budgetary line. As to the question of how we should then proceed, I will answer that one of the areas which would justify raising the 1 % VAT ceiling in the Community is this very one of youth exchanges. That is another thing I want to say quite plainly, against the background of this discussion not only in my own home country but in the Community as a whole.

What we must do now — and I remember your statement, Mr Bangemann — is to put into practice what has been said today in this debate and not to confine ourselves again, as so often, to declarations of a general nature.

Bocklet

I thank you warmly for your broad support in this matter. Let us now get to work to achieve it and not leave the file lying in a drawer, as has so often happened to European initiatives.

On 6 May 1966, the European Parliament first called for a programme. It must not take another seventeen years until the matter is brought up again and translated into action.

(Applause)

President. — Two Members have asked to make personal statements under Rule 67. These are Mrs Hammerich and Mrs Boserup, whom I remind that they have each no more than three minutes.

Mrs Hammerich (CDI). — *(DA)* Mr President, I rise to speak in a personal capacity in order to refute the very gross allegations which Mr Bangemann has permitted himself to make in this Chamber. He took it upon himself to draw parallels between fascist movements and our movement. I can tell Mr Bangemann that our movement is made up of anti-fascists, nothing but anti-fascists — including many who were compelled to become freedom-fighters during the last world war and the occupation — but it also has many young people, who oppose the slightest sign of, or tendency towards fascism which may appear, including the tendency to make use of culture and cultural workers for propaganda purposes. I ask Mr Bangemann to make us and the people I represent here an unequivocal apology, and I want to see his offensive remarks struck from the record. The last time I took issue with you, Mr Bangemann, was when you said that Denmark was a scandal because we did not want to mortgage our national government to this Assembly. God forbid that that should ever happen! You should keep a somewhat tighter rein on your arrogance, Mr Bangemann, and I demand an apology from you.

(Applause)

Mrs Boserup (COM). — *(DA)* Mr President, it is not surprising that I wish to speak on the same subject. I am a co-author of the motion for a resolution which has called down the wrath of Mr Bangemann. I stand by what it contains. I do not take kindly, as an elected Member of Parliament and a representative of a socialist party, to being called a fascist or to being accused of having fascist leanings. If Mr Bangemann has time one day, he should ask a Danish member of his group to inform him of my party's programme. There is nothing fascist in holding the view that the Treaty of Rome is the worst possible basis for socialist development here in Europe. And I ask Mr Bangemann, as Mrs Hammerich has done, to think again and apologize for levelling abuse at people whose only fault is not to hold the same political views as Mr Bangemann. I think that is allowed.

(Applause)

Mr Bangemann (L). — *(DE)* Mr President, naturally I quite understand that people may have quite different views from those I consider right. That is quite natural. And perhaps it is another problem of European cultural policy that I am unable to speak Danish; for instance, if I had ever taken part in a school exchange visit, I would certainly have gone to Denmark and could now say this in Danish. But may I say quite clearly and definitely that I did not assert that Mrs Hammerich, Mrs Boserup or the parties they represent here were fascist! I said, and I am happy to repeat it to make it quite clear, and therefore I have no reason at all to apologize: 'If you use the same methods as the Fascist movements use throughout the world...'

I repeat again what those methods were, Mrs Boserup. You are against European youth exchanges, so you are not in favour; so you are not in favour of young Europeans getting to know one another.

On another occasion too, both of you and other Members repeatedly objected to an extension of the European Parliament's rights. We are a democratic institution here, fighting for a *rapprochement* of the peoples of Europe. We are fighting to prevent any recurrence of the bitter experiences suffered by many members of your party, and perhaps by you too, in the war. I am happy to express my respect for that, and I should be sorry if what I said were taken as an attack on that attitude. That would be a serious misunderstanding. All I ask you to do — and in fact all those who have spoken against Europe on these occasions — is to determine how close your anti-European attitude, how close the methods you recommend, are to the fascist methods used throughout the world, which consist in not allowing people to come together, to get to know one another, to move towards democratic institutions, such as our institution here. I should like to see the day when you and Mrs Hammerich rise and call for more rights for the European Parliament! Then you will be following the traditions which were alive in your party at the time when it fought against fascism. For you did fight against fascism, indeed ...

President. — Mr Bangemann, you are making a personal statement and may not speak on the substance of the matter.

Mr Bangemann (L). — *(FR)* No, but I am replying to remarks that have been made!

(DE) If you could try to follow the traditions which were alive in your parties and among your acquaintances during the period of National Socialism in your country, then you would be behaving as a European today. That is my conviction!

(Applause)

Mr Fich (S). — (DA) Mr President, unfortunately I was not in the Chamber the first time Mr Bangemann made his remark but, now that he has repeated it, I too feel prompted to make a personal statement.

I would like to point out that what Mr Bangemann has said here also affects our party, the Danish Social-Democratic Party, which was the party in government for many years. Mr Bangemann says in effect that the methods which our government has made use of for many years are fascist in tendency, and that seems to me a very grave accusation to make against a democratically-elected government. I would point out to Mr Bangemann that we have nothing against exchanges of young people. Indeed, we think they are a good idea, but we do not see any basis for organizing them under the Treaty of Rome. We think that there are other ways of promoting exchanges of young people, and we think it quite wrong to allege that we are opposed to such exchanges. On the contrary, we are in favour of international cooperation, in the field of youth affairs too, but, when Mr Bangemann then takes up the problem in regard to powers for the European Parliament, I must point out to him that our party is not in favour of power for the European Parliament. We consider there are other ways of safeguarding democracy, that is to say, by strengthening the national parliaments. We have a distinct feeling that certain people who are calling for power for the European Parliament do so because they have not the necessary parliamentary control over international cooperation in their own countries.

Mr President, let me finally point out to Mr Bangemann that Europe and the European Community are not quite the same thing. We are in favour of international cooperation and of European cooperation, but we are fully entitled to put forward a number of critical views on the cooperation which takes place in the Community, Mr Bangemann. I ask you to withdraw your remarks. I consider them to be a gross insult to our former government and to our party, the Social-Democratic Party of Denmark.

(Applause)

President. — Mrs Nielsen has also asked for the floor, after which I think we can consider the incident closed, for we cannot carry on this debate *ad infinitum*.

Mrs Nielsen (L). — (DA) Mr President, as a Danish member, I also feel prompted to make a personal statement, but it will be quite short.

What is happening here in reality is that some Danish Members who use all the resources at their disposal to combat the Community, which so many of us want to build up, defend and strengthen, are now using this debating-time to attack one of my colleagues. He is well able to defend himself. But what is behind all this is that Danish people who do not want us to be

active on cultural matters must really be saying that they hold their own Danish culture in contempt. How spiritually impoverished the land that does not tolerate interaction with other countries! How narrow the culture which will not tolerate interaction with the cultures of other countries! History and experience have always shown us that culture is constantly faced with challenges in part from within our countries but, to a particular degree, from outside our countries. Our Danish culture is strong: we have much to give, if we only believe in ourselves. I take these remarks as an expression of lack of self-confidence, as a failure to believe in the strength and goodness of Danish culture.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will take place at the next voting-time.

We now proceed to the request for an early vote on the motion for a resolution by Mrs Boserup and others (Doc. 1-412/83).

Mr Schwencke (S). — (DE) Mr President, so far Mrs Boserup's motion is only available in Danish. One might therefore take the view that we should not vote on it now. I therefore propose that we vote on it this afternoon when the texts are available.

I would also like to add right now that I have looked at the text and had it translated, and as the rapporteur responsible I will be against it because in two months' time Parliament will be considering my motion for a resolution, which is already before the committee. So there is no need whatever to vote on it.

President. — Mr Schwencke, I think you are right: if the motion has not been distributed in all the languages, it cannot be put to the vote now. We should be able to vote on it at 4.30 p.m.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

5. Welcome

President. — I have the pleasure of welcoming to the official gallery a delegation from the Indian Parliament headed by the Speaker, Mr Bal Ram Jakhar. This is the second visit to be made by one of our delegations, the first being that made to India by the delegation from the European Parliament led by Mr Vergès in November 1981.

We are conscious of the role played by India in the international community and among the world's developing countries. We are particularly happy to welcome a delegation from the biggest democratic country in the world, and we trust that the discussions between our two delegations will produce positive results.

(Applause)

President

6. Memorandum on Greenland's withdrawal from the EEC

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Janssen van Raay, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee (Doc. 1-264/83), on

the Memorandum concerning the proposal by the Danish Government amending the Community Treaties with a view to Greenland's withdrawal from the Community and with a view at the same time to making the special association rules in Part Four of the EEC Treaty applicable to Greenland (Article 96 of the ECSC Treaty, Article 236 of the EEC Treaty and Article 204 of the EAEC Treaty) (Doc. 1-380/82).

Mr Janssen van Raay (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, after this lively Danish exchange it is perhaps appropriate that we now turn to Greenland, which is still a Danish territory today.

Mr President, during the final stages of negotiations on the EEC Treaty the French Government produced the brilliant idea of extending the workings of the Common Market to cover the overseas countries and territories with which certain Member States of the Community had a special relationship, in other words, the former colonies. This French initiative was acted upon: hence the fourth part of the EEC Treaty concerning association with overseas countries and territories.

This initiative showed vision, magnanimity and solidarity, and it has taken on topical significance. Let us not forget that the EEC, since the accession of the other four countries, actually comprises eight former colonial powers. Germany was no longer a colonial power at the birth of the EEC Treaty; Luxembourg has never been one; the Greeks, who were fifteen hundred years ahead of the rest of Europe in everything, in their philosophy, their learning, their democracy, their arts and sciences, their form of government, even the Greeks who were so far ahead of us in everything really ended their colonial period fifteen hundred years ago. Fifteen hundred years before the other countries of Europe. But then we are left with seven others.

As I said, the French initiative led to Part IV of the EEC Treaty on association, and in practice the seven other countries have made ample use of it. I advise you all to have a look at the list in Annex IV of the EEC Treaty. I have counted them for you. Great Britain has taken advantage of this for 23 1/2 countries, France for 21 1/2 countries. If you are wondering what half a country is, then the two halves refer to the Franco-British condominium of the New Hebrides. The Netherlands has used it for three countries New Guinea, Surinam and the Dutch Antilles Belgium for two and Italy for one country.

Now Denmark has also applied today for association status for one of its former colonies. What perhaps many of you, excluding the Danes themselves, may not know is that Denmark, albeit on a very modest scale, was also a colonial power, on the Gold Coast, in the Caribbean, with the Virgin Islands, and finally, Greenland. Denmark is now asking us to grant to its former colony of Greenland what we have granted six other Member countries in fifty cases. And my first rhetorical question must be, how could we refuse?

We could refuse if there were formal reasons for doing so. So we turn to Article 131 of the EEC Treaty, which sets out the two requirements which must be met for association with the EEC. The first is that it must be a non-European country. Well, one glance at the globe and you will all be convinced that Greenland is part of the American continent. Sixty kilometres from Canada, more than four thousand kilometres from where we are now meeting. Its population, its situation, its history all mean it belongs to the American continent. The second formal requirement in the Treaty is that it must have special ties, which means that it must be a former colony. If I am not mistaken, Greenland enjoys the privilege of being the only country recognized as a colony by the permanent Court of International Justice in The Hague, in the famous case between Norway and Denmark, and you know that until Greenland became a province of Denmark, Denmark regularly made a report on Greenland after the war to the colonial commission of the United Nations. Thus, the formal colonial status of Greenland is established.

Now apart from these two requirements, which Greenland meets completely, there are a number of fallacious arguments doing the rounds which I shall go through briefly and disprove. Some say that Greenland is really too large and is not a proper overseas country. To counter that, I would point to Dutch New Guinea, which is of the same order of magnitude, and if the ice on Greenland should ever melt — which I do not hope — then New Guinea would become even larger than Greenland if one were only to look at the land and not the frozen sea. It is also argued that Greenland is not poor enough, that Part IV only refers to poor countries.

My first point is that for decades Denmark has pumped millions into Greenland. The relative prosperity of the Greenlanders is solely due to that fact. The inhabitants of the Falkland Islands at the moment enjoy the highest *per capita* income, higher even than in the United Kingdom itself, and this is solely due to the enormous amounts pumped into it by the United Kingdom. So that is the same situation as Greenland, and furthermore it is a fact that rich Brunei and rich Bermuda are also British overseas territories.

Then people say that Greenland possesses minerals. That holds good for New Guinea, for Brunei, with its oil, for Surinam, with its bauxite; there are murmurs too that the Falklands have great mineral resources in

Janssen van Ray

the surrounding seas, difficult to exploit, but that is also the case with Greenland of course. And then it is argued that one cannot be inside and outside the EEC at the same time, that Greenland is part of the Kingdom of Denmark and must either be in or out. But that argument is also fallacious. The Faroe Islands have exactly the same status as Greenland, belong to the Kingdom of Denmark and are not part of the EEC. And to my British colleagues I would say that the sovereign zones on the island of Cyprus belong to the United Kingdom and are not part of the EEC; and an even stranger situation is enjoyed by the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands, which have one foot in the EEC and the other outside. So there is absolutely no reason for refusing to grant the status of Part IV.

Then I have heard people say: ah yes, but Greenland has fish. Is there no fish in the Caribbean Sea, with all its overseas countries and territories? Is there no fish in the Indian Ocean? Is there no fish in the Pacific? Is there no fish in St Pierre and Miquélon, with their famous crabs and lobsters? It is quite true that there are no German fishermen, but there are fish. We must not confuse the issue. I believe that Europe is completely justified in looking after the interests of its own fishermen in general and German fisherman in particular. It is an objective economic argument, it concerns our own interests and we in this House should stand up for our own legitimate interests. That I support, but let us not confuse these two matters! Let us support the interests of our fisheries but recognise in principle Greenland's right to association.

It is argued that it is a dangerous precedent for Europe to allow withdrawal and accession. I think that is a legitimate concern. I understand the Italians, I understand the French, I understand the British with their worries about Sicily, Corsica and the Shetlands, but that is precisely why I as your rapporteur have done everything possible in my report to concentrate on non-European territories. I did that, too, to follow the Treaty, which talks about non-European areas. So my report, if adopted, cannot be considered in any way as a precedent for European countries and the integrity of the territory of the Member States as such.

My conclusion is that the European Parliament has always favoured the self-determination of peoples and democracy; the Greenlanders have never voted in favour of becoming a province of Denmark, but three times they have voted against us, three times they have said that they want to remain with Denmark but not in the EEC.

Secondly, association is, of course, a European matter, but the primary responsibility lies with the mother country. Mrs Thatcher sent her navy to the Falklands and Mr Mitterrand his forces to Caledonia and Mr Lubbers is negotiating on the Dutch Antilles: that is to say, Denmark's opinion is extremely important. In conclusion, I would say that we regret that the Green-

landers want to leave us, but we should be happy that they want to be associated with us, and I therefore recommend my report to you.

(Applause)

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, some 12 months ago, in compliance with the democratically-expressed wishes of the people of Greenland, the Danish Government tabled an amendment to the Community Treaties with the object of enabling Greenland to withdraw from the Community. It simultaneously requested that Greenland be accorded the status of an overseas territory. In conformity with the procedure laid down in the Community Treaties for treaty amendments, the President of the Council sought the advice of both the Commission and the European Parliament in his letter of 8 June 1982. The Commission presented a very comprehensive opinion in February 1983 but reserved the right to submit supplementary proposals for regulating the question of fisheries.

While awaiting Parliament's opinion, which we look forward to with interest, every Council meeting since February of this year had addressed itself to the Greenland issue. No other issue has figured so consistently on the Council's agenda as that of Greenland since February 1983. We have been able to make some headway already. Thus we have had various frank discussions at the political level and have commissioned an expert factual report with a view to having all the necessary information to hand at the opening of the negotiations.

On the basis of the Commission's opinion, the Council held an initial information debate at its sitting of 21 February 1983. The Danish Foreign Minister provided an exhaustive account of the motives, grounds and aims underlying his government's request. Later in the debate, most delegations named fisheries as the biggest essential element in the whole question.

Whereas the Danish Government advocates parallel negotiations on the fisheries issue and the question of Greenland's future status, most of the other delegations consider these two issues inseparable. The deliberations have brought out the primary importance of the fisheries issue, most Member States taking the view that Community access to Greenland's fishing-grounds after its withdrawal was one side of the matter, the other being access to Community markets for Greenland's fishery products. In comparison, the remaining questions of substance — the overall trade structure, financial aid — may be regarded as being of minor importance.

The very thorough debate in the Council on 25 May 1983, at which Greenland's prime minister, Mr Motzfeldt, took part as a member of the Danish delegation, revealed a wide divergence on the fundamentals.

Mertes

Subject to Parliament's opinion, however, the Member States were able to take another step towards the opening of negotiations. A growing appreciation of Greenland's special case is also to be observed. The Council intends to take up the issue of Greenland once again in its sitting at the end of June.

We are fully aware that a very difficult issue is at stake here. This is reflected in the report now before Parliament, which contains both a majority and a minority view and is accompanied by the opinion of the Political Affairs Committee, which diverges from the views of the Legal Affairs Committee.

We all regret Greenland's decision. After all, it is the first time that a region of our Community has expressed a desire to negotiate a withdrawal after ten years' membership. At the same time, we respect Greenland's democratically-expressed desire and welcome its wish to maintain close, albeit modified, relations with the Community.

The search for a political, sensibly-balanced solution is hampered by Greenland's desire to have control over its natural resources, which means essentially its fish-stocks. Thus the Council is faced with the task of finding a solution which does justice to the interests of Greenland's inhabitants while not upsetting the Community's common fisheries policy, which has only just been secured after negotiations protracted over years. On this aspect, the discussion in the Council is still in its infancy. It is a classic example of the difference between perceived and real interests. I feel one cannot overlook the fact that a loss of the Community catch-quota in the waters around Greenland would imperil the equilibrium of the Community's common fisheries policy as a whole. It would directly affect all Community Member States with fishing interests in the North Atlantic. We must not forget that third countries who allow Community fishermen access to their waters are also affected, such as Norway and the Faroe Islands.

At the same time, Greenland's interests are not confined to fish. General integration and political-related issues also play an important role. The task before us will require vision and understanding all round. If such is forthcoming, it will be possible to achieve a realistic, balanced and truly equitable solution which is acceptable to the Community and to Greenland.

IN THE CHAIR : MR LALOR

Vice-President

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, the Commission shares the Legal Affairs Committee's regret that Greenland wishes to withdraw from the Community, but respects this democratically-expressed wish. All aspects of the request for withdrawal — institutional, legal, political and economic

— have been carefully weighed up by the Commission. Our opinion to the Council follows, therefore, on deep reflection and a desire to achieve a reasoned overall balance of interests which could in time provide a solid but flexible basis for a long-term, close relationship between the Community and Greenland after withdrawal.

I have discussed with my Commission colleagues the very special psychological, cultural and other factors which underlie Greenland's request. I have had the opportunity of making two visits to Greenland, and I have discussed both there and in Brussels, with my Greenlandic friends, some of the broader implications, as I perceive them, of Greenland's desire to cast aside the Community mantle when a harsh wind is blowing in the world's economic climate. My main conclusion was that the key to a meaningful and close future relationship is clear perception by each side of the other's major area of concern.

The Community must try to perceive — albeit at a great distance — the seemingly strange but deliberate psychological and cultural emigration of a people who, for better or worse, wish to set their path on their own terms. I know that my conviction is shared that the Community should do what it can to help Greenland develop itself in the years ahead in a new but close relationship with its former Community partners. Greenland must try to perceive that there are a number of Community concerns which must be taken into account in Greenland's transition from membership to a new status.

While demonstrating understanding and sympathy for Greenland's concerns, the Member States feel that their concerns also deserve understanding and sympathy. Thus the Commission has responded positively to Greenland's request for withdrawal and to the request for OCT (overseas countries and territories status). The first decision was in response to the democratically-expressed wish of the Greenlandic people. The second was because Greenland fulfils the basic conditions governing OCT status, i.e., that it is a non-European territory in a state of development having a particular relationship with a Member State.

It is worth noting here that these three conditions apply to no other part of the existing Community. Thus Greenland could not be cited as a precedent for any other part of the Community which might find itself considering secession. Here I noted with particular interest the contribution made by the rapporteur, who spelled this out beyond any ambiguity whatsoever.

Now, in proposing OCT status for Greenland, the Commission was well aware that in one regard this status would not take account of one major element essential to any future relationship. This is the necessity to preserve a measure of fishing in Greenlandic waters. The preservation of the complex and delicate balance of the common fisheries policy, internal and

Burke

external, reached only a few months ago after years of intense negotiation, is a matter of great concern to the Commission and to the Member States. The Commission therefore decided that a pragmatic solution should consist of the best possible balance between the two needs;

1. Greenland's need to develop its fishing capacity and to find markets for its fish products.
2. The Community's need to have certain fishing rights granted in Greenlandic waters.

I believe the just solution lies in this direction, and I am pleased that the report of the Legal Affairs Committee also takes the same approach. In paragraph 3, the committee recommends the granting of OCT status to Greenland. In paragraph 4, the committee agrees with the Commission's view that the granting of this status must be accompanied by a simultaneous agreement setting out the mutual rights and obligations.

Mr President, I would ask for your guidance at this point, because since this is a very significant piece of legislation, I would like, on behalf of the Commission, to refer to some of the amendments — to all of the amendments moved, if I understand correctly that they have been moved — and now is as good a time as any to do so, but I am in your hands.

(The President indicated his approval)

Then, Mr President, I would refer to Amendment No 1, in the name of Mr Sieglerschmidt, and I would have to state on behalf of the Commission that we would be somewhat negative in regard to this. We regret the withdrawal decision but, as I have said earlier, the democratic decision of the Greenlandic people is firmly backed by the Danish Government, which has made it clear that any solution other than withdrawal cannot be negotiated. In any case, I would put it to you that there is much more underlying the withdrawal request than Greenlandic interests as perceived from Europe. I believe, as I have mentioned earlier, that the underlying cultural and psychological factors, which can really only be seen on the ground in Greenland, are predominant and, indeed, inevitable.

Amendment No 2 I understand that has been withdrawn and therefore there is no need to deal with it.

Amendment No 3 would delete recital D. Again the Commission would point out that the Danish Government and the Greenlandic home-rule government have both spoken explicitly on this point. It is, of course, not a direct Community consideration, but it is an important part of the wider background of the question as a whole. Perhaps a textual amendment might be ... I could suggest some further words here at a later stage if Parliament wished me to do so.

In regard to recital G, again I would have to be negative. The point is not whether in the strictest sense

Greenland is part of the American continent, but that it is non-European — overseas in the sense required for overseas countries and territories. This is an important political point because, as has been stressed already by the rapporteur, Greenland's withdrawal as an OCT can never become a precedent for any other part of the existing Community.

As to where Greenland actually is in the geographic sense, it is, as has been pointed out, close to the Canadian land mass, 70 kilometres from Cape Jameson and thousands of kilometres from the European continent. This, I think, speaks for itself.

To amendment No 5, again I would have to say no. We are dealing with the deletion of the words 'regrets yet'. I would say here that the Danish Government regrets it; virtually every Minister in the Council of Ministers regrets it; the Commission regrets it and does any one here, I ask, not regret it?

Amendment No 6 calls on the Commission and the Member States to give Greenland their support in defending the way of life of the Inuit community against outside threats of any kind. I think that this is a very worthwhile amendment in principle. I would suggest, however, that the words after 'community' — that is the words against outside threats of any kind should perhaps be deleted.

Amendment No 7 I would say yes. The fact that the Norseman from Iceland, Erik the Red, set foot on Greenland some thousands of years ago is a fascinating piece of history in itself. But more pertinent perhaps, is the fact that the Inuit population first entered Greenland *via* Arctic Canada, maybe some 15 000 years ago.

In regard to Amendment No 8, I would have to say my opinion here is the same as for Amendment No 3, and the answer is in the negative.

There is no problem with Amendment No 9, which is a drafting point.

Amendment No 10, I would have to say no for the same reasons I gave in reply to Amendment No 1.

Amendment No 11 recommends that the request by the Danish Government that Greenland be allowed to withdraw should not be granted. I think I have already indicated in the main statement I made on the report, that the Commission would suggest that a negative answer be given to this. The Amendment does not, in my judgment, take account of the truly unique psychological and cultural elements which have led the Greenlandic people to a decision which, as they know very well, may have a negative effect on their economic well-being, at least in the short and medium term. However, they have made that request and I think we should look at it sympathetically.

Burke

Amendment No 12 I would give the same reply as to Amendment No 11.

Amendment No 13 considers that the granting of the Danish request would set, from the political point of view, an important precedent and, from the legal point of view, would detract from the Community's status as a legally binding Community. This has already, I think, been answered by the rapporteur and in my previous statements, I do not think that there will be any important precedent set.

Amendment No 14 instructs the President of Parliament to forward this resolution to the Council and the governments of the Member States. This I shall leave to yourselves.

Amendment No 15, which recommends that the request by the Danish Government regarding negotiations on Greenland's withdrawal from the Community be granted — no, I believe that the text as a whole makes OCT status conditional on certain criteria being met. This is set out in your paragraph 4. And I fully support the reference to the granting of OCT status as part of the package.

Amendment No 16 recommends negotiation of a new status for Greenland as a non-European territory providing for Greenland's special relations with the Community in a mutually harmonious form. I would say that this should be seen in the same light as the answer I gave to Amendment No 15.

Now Amendment No 17, I think, is of prime importance. And I may say here that I find it difficult to understand the text in part B. Article 1, paragraph 1, of the protocol which the Commission proposes, specifically refers to an agreement to be concluded between the Community and the authority responsible for Greenland before the entry into force of this protocol.'

Mr Janssen van Raay (PPE), rapporteur. — This amendment has been withdrawn.

Mr Burke, Member of the Commission. — I did not know that. I am grateful to the rapporteur for this. May I say that I am very glad that it is withdrawn.

With regard to Amendment No 18, I agree to this amendment.

Mr President, in conclusion, may I warmly congratulate, on behalf of the Commission, the rapporteur and the Legal Affairs Committee for the outstanding report which has been made on this important matter of the request by the Danish Government on behalf of Greenland for withdrawal from the Community and a new status. I think that the work being done by Parliament here is of tremendous help to the other institutions of the Community.

Mr Glinne (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group fully supports the

report by Mr Janssen van Raay on the withdrawal of Greenland from the EEC, and will therefore vote in favour of the resolution submitted to our Assembly.

As does the rapporteur, the Socialist Group deplores the result of the referendum of 23 February last; but we feel we must respect the democratic will of the people of Greenland, and in a spirit of friendship we wish to help ensure that this withdrawal can take place under the most favourable conditions; and so we fully approve of Paragraph 3 of the resolution, which recommends 'that the request by the Danish Government to grant associated status to Greenland be approved', the purpose of the association being to promote economic and social development in the countries and territories and to establish close economic relations between them and the Community as a whole. We hope that these relations will be fruitful, both for the Community countries and for Greenland. In our relations with Greenland, we intend to respect ancestral traditions and specific cultural values.

To conclude this brief speech, our colleague Finn Lyngé certainly being the most suitable person to comment on the report submitted to us and the reasons which led the people of Greenland to ask for withdrawal from the Community, I will repeat that we truly regret this decision, and that we share the Political Affairs Committee's fear that it may have harmful political and economic consequences, but we want to respect the democratically-expressed will of the majority of the people of Greenland. Once again, this is why we will vote in favour of the report by Mr Janssen van Raay.

Mr Jakobsen (PPE). — (DA) Mr President, I am very happy that my group has asked me to be their spokesman on this matter, and I am particularly happy to note that there is full agreement in my group to the effect that what is before us today does not constitute a Danish request for special treatment. We are not concerned today with Denmark's interests, even though Denmark's interests are much involved. The Danish Minister for Greenlandic Affairs is following the entire proceedings from the visitors' benches and, of course, we are interested; but, colleagues, you must not interpret that as a fresh example of Denmark seeking to secure a special status and to get something without giving something. I stress: it is an affair of the European Parliament. It is Parliament's good name and reputation which are at stake. It is not Denmark's name and reputation. It would be unfortunate if Parliament demonstrated — and I do not think that is what will happen — that it is difficult for a small population group such as that of Greenland to make its voice heard, that the interests of the big powers force the interests of the small countries into the background. I hope that the reverse will be the case today and that Parliament will follow the

Jakobsen

recommendations of Mr Janssen van Raay, who in an excellent report — one of the best I have seen in the ten years I have been a Member — has clearly stated the importance of meeting the request of the Danish Government. I hope that in this way we can put a stop to the Greenlandic and Danish fanatics who would like to exploit this issue. I also hope that we can count on a readiness among the responsible circles in Greenland, in return for the negotiating good-will we have encountered here, to show the same good-will in negotiations when major common issues are discussed at a later stage.

Mr Tyrrell (ED). — Mr President, we uphold the right of self-determination of all peoples. This is implicit in the preamble to the Treaty of Rome. If the people of Greenland wish to leave the Community, they can, of course, do so. But they are seeking OCT status. Here the first problem lies.

This is a status conferred only on non-European territories and only on those that have a special relationship with one of the Member States named in Article 131 of the Treaty. As a former colony of Denmark, Greenland would have qualified. At the time of the Treaty of Accession, however, it was an integral part of the Kingdom of Denmark, and so no Treaty amendment was then made. Now, however, a Treaty amendment would be necessary. That would require the agreement of the ten national parliaments of the Member States. Clearly the road towards withdrawal will be a long and difficult one.

I would like to underline that, as has been said by Mr Janssen van Raay in his excellent speech and by Commissioner Burke, no other part of Community territory qualifies for OCT status. This status confers special privileges. In particular, goods from those territories are exempt from import levies. To balance these privileges a number of OCT territories have been required to enter into agreements with the Community dealing with specific areas. In my view, the Community could not possibly confer OCT status on Greenland unless Greenland and Denmark entered into an agreement of that nature relating particularly to fishing.

Greenland's fishermen are Community fishermen, and today they reap all the benefits of the Community fishing policy. Since 1973, owing to membership of the Community, they have had a 200-mile exclusion zone. This zone is protected at Community expense, while 1 500 m ECU's have been provided by the EEC for surveillance. The last large East European factory fleets over-exploiting Greenland's waters have been excluded since 1977 through Community action. Since 1973, its fishing capacity has been expanded by EEC grants for 27 new vessels, 10 % of the fleet. Since 1973, Greenland has had free access to Community markets.

All this and more will be put at risk if Greenland goes. There is no way in which it can get unduly favourable terms on withdrawal — that is to say, unduly favourable having regard to its *per capita* income, which is higher than that of many Member States.

I conclude by saying: Let Greenland go, and let it go in friendship. Let it have OCT status, but let it not expect that this can happen without costly terms. I know it does not expect that.

President. — I now call Mrs Boserup to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mrs Boserup (COM). — (DA) Mr President, it should hardly be necessary, but for the sake of good order I will say that, in the Communist and Allies Group, we do not speak on each other's behalf. I therefore speak solely on behalf of the Danish Socialist People's Party, which elected me.

Greenland has now twice expressed the wish, through referenda, to withdraw from the European Community. The first time was in 1972, when it could not be done. The second time was after the achievement of home rule in 1982, so now it is high time we met Greenland's wishes. It is self-evident, and I cannot see how any democratic organization can oppose it. I also think that the Commission, the Council and the Janssen van Raay report favour it, and thus far I am also in agreement.

But when we look at what has happened since the second referendum, which was the important one, I must say that it seems to me the Commission has been very slow. It was a very long time before we received the Commission's memorandum on the subject. I do not know whether the Commission wanted history to go into reverse or something of the kind. At all events, it did not happen. And now negotiations are to take place, and we ask: under what conditions can these negotiations be conducted?

We were shocked in Denmark to hear the Danish Foreign Minister declare in the Folketing less than a week ago that West German fishermen were currently fishing illegally off Greenland. This is indeed a statement of some gravity, and I should very much like to know whether the Commission shares the view of the Danish Foreign Minister. The Danish Foreign Minister is, along with the rest of the Danish people, very much concerned to see the negotiations on OCT status linked to the current fisheries negotiations. Are the 5 000 tonnes of cod West Germany caught off West Greenland at the close of 1982 to be regarded as a precedent for what is called historical rights? This can hardly be the case. On that occasion, at least, the Danish people were told that it was not the case, and it was under those conditions that Denmark accepted the common fishery policy in January 1983. I hope to receive assurances that this continues to be the case,

Boserup

and that the fishing being pursued by West Germans off Greenland is not made legal by a roll-over ruling. We cannot expect the cordial and friendly negotiations on Greenland's withdrawal from the Community which we all desire, unless we have a clear statement that fishing rights are to be negotiated between the Community and Greenland as two equal partners — that is to say, that we start with a clean slate and that something will not suddenly be pulled out of the hat called 'historical rights', which in any case we have never heard of and nobody has told us about.

Greenland's withdrawal from the Community should not be made the focus of a power game — a power game which would force a small nation or a small people into paying too high a price for the independence it so earnestly desires. I should therefore very much like to have the Commission's answer on how the matter rests with regard to the cod-fishing which is currently taking place off West Greenland.

Mr von der Vring (S). — *(DE)* A point of procedure, Mr President. I find myself in a difficult situation. Mrs Boserup has just made an accusation against German fishermen to the effect — if I have understood correctly — that the Danish Foreign Minister informed the Lower House (Folketing) that German deep-sea fishermen had stolen 5 000 tonnes of cod last year. Mr President, would you kindly ask the Commission immediately to ...

President. — Sorry, that is not a point of order. It is a different point altogether.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, as most of the preceding speakers have done, I will say that we approach this debate on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group with a feeling of sadness, for certain members of the Community are going to leave us.

However, I would like to minimize the psychological effects of this withdrawal from the Community or of this request expressed by Greenland. If we compare the Greenlanders' opinions in 1972 and 1982, two dates on which they were able to express their views on this subject, we see that although 70 % were opposed to joining the Community in 1972, in 1982 only 52 % wanted to withdraw from it, which shows that the Community has succeeded in convincing a number of Greenlanders that it is advantageous to them.

Furthermore, I think one should beware of drawing inferences from this event. Greenland belongs to the North American continent; it is 60 kilometres from Canada, more than 4 000 kilometres from Copenhagen, and its population has a specific culture, different from ours, with desires other than our own. The Political Affairs Committee has expressed the fear that their withdrawal will set not only a legal but also

a political precedent, but I believe that we need feel no anxiety in this regard. We are dealing here with a very special desire in a similarly special setting.

Furthermore, since the Kingdom of Denmark has recognized the Greenlanders' right to self-determination and to a status other than that of the country as a whole, I do not see how we, as liberals, can oppose it. It would be paradoxical for the European Parliament, which has so often invoked the right to self-determination in other cases, to deny it today for one of its members.

We, as liberals, believe that one of the greatest qualities of the Community is the idea it fosters that the peoples joined together in it are bound voluntarily and by their own choice, and that they may dissolve this bond if they wish to do so — even though we naturally hope that they will not, for we believe that this Community is advantageous for all. What would a community be worth if it were no more than a legal bond artificially imposed on citizens who no longer felt themselves to be Europeans?

However, Denmark's request concerning the status of Greenland is a debatable issue. For our part, we do not believe that this associated-country status is incompatible with the current situation, and we even feel it would be paradoxical to grant it to countries which are in the position Greenland would be in if, in 1972, it had been in the same legal position as it holds today (home rule within the Kingdom of Denmark). We do not think that it can be penalized by this situation, and therefore we believe it should be granted this status on purely legal grounds.

At the same time, however, we feel it would be unnatural for it to find itself in a more favourable position with this new status upon leaving the Community, and so we fully approve of the formula finally accepted by the Legal Affairs Committee. Here I wish to thank Mr Janssen van Raay for the considerable amount of work he has performed, for it was no easy task in the Legal Affairs Committee — and I say this as its chairman — to find a legally acceptable position while also taking into account the political and humanitarian imperatives of this situation of Greenland — and I say 'humanitarian' because I believe this to be the important thing.

In voting for the proposal contained in this report as it has been presented to us — the Liberal and Democratic Group intends to support only two of the proposed amendments — I believe that Europe will demonstrate that it no longer seeks hegemony, that it acts according to democratic principles in accepting Denmark's proposal. At the same time, we naturally hope that the general principles of the Community will be respected and that this territory which is leaving it will not find itself in a better position than before, for in that case the Community itself would not make sense. Even so, we must take this opportu-

Veil

nity to further our friendly relations based on the respect of different cultures and on the awareness that there are still deep-rooted common interests to bind Greenland and the Community.

(*Applause*)

Mr Vie (DEP). — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to join in all the compliments paid to our colleague Mr Janssen van Raay for his excellent report. For someone who, like myself, comes into frequent contact with him in the Legal Affairs Committee, the qualities of this report cannot come as a surprise, but it is always pleasant to discuss a text which is concise, complete, and clearly presented. The subject was both delicate and complex, but our colleague was able to master it and restrict it to its legal implications alone: the political or economic aspects, though far from being negligible, are outside his province.

On the legal plane, no one can dispute the fact that Denmark has conducted itself irreproachably *vis-à-vis* the Community, but the case in point is in truth somewhat disturbing. Greenland is not an independent country: legal matters, foreign affairs and defence are still the responsibility of the Kingdom of Denmark. The Greenlanders retain their Danish citizenship, and when a Council of Foreign Ministers is held, the Danish minister represents the interests of Greenland.

This is true, but it is also true — the rapporteur does well to emphasize this in his explanatory statement — that a refusal on the basis of these reasons would be in legal contradiction with the principle mentioned by Mrs Veil a moment ago, that is, that we give priority to the right to self-determination for all peoples of the Community.

Therefore, although from the political viewpoint we can rightly deplore the diminution of Community territory, and although certain economic fears may emerge — the status requested for Greenland will give it advantages over its former status as a member of the Community — from the legal viewpoint it appears that the rapporteur is perfectly right and that it is impossible to come to a different conclusion.

It is to be hoped — as the Commission expressly indicates in its memorandum concerning its reservations on the issue — that a specific agreement will be established including a precise definition of the respective rights and obligations of Greenland, Denmark and the Community.

It would be well — and this shall be my only political remark in a debate that should remain purely legal — if every effort were made to keep Greenland closely connected with the European Community, strengthening the ties of security and defence which our Community rightly judges indispensable, even though this territory is far from Europe.

For these various reasons, my group and I fully support the Janssen van Raay report.

Mr Lyngø (S). — (*DA*) Mr President, over the four years I have sat in this Chamber, I have followed with the greatest interest the many motions for resolutions and debates concerned with the moral support which the European Communities have been able and willing to offer to countries of the Third World and to former colonies around the world. For four years I have witnessed the sense of responsibility this House has shown in its decisions on development problems and changes in political structures the world over, and I have been content until today, when Parliament is to give its opinion on the necessary structural change which is on the table before us, Greenland's transition from member status to that of an associated territory. This is a question of a highly special nature, and that has been demonstrated by both its treatment in committee and the present debate. And, if we are to go to the heart of the matter, we have to say that the point at issue is that the Community must now define its attitude to the idea of an Arctic policy.

The Arctic is an area of increasing importance and concern to all, from the geographic, strategic and resource-related points of view. Both the biological and the non-renewable resources of the Arctic increase in importance with each year that passes. The Arctic is also the homeland of a number of indigenous peoples, who are attracting an increasing amount of attention, and the Arctic is an area in which every aspect of the political process on a large and small scale fails to fit into the categories we apply at other places around the planet.

This at least emerges quite clearly when we look at the relationship between Greenland and the European Community. The Community is an agricultural and industrial community. Greenland has no agriculture and little industry. Fishing in the Community accounts for less than 1% of the combined gross domestic product. In Greenland, it is the very basis of our economy. In Europe hunting is a hobby, and catching seals and whales for food is totally unknown. For us, these forms of hunting and catching are a way of life.

Geographically and strategically, we are an American region not a European one. Following on from this, the Greenland of the future is already becoming discernible through increasing cooperation with its neighbours and natural allies, i. e., on the one hand the fishing nations of the North Atlantic and on the other the indigenous populations of Canada and Alaska. These interest-groups are, so to speak, political neighbours of the European Community, but they can never be integrated into the Community. That is clear to everybody. And neither can Greenland be integrated in any way which is at all natural.

Lynge

At the same time, it is important for the Community to maintain a positive and constructive relationship with the interest-groups which have grown up in the Arctic region. It is in effect becoming increasingly important with every year that passes, for the time has gone in which the Arctic could be administered simply as a satellite of the European power centres. The time has come for the Community to define its policy with respect to an Arctic which is pursuing its own development according to its own ideas. The time is now. Anyone with an eye for the great trends in history can see that a former European colony, closer to the North Pole than any other country in the world, with an indigenous population which is totally non European and with an economic structure which is totally unknown in Europe, that such a country and such a society would at some time or another request a redefinition of its relationship with the European Communities if, by a series of historical circumstances going against its democratically expressed will, it were to be incorporated as a member, as is the case with Greenland.

The approval by Parliament of Mr Janssen van Raay's forward-looking report will, in the history-books of the future, stand as the Community's first formal step on the road to defining its Arctic policy, a policy which aims fully to respect the right of even quite small nations to their own chosen future, to recognize that it is reasonable that even the Arctic peoples and nations should achieve political control over their own natural resources and finally, as far as possible, to promote positive, constructive relations between the Arctic societies.

As Greenlanders, we have through the Danish Government requested the status of association with the European Community, recognizing that, through our relationship with Denmark in the National Community (*Rigsfælleskab*), we have close links with Europe. Those are the facts of the matter. This request must be supported and applauded, for it gives Parliament the opportunity to take the first practical political step towards the definition of an Arctic policy for the European Community and to make it a positive and constructive step, for in essence Greenland's withdrawal from the circle of membership of the Community is not to be seen as some form of repudiation. It is not to be a showdown, a conflict between two adversaries. Friends and colleagues, Greenland is not an adversary! It is seeking a redefinition, a restructuring of the relationship between two allies, two politically like-minded parties to a model of cooperation which will be based more on the natural premises of both parties, the democratically-expressed basic attitudes of both parties. This cooperation between a small, emergent nation and a great Community rich in tradition, between the Arctic and the European, between the resource provider and the resource consumer, this cooperation in mutual respect for each other's entirely

different starting positions and situations is something that many of us in Greenland look forward to and will be happy to see established in a new, natural and constructive manner.

It has been a stimulating experience for me to have witnessed and taken part in the committee treatment of this question. The proceedings were conducted in an exemplary manner. Now there are many of us in this House who desire a large and clear majority for the motion for a resolution of the Legal Affairs Committee. Such a majority will be an expression of a realistic and worthy attitude and will rebound to Parliament's credit when the history of the Community comes to be written. I support Mr Janssen van Raay's report 100 % and recommend that you vote 'yes' to the motion for a resolution.

Mr Helms (PPE) — (DE) I am especially pleased to take the floor immediately after Finn Lynge, our colleague from Greenland. In committee, we have frequently taken up, in pleasant and fair discussion, the fisheries issue and also the fundamental positions to which he refers. I welcome the fact that this debate corresponds to the seriousness and importance of its subject; I feel that we can achieve a good result and a resolution which will do justice to the political considerations and conceptions.

For the first time in the Community's history, the European Parliament is dealing with a request for withdrawal by part of a Member State. This is a rare occurrence, one which brings in its wake a great deal of problems for the Community, and in grappling with them we must also take account of their effects. This began to emerge in the deliberations in, for example, the Political Affairs Committee. We are participating in this debate both as spokesmen of the political groups and of the Parliament as a whole and we have a collective responsibility for the entire Community and for every individual part and region thereof. Without doubt the Council and the Foreign Ministers have the ultimate responsibility of reaching agreements and of taking the necessary decisions prior to ratification by the Member States.

On behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, I would point out that we respect the decision of Greenland's citizens to seek withdrawal, albeit by a very narrow majority, as a democratic vote for self-determination and autonomy. As you are aware, Mr Lynge, my colleague Mr von Hassel and I spent five days in Greenland. Thanks to the hospitality of your home-rule government and the excellent support of the Danish Government, we were able to consult all political parties. I have no doubt that a good deal of Greenland's citizens are in favour of remaining in the Community.

Time considerations preclude me from touching upon the substance and the fundamental questions, but I would like to extend especial thanks to the Council

Helms

representative for the balanced way in which he presented the declarations and explanations and for his description of the positions taken up.

I consider it important that an equitable and durable agreement be concluded prior to the determination of Greenland's future status in relation to the Community, and I concur fully with Mr Lyngé that the fundamental issues should be decided beforehand in the appropriate bodies.

I have no doubt that, once this has been achieved, it will pave the way for a harmonious and durable agreement.

Mr Møller (ED). — *(DA)* Mr President, it is without any joy that I give my support to Mr Janssen van Raay's report. I am not happy that we have to take this decision, but I support it because I realize that the people of Greenland have taken their own decision by a majority vote and the general democratic principles which my group upholds compel us to bow before the result of this referendum, however small the majority may have been. I do not believe that this will be a happy outcome for the people of Greenland, and I am therefore disturbed over the decision we have to take. I do not believe that it is something the people of Greenland will be content with in the long term, but it is what they themselves want, and a man's desire is a man's delight, so to speak. Greenland has thus opted for OCT status, but the National Community relationship with Denmark continues, and the government Greenland has will still be the Danish government, which conducts Greenland's foreign policy and has responsibility for Greenland's security. Thus, nothing will change as regards our involvement in the Atlantic defence alliance.

It is very important for us Danes that this decision be taken now, and we therefore express the hope that it will be of benefit to Greenland. But it is important for us to make clear, Mr President, that something which may be of benefit to Greenland should not establish a precedent for others. For it is of course a major question — the minority is right on this point — whether part of a Member State can withdraw from the Community. That is what is happening here, and we cast our votes in favour, but we do so because we think that Greenland has quite special problems in relation to Europe. As has been pointed out by our colleague from Greenland — to whom we shall at some stage or other have to bid farewell, for he must leave this House and take on the status he desires — Greenland is ethnically not part of Europe, and geographically not part of Europe; but it is part of Denmark, and I wish to emphasize that. But because of the special ethnic and historical factors and geographical situation involved, this cannot establish a precedent for parts of other Member States which might decide that they would like the same arrangement as Greenland.

I will say to Mr Lyngé that I wish him luck and good fortune. May it all turn out according to his expectations and not as I fear!

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, although they have serious reservations about some of the wording of the motion for a resolution submitted to us, the French members of the Communist and Allies Group approve and will vote for the conclusions of the Legal Affairs Committee concerning the request by the Danish Government to grant OCT status to Greenland. In our opinion, there are no objections, whether legal or political.

We do not see — particularly in the case in point that there is anything to prevent a modification of the — Treaties if all the parties concerned are agreed that this modification should take place. From this viewpoint we do not at all share the somewhat timid view taken by the Political Affairs Committee that the Treaty of Rome lays down no procedure for Member States or their administrative dependencies to withdraw from the Community. On the contrary, I would say that there is nothing in the Treaty to prohibit such action.

The Danish Government or governments, whatever their political leanings, have never concealed the fact that they would not oppose a desire on the part of Greenland to request a review of the association of this territory with the Community if a majority of Greenlanders were to favour such a move. In 1982, such a majority expressed the wish to leave the Community. I make no judgments, for this is not my function. I have heard other colleagues say that they deplore this; I simply note that a majority has expressed such a wish. I also note that this democratic consultation took place under perfectly fair and legal conditions. I am not aware that there has been any sort of protest, either in Greenland or in Denmark.

While remaining a member of the Danish national community, Greenland, with the agreement of the Danish Government, is asking only for what has already been done for other non-European territories. This is the application, as has been repeatedly mentioned, of Article 131 of the Treaty of Rome. And I think it is well to insist on this expression 'non-European territory', which is quite clear and invalidates all possible speculation about non-continental European territories. We therefore welcome Greenland's desire to retain a privileged position in relation to the Community and believe that with a little wisdom certain economic problems, particularly those related to fishing can be solved in the interests of all the parties concerned.

For these reasons, and naturally depending upon the fate of certain amendments with which we do not at all agree, we will vote in favour of the report presented on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (*GR*) Mr President, on behalf of the Members who belong to the Communist Party of Greece, I wish to make the following observations.

Firstly, we agree with Mr Janssen van Raay's motion for a resolution which accepts the position of the Danish Government as a whole, both on the withdrawal of Greenland from the European Communities and on the granting to it of OCT status, since this is also the wish of the people of Greenland.

Secondly, we consider the positions taken by the Political Affairs Committee to be motivated by the spirit of colonialism because, on the pretext that the Treaty of Rome envisages no procedure for withdrawal, these make as if to ignore the express wish of the people of Greenland and amount to unwarranted interference in their internal affairs. However, it is self-evident that the right of withdrawal does not presuppose the acquiescence of the partners, all the more so in an organization for economic cooperation such as the EEC. This right is founded on the principle of international law concerning the self-determination of peoples, which is recognized in the United Nations Charter and in a multitude of other international legal texts.

The matter we are now debating is of importance, because indirectly it concerns other countries as well. We should not forget that in this House there are dozens of Members who belong to the Communist Party of Greece, to PASOK, to the Danish Movement against the EEC, to the Danish Popular Socialist Party and to the British Labour Party and who have a popular mandate for the withdrawal of their countries from the EEC irrespective, of course, of how faithful each one of them is to this popular mandate.

Thirdly, I would like to make a political point. The withdrawal of Greenland puts an end to the expedient and fatalistic assumption, also propagated in our country, that the road to membership of the EEC is a road of no return. The Greek Government ought to have drawn the necessary swift conclusions from the precedent of Greenland and from the firm attitude of the Danish Government. With a policy along similar lines, it would have been able to avoid the deadlock, the backtracking and the concessions of the Greek memorandum. However, instead of holding a referendum, as in the case of Greenland, it went ahead with the ratification of the unacceptable Treaty of Accession which had been signed by the Right.

Finally, we must emphasize that, as in the case of Greenland, and commensurately speaking, of course, the demand by the Communist Party of Greece for the withdrawal of Greece from the EEC does not betoken hostility towards the other member countries of the EEC. On the contrary, it is the primary condition for real cooperation on the basis of equality and mutual benefit, which could take the form of agree-

ments with the EEC as a whole but remain free from the stifling Community framework, which is gravely undermining our national independence, the sovereignty of the people and the future development of our country.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting-time.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.5 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MRS DE MARCH

Vice-President

7. Council Statement on the 1984 elections

President. — The next item is a statement by the Council on the date of the 1984 elections to the European Parliament and on the right to vote.

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — (*DE*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, at a meeting of a delegation of the European Parliament and the Council on 25 April 1983, the presidency outlined the progress made by the Council on the draft text on the electoral procedure approved by Parliament on 10 March 1982. At the end of the following discussion, an appeal was made for the adoption of a declaration on the voting rights of citizens of Member States residing in another Member State. Since then, the European Parliament has adopted an opinion on the polling date for the forthcoming elections.

Having regard to the wishes expressed by Parliament and the position adopted by it, the Council adopted the following declaration on 25 May 1983 :

- 1) After hearing the European Parliament, the Council has set the polling date for the next elections to the European Parliament at 14-17 June 1984 ;
- 2) The Council welcomes the fact that the peoples of the states united in the Community will next year be electing their representatives to the European Parliament for the second time in universal, free and direct elections ;
- 3) As with the first elections in 1979, the forthcoming elections will be conducted in accordance with the democratic procedure of the individual Member States. The task enshrined in the Treaties establishing the European Communities of introducing a single electoral procedure for use in all Member States remains, however, of essential importance. For this purpose, the European Parliament has, as provided for in the Treaties, presented a proposal. The Council intends to pursue its efforts with a view to ensuring a common electoral system for the elections of 1989.

Mertes

- 4) The Council appeals to the citizens of Member States of the Community to demonstrate their interest in the European unification process by taking an active part in these elections. It takes cognizance of the fact that the national legal provisions of Member States entitle the great majority of citizens residing in the Community but not in their homeland to take part in the coming elections. The Member States are working together to facilitate the exercise of the right to vote.
- 5) As part of the European integration process, the Council appeals to the Member States to make every effort to ensure the right of all citizens of Member States, either in their country of origin or in their country of residence, to take part in elections to the European Parliament.

We are still one year from the next elections. I hope both Parliament and Council will use that period to work together to attain the goal we are all striving for and will spare no effort to achieve an ever-closer union of the peoples of Europe.

President. — Pursuant to Rule 40 of the Rules of Procedure, this statement by the Council may now be followed by a brief debate of thirty minutes at the most.

Lord Douro (ED). — Madam President, on behalf of my group I would like to welcome the Council's agreement to the June date for the European elections in 1984.

We believe that any confusion that may have been created could have been avoided if the Council had consulted Parliament earlier, but, nevertheless, we are grateful that the Council has agreed to this new date which was proposed virtually unanimously by Parliament.

We would also like to suggest to the Council that the date for the 1989 European elections should be agreed between the Council and Parliament at a much earlier stage than on this occasion, i.e. only one year before the election. If we do agree a date with a number of years still to go, we shall have less difficulty with public holidays in certain Member States and other such circumstances which have arisen in this case and have made the choosing of a date really rather difficult.

I was very pleased to hear the apparent agreement within the Council that all EEC citizens who are resident in the Community should have a chance to vote in the next European election. We very much hope, in this group, that the governments of all the Member States will legislate in the course of the next few months — and it will be necessary to do this in the course of the next few months — to ensure that every citizen of the Community, living in the Community,

does have a chance to vote in the elections to the Community's Parliament.

As I say, Madam President, we broadly welcome the Council's statement and we believe it important on this occasion, as on other occasions, that the Council makes a statement in this Chamber and that Members of Parliament should have a right to question and comment on the statement just made.

Mr Bangemann (L). — *(DE)* Madam President, my group congratulates the Council on its wisdom in adopting Parliament's suggestion. It would do well to show this wisdom more often and on bigger issues. As far as the polling date is concerned allow me, on behalf of my group, to reiterate our satisfaction with the Council's decision.

(The speaker continued in English)

As to the questions linked to the electoral system — and it is not by chance that I am now switching to the English language, Madam President — I regret to say that I am not in the same position.

Everybody knows in this House that the agreement on a common electoral law was not possible because the British Government was opposing the system of proportional representation.

(Cries of 'Other governments too!')

No, that is unlikely, because every other Member State is using the system of proportional representation for the European elections at least.

I am very dissatisfied about that position because, as you know, perhaps the result of the British elections on 9 June will prove that a party which comes second where the number of votes is concerned might only come third and that there is no proportion between the number of votes received and the number of seats won. There may be some to defend that on a national level — and I do not want to concentrate my considerations on the national level — but any argument at European level is completely wrong. We do not have to vote for a government here. In this European Parliament we must express the views of all voters who participate in elections. Therefore, it might have been wiser for the British Government — and even some of our British colleagues were of the same opinion as the Liberal and other groups — to accept a proportional representation system for the European elections. If that had been the outcome, that would also have been a step forward to European unity. After all, European unity lies also in the basic laws on which we are living together. One of the most basic laws for parliaments and parliamentarians in the European Community is a common electoral law. I and my group would have preferred even to hear of a change in the date but to have the assurance of the Council that a common electoral law was possible. This is, unfortunately, not the case.

Bangemann

I do not blame some of my colleagues in the Conservative Group here in Parliament, but I must tell you that this reluctance on the part of the British Government was not a step forward to the unity of Europe.

(Applause)

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, I should like to know how the procedure which has just taken place can be reconciled with our Rules of Procedure. Rule 40(2), to which you refer, reads as follows :

Unless Parliament decides otherwise, such a statement shall not be followed by a debate. Members may, however, avail themselves of a period of thirty minutes in which to put brief and concise questions with a view to clarifying specific points in such statements.

No debate figures on the agenda. Am I, therefore, to conclude that it has not been decided on and that, in conformity with Rule 40(2), only brief and concise questions may be asked ?

President. — I am sorry, but I proposed to the House just now that we apply Rule 40 so as to allow the Council statement to be followed by a number of explanations by Members and by political groups.

We have already heard two political groups ; we shall now hear the Group of Non-attached Members and then the EPP Group. Thus we shall have an entirely correct application of Rule 40.

Mr Pasmazoglou (NI). — *(GR)* Madam President, I too would like to welcome the statement on the 1984 elections by the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers. I should like to take this opportunity of asking whether the Council of Ministers also deems it necessary to include in the general rules and guidelines for the holding of these elections the following principle which, I believe, is in force in all of our countries and is of particular importance for the European Parliament. I mean, Madam President, the opportunity for all the issues in these elections to be given presentation by the mass media on an equal basis — on an equal basis, I stress — for all of the political parties taking part in the 1984 elections. I think that for the European Community this is a basic matter of principle which will serve to underscore the democratic process which prevails in our countries and in the European Community itself.

I want to emphasize the three reasons in particular why this is important.

The first centres on the need for simple proportionality — which is, I believe, the system generally accepted in the European Community — to be accompanied by equal presentation of the views of all the parties by the mass media. This constitutes a basic principle of democracy.

The second reason concerns the need for the work of the European Parliament and of the European Community to be given full and accurate presentation, something which does not happen everywhere.

The third reason concerns the need for the positions of the various parties to be made clear to the electors.

Madam President, if this is done — and I ask the President-in-Office of the Council whether he thinks that it should be cleared up by the Council of Ministers — the European Parliament will, I believe, become more vigorously representative and as a result will carry greater political weight in the European Community and in world affairs.

Mrs Maccocchi (S). — *(IT)* I would like to insist on the explanation given by Mr Sieglerschmidt. We have already said that there is no reason to hold a debate after a statement by the Council. Time is precious ; please let us not waste it.

President. — Thank you, Mrs Maccocchi. I wish to remind the House of what was decided yesterday in plenary sitting — that is to say, that at 3 p.m. there should be a declaration by the Council on the 1984 elections, which would *not* be followed by a debate. Following a remark made by Sir Fred Catherwood, on behalf of the ED Group, it was pointed out that Rule 40(2) of the Rules of procedure would be applied normally. This is what we are in the process of doing, and no time is being wasted.

Mr Barbi (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, I really do not understand why our colleagues from the Socialist Group do not want us to express our opinion on this communication from the Council. Personally, I have no reason to be particularly pleased with it.

The Council has fixed the date. This was an unquestionable duty ; if it had failed to do so, it would have been guilty of a real *coup de main* against the European Parliament and against the peoples of our ten countries. Therefore the Council has done its bounden duty. From our viewpoint, however, we have no particular reason to be pleased because it did do its duty. It did nothing else, although it had given Parliament the task of drawing up a common electoral law. Parliament performed this task with great realism and a keen sense of responsibility. The Council was unable to accept even a part of what Parliament had proposed.

At this I express the great disappointment of my group, and I agree with all that Mr Bangemann said in this regard a moment ago. The Council hopes that all the States will make it possible for the European electors to vote wherever they are. Let us hope that this will be the case. I know that the Belgian Parliament has just recently launched a bill to this effect. I hope that the other governments and the other national parliaments will do the same. There are millions of European citizens who will be away from their native

Barbi

countries when the European elections are held. The Member States have a duty to these millions of electors to guarantee equal voting conditions. I hope this will be done.

(Applause)

Mr Patterson (ED). — Madam President, I have to point out to you first that Sir Fred Catherwood, in the name of my group, did ask for short, sharp, concise questions to the Council, and it is indeed questions to the Council I wish to ask.

The first one — and I am sorry Mr Bangemann is not here — is to ask the President-in-Office to confirm that more than one government was in disagreement with the system proposed by this Parliament. Could the Council please tell us how many governments were against the system of regional lists proposed by this Parliament?

Secondly, to point out to Mr Bangemann — who, I say again, I am sorry has disappeared — that my group voted in favour of proportional representation. It is just that we voted for a different and, in my estimation, a better system, the system of additional members, and just because we voted for a different and better system — the German system — I refuse to have my group accused of being against proportional representation.

My final question is again to the Council. He said — and I am glad — that all citizens should be able to participate in the elections. Would he please give us some indication as to the balance of opinion in the Council between the two solutions to this problem — one that voters should be able to vote on the basis of residence and the other on the basis of nationality? What was the balance of opinion in the Council on those two principles, and how far does he believe that a solution can be reached at least in time for the next elections but one?

Mr Kyrkos (COM). — *(GR)* Madam President, we have listened carefully to the statement by the President-in-Office.

In actual fact, the only point of importance in it was the fixing of the date of the elections. As a Parliament we have failed to settle on a definite electoral system, mainly because of opposition from our British colleagues; but perhaps this is better than opting for a two- or three-headed monster of a system such as the one which, unfortunately, is in use in our country.

With regard to the appeal by the representative of the Council to European voters to turn out and cast their votes in the elections, we must say that getting the voters to turn out is not a question of addressing an appeal. It depends on what policy we pursue until then to affirm in the minds of our peoples that it is worth their while to turn out. I would say also that, in our endeavours concerning both social problems and the major issue of peace, we must place ourselves

alongside the people of Europe in their struggles so as to give our Parliament greater credence.

As far as other things are concerned, we endorse Mr. Pasmazoglou's comments on the need for all political groups and parties to be accorded the opportunity to set out their programmes on radio and television with complete facility and total equality in order for us to be able to assert the usefulness of our role through these means of communication.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — *(GR)* The only question I want to put — and I would request a clear reply from the President-in-Office of the Council — is whether, in the election battle due to take place, there will be any form of direct or indirect interference by the institutions of the Community or by the Community as a whole, or whether the struggle, the rivalry, the electoral competition will be conducted freely by those forces vested with this right, by the political forces of each country, that is. All the more so because the eventuality of such interference has been discussed in this Chamber, and indeed a charge has been laid by a colleague in the British Labour Party that such meddling by the Community has already occurred and that there is a likelihood of further interference in the election struggle in the form of special fundings and publications, etc. This struggle must only be conducted by the political forces of each country: otherwise, the institutions of the Community will be meddling in matters that do not concern them, and this will constitute a blatant interference in the sovereign affairs of the peoples of Europe.

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(DE)* Madam President, I would like to address myself individually to the statements voiced and the questions asked.

Lord Douro, thank you for your words of appreciation. In general, it is an exalting feeling for the presidency to find, for the most part, only words of appreciation and thanks being bestowed on it.

All the more reason for noting where the congratulations stop and seeking consolation in the proverb, better late than never. Of course it can be done better in future, and I shall follow your good advice. From my school days I recall having learnt in religious instruction that a good intention is the better part of contrition.

This brings me to Mr Bangemann. I fully appreciate the emphatic words of felicitation on the Council's wisdom, coming from such a personality. The collective good intentions of the Council underwrite the future translation of such good intentions in action.

Mr Pasmazoglou, too, had some words of appreciation for the Council's decision. He followed this with some questions addressed to me, of which the first concerned the possibility of rallying popular support for the European Parliament and for Community

Mertes

policy, through advertising campaigns in the mass media. I would answer him as follows: We ourselves recognize that the forthcoming elections to the European Parliament in 1984 call for an active participation of the mass media. The Council presidency has already set the necessary machinery in motion. We have proposed an agreement between television and radio networks throughout the Community to broadcast special programmes in advance of the elections which would cover the elections and the right to vote, more particularly that of Community citizens residing in a Member State other than their own. The latter aspect is of considerable importance in my own country.

The second question was somewhat similar to the first. I can only reiterate that the Council shares this view fully and is even undertaking initiatives. As to what you say about the European Parliament counting for more, politically, with our citizens, I can only say that the realization of this aim is behind what I said just now about the need to bring in the mass media.

Mr Barbi had some very warm and vividly appreciative remarks to make. While expressing my gratitude, I would repeat that it is a great experience for me on behalf of the Council to be on the receiving end, concerning one point at least, of almost exclusively complimentary remarks from Parliament.

Now to Mr Patterson. The European countries have decided as follows: 8 were in favour of proportional representation, one was against, and one was in favour of a transitional system using the single transferable vote. I assume you can guess which countries I have in mind.

I particularly welcome Mr Kyrkos's remarks on the importance of the European Parliament. He feels it incumbent upon Parliament to deal with the great issues of our time. I would remind him that I have had occasion, on behalf of the Council, to address this Assembly on the observance of human rights, which made a considerable impression on public opinion in the Federal Republic and in the Community at large. I concur with him fully that respect for human rights is one of the key elements of true peace in our time.

In January I had the honour of addressing Parliament, on behalf of the Council, as a follow-up to Mr Haagerup's report on security in the Community. Once again I would say that this debate was very useful. It highlighted the limits on a specifically Community security policy but also the duties which accrue from the special position of Europe. As you see, Mr Kyrkos, the Council has shown every respect for the Parliament, and it has already implemented the widening of the range of subjects which you call for.

(Interjection from Mr Schinzel: 'You should now follow it up with action!')

In reply to that interjection, I would point out that we are taking very practical measures to ensure the obser-

vance of human rights wherever necessary. As I said at the time, 60 000 refugees from Chile are 60 000 too many, and 3 million refugees from Afghanistan are also 3 million too many. Such was the clarity of my statement at the time.

I recently had occasion to refer to Hermann Goering's answer at the Nuremberg war trials, that no one had the right to meddle with the then German Reich's internal sovereignty and existing laws. I pointed out that such an excuse for violations of human rights is no longer possible today. So all this has been referred to in by no means vague terms in this very Assembly.

I now turn to Mr Ephremidis and the forthcoming electoral campaign; I can only say that the European Community has no intention whatever of meddling with the political autonomy of the groups which make up this Parliament. The sole measure envisaged — and it is one which ought to serve everyone's interests — is providing the wherewithal to finance a non-partisan information campaign on the function and purpose of the European Parliament.

The value of this Parliament, as of our national parliaments, is our commitment to constitutional democracy, which is also the cornerstone of our Community. There is no reason to believe that causes and tendencies could gain ground which were in any way comparable to the conditions prevailing in Eastern Europe.

President. — The debate is closed.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, following your criticism of my point of order, I have once again consulted the Minutes of Proceedings. On this matter it states:

Following a remark made by Sir Fred Catherwood, on behalf of the ED Group, it was pointed out that Rule 40 (2) ... would be applied normally.

I stress the word 'normally' for the terms of Rule 40(2) refer to 'brief and concise questions'. There is no decision by Parliament to set aside 30 minutes for a debate — witness the Minutes of Proceedings and the Agenda, which naturally and quite logically does not mention a debate. I point out, therefore, that inasmuch as there were no brief and concise questions, the observations made by fellow-Members — to put it cautiously — were beyond the scope of the Rules of Procedure, all of which presented the Socialist Group with a dilemma for, having correctly interpreted the Rules of Procedure, we were not prepared for a debate.

President. — I think that Members have, by putting questions pursuant to Rule 40(2), been able to clarify a number of points contained in the Council statement. During this part of the plenary sitting, therefore, this rule has indeed been respected.

Mr Patterson (ED). — Madam President, I wanted to support Mr Sieglerschmidt. It does say concise ques-

Patterson

tions, and to add insult to injury, when I put concise questions I did not get any answers I asked a specific question about the principle of residence or the principle of nationality, and I got no answer to the question. I say no more now because the President has disappeared, but next time this happens can we please have it absolutely clear that we are going to ask questions and we expect answers?

Mrs Boserup (COM) — (DA) Madam President, just one short question, This morning I put a concrete question to the Commission in connection with the negotiations on Greenland. I should like now to hear from the Commission specifically that it does not intend to give me an answer. I gather that this is the case, since we are now passing on to Mrs Macciocchi's report.

8. *Right to vote and stand for election*

President — The next item is the report by Mrs Macciocchi, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on the right of citizens of a Member State residing in a Member State other than their own to stand for and vote in local elections (Doc. 1-121/83).

Mrs Macciocchi (S), rapporteur. — (IT) I would like to say that this is not the first time we have dealt with a problem similar to that which I am presenting on behalf of the Committee on Legal Affairs: that is, the problem of the right of citizens of the ten Member States of the Community residing in a Member State other than their own to vote and stand for election. It is not a question of voting in parliamentary elections — we have already clarified this both in the report and in our committee discussions but of voting at the lowest level, that of the local administration of the town or village where an emigrant citizen of the Community has taken up residence.

I said that this was not the first time we have dealt with this problem, because it has been with us for ten years, ever since the Paris Summit of 1974. On 16 November 1977, Mr Scelba presented us with a motion for a resolution on this subject, and the Round Table on special rights was held; thence came the conclusion that these special rights occupy a specific place in Community legal matters, and this in turn gave rise to a multitude of questions. The Council, however, has always been somewhat laconic in this regard over these last ten years, and the question of the voting rights of citizens residing in a Member State other than their own has always been left unresolved.

Today we have an encouraging sign: after long debates in the Legal Affairs Committee, we were able to agree on at least two interesting conclusions: first, we believe that the conditions are fulfilled for the application, in the case in point, of Article 235 of the Treaty, which says:

If action by the Community should prove necessary to attain, in the course of the operation of the common market, one of the objectives of the Community and this Treaty has not provided the necessary powers, the Council shall, acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the Assembly, take the appropriate measures.

The interpretation of the preamble to the treaties is also a source of optimism. The right to vote and stand for election at the local level corresponds to the principles expressed in the texts: the constant improvement of the living and working conditions of the peoples; the elimination of obstacles to the free movement of citizens among Member States, and, more generally, the desire to 'lay the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe'.

We agree on these two points both in the Legal Affairs Committee and in the Political Affairs Committee, which has sent us a very favourable opinion specifying, however, that this applies exclusively to local and municipal elections and in no way to political elections. This was not our intention, in any case, and nothing of the sort is contemplated in this report, as they can see for themselves. We are pleased that the document of the Political Affairs Committee exactly corresponds to the decision made ten years ago by certain prominent political figures in this Parliament before it was elected by universal suffrage.

Are we to move backward? This would be scandalous, from a political viewpoint, since we were elected by direct suffrage for the first time, and we are already discussing the 1984 elections for the future parliament.

What, then, is worrying us today? It is that we have not yet been able to determine how this right — and the legal basis for considering it as such does exist — can be embodied in a decision. In the course of the discussions held in the Legal Affairs Committee, we took two approaches — I mention this as rapporteur — which I would qualify as minority ones: part of the Legal Affairs Committee, for example, thought that the problem was a valid one, but that because of the difficulty in obtaining quick results — for the Commission is moving at a snail's pace and no rapid conclusions appear to be possible — it would be better for the present to turn our attention to other and equally urgent problems.

It has also been said that those who claim the right to vote in local elections have only to take out citizenship in another country. This seems abnormal to me, for if someone wants to vote in the commune of Saint-Denis, I do not think he should have to give up his Italian citizenship, and *vice versa* if he wants to vote in the commune of Cerignola.

Macciocchi

Someone expressed the fear that this would lead to double voting, which we are unable to check — that is, that a worker or emigrant citizen might vote in a certain commune in France or Germany and then in another commune in Italy or, in the future, Spain. I don't think this argument merits serious consideration. Already, at least in Italy, we have great difficulty in enabling workers residing abroad to return to vote in the political elections. How can we imagine that a worker will travel from one place in Europe to another to cast a second vote at the local level? This is an important human and social question, and as such I permit myself to emphasize it before Parliament. We are faced with the human problem of a group of citizens which includes not only manual workers but intellectual workers as well. I can mention my own case here. I was an intellectual emigrant worker: so am I still to some extent when I work in France. For years I have been paying taxes to the French government; for years I have been living in a certain neighbourhood and paying local rates in France, but I have absolutely no rights. I am a sort of European foreigner for life: an Italian citizen who, working elsewhere, has no right to speak on the simplest local problems concerning the place where she resides. Imagine parents who want to present their views, not on any great theosophical question, but on the problem of the local school, the operation of the local nursery school, the streets, refuse removal — on even the smallest problems which nevertheless have a far from negligible effect on family life. They can have a voice in these affairs only if they can vote at the municipal level, only if they can find a weapon of their own: that of the democratic vote.

I am convinced that none of us thinks of these citizens as second-class beings. At this point I will mention other arguments raised by another minority in the Legal Affairs Committee, which strongly urged me to emphasize the need to consider those who come from other countries in Europe not as migrating herds, but as people. Let us remember that we are concerned with human rights, with human rights in the world, and that we take pride in this.

Furthermore, the problem has already been solved in some of our European countries. The arguments which some people use to oppose these proposals by the Legal Affairs Committee have already been proved futile in Denmark. The right to vote and stand for election already exists for all non-Danish citizens; it is enough to be 18 years of age and have resided in Denmark for at least three years. In Ireland, the right to vote and stand for election exists for all foreigners after a residency of at least 6 months. In Holland, the constitutional obstacles have been eliminated and a new law is being prepared which should become applicable in 1986. I emphasize all this in order to demonstrate how certain countries have already taken steps in this direction without having suffered any unpleasant or disturbing consequences. They have eliminated all

traces or racialism or chauvinism as found not only in the larger context of northern and southern Europe but also within a single country, as in Italy, for example, where the southerner is still considered inferior to the northerner.

It is greatly in our interest to repeat that we have restricted the vote to citizens of the ten Member States. During the discussion in Committee, a minority also suggested that the Commission should present to Parliament a proposal for the recognition of the right to vote and stand for election at the local level for citizens residing in a Member State other than their own, and this before the end of 1983. The Commission, after having consulted the Council in accordance with Article 235, should then reappear before Parliament to give us the elements and the basis for the recognition of this right.

These are more or less the terms in which the discussion proceeded in the Legal Affairs Committee and developed in the Political Affairs Committee. I repeat that it has been ten years since this problem was first raised, and it was done then with greater decision and vehemence than we, discouraged as we sometimes are, can muster today. We should realize, however, that this is at least a first step toward the recognition of human rights in the European Community, not in the rest of the world. The rapporteur is convinced that the Commission, in conformity with the rôle assigned to it by the Treaty, will be able to draw up this proposal in a relatively short time.

This is the view of the committee, but there are also important amendments which I consider very relevant. These will be discussed today.

In conclusion, we are all agreed that such a proposal should be presented to Parliament by the Commission after the necessary consultations, especially as the Commission in the course of the discussion in the Legal Affairs Committee, appeared to welcome such a step, almost going so far as to urge us to embody this problem in the form of a proposal to be presented within a few months upon the formal request of Parliament.

In any event, from a more general viewpoint the rapporteur wishes to state — as indicated in the report I am presenting on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee — the conviction that...

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

(FR) I am about to conclude, Madam President.

I said to the President-in-Office of the Council that the 1984 elections are approaching and that there is talk of using television and other media to provide publicity for the European Parliament. I think that the best advertisement for this Parliament is action and that the report I am presenting now, which is very modest but which demonstrates our good will, is a very useful example.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — *(DE)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the right of citizens of a Member State residing in a Member State other than their own to take part in local elections is by no means a revolutionary demand. As the rapporteur himself has stated, the European Council, nearly ten years ago, declared itself in favour of such a principle. It commissioned a working-group, and we all know the fate which normally befalls such high-level think-tanks. It all came to naught. Now the Commission must immediately present a proposal for introducing communal electoral rights for these citizens in order to preclude recourse by the Council to the excuse that it has nothing to decide on.

Should the European Parliament fail to seize the initiative in time — and that means today in this sitting — it will lose credit in the eyes of those who put the Community into practice — citizens who, sometimes together with their families, reside in a Member State other than their own. Electoral rights must be Europeanized from two sides at once. We have to approach the subject from the highest level — there was talk of this just now in connection with the Council declaration on voting-rights for elections to this Parliament, and it may also be the subject, in a special connection, of further discussion tomorrow during the urgent and topical debate — but this Europeanization must also be applied at the lowest level, that is, electoral rights in local elections, and there are good reasons for this. Residents of a local community, whether or not nationals of the Member State in which it is situated, ought to have a say in matters which directly affect their lives. They don't have to be citizens of the country where they live. All residents — I repeat, all — should have a voice in matters which concern them. Several countries, amongst them a number of Community Member States, already grant electoral rights to all residents in local elections. However, particularly in the case of Community citizens, whose status, when residing in another Member State, is already strongly assimilated to that of the local population, the absurdity of depriving them of electoral rights in local elections is manifest.

The Socialist Group has tabled an amendment to restore the rapporteur's original text, which is excellent. I am pleased to see that quite a number of other amendments have been tabled with much the same object. Should the House adopt this report from the Legal Affairs Committee in its present form — and I hope it will not — then it would be adopting a document of national timidity and a sham. We Socialists will not go along with this. We shall vote for the motion only if the rapporteur's original version has been restored.

(Applause)

Mr Malangré (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, fellow Members, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democrats), I support

the report as adopted by the Legal Affairs Committee. We welcome its trend towards that goal which we have proclaimed since the very beginning — a political union of European states. Neither my group nor the Legal Affairs Committee underestimate the difficulties which at present beset this question of electoral rights and which have been impressively listed on page 13 of the report. These difficulties are quite imposing. They embrace the very varied powers vested in local self-government according to the Member State in question: they reflect the differing view in the various Member States as to what should even be taken as the local authority level; and they highlight the constitutional link between electoral rights and citizenship, to name but some of the problems. Real progress can only be made when we entrust the Commission with the task of informing us on the present state of their efforts with a view to taking the necessary measures in orderly, regular fashion and with an eye to the future. I feel it my duty to warn against a desire, however understandable to take the fourth or fifth step now instead of the step which is next in order of feasibility. I would warn against kindling premature expectations in the Community's citizens which will perhaps be dashed, adding yet another unfulfilled promise to the existing litany.

The report adopted in the Legal Affairs Committee calls for what is realistically attainable. We welcome its aim and the consistency of its approach. The amendments aiming for more run the risk of having to be satisfied with less and of underestimating the realism of the House. What we are primarily concerned to do is precisely to dispel any doubts about our determination to push for political union. We can only remove the obstacles along the way when we recognize them and take stock of them. And such is the tenure of the report. In the wake of that report we can get down to honest work and avoid any spectacular flash-in-the-pan.

Thus we support the report and reject the amendments which seek to modify the Legal Affairs Committee's motion for a resolution.

Mr Tyrrell (ED). — Madam President, my group agrees with the attitude of the two motions for resolutions annexed to Mrs Macciocchi's report. Citizens of one Member State who, making use of the rights bestowed on them under the Treaty, go to reside in another Member State should have the right to vote in local elections in that state. This should be an example of the special quality of relationships within the Community. That special quality leads to special rights, special rights that have been talked about since the Paris Summit of 1974 but have never yet materialized. Nowhere is this right more obviously needed than amongst our own Community staff, who, serving the Community as a whole as they do, usually in Member States other than their own, nevertheless find themselves unable to participate in the local government of the area where they live.

Tyrrell

The first question is whether or not this is a fit subject for a directive. The Legal Affairs Committee thought that it was, under Article 235. The Commission, attending the committee meeting, agreed with that. Any misgivings one may have had were allayed by the thought that this required unanimity in the Council. Nevertheless, the Legal Affairs Committee said: go slowly! The Commission should merely report progress. Mr Malangré has given the reasons for that this afternoon. I am afraid I disagree. I think that we should go faster. I think that we *should* have a proposal. Of course there are many difficulties, but a proposal would highlight those difficulties and might therefore show the way in which they could be overcome.

Now there are seven amendments down to Mrs Macciocchi's report, and they all come to the same thing namely, that we should have a proposal from the Commission this year. At the moment we have given the Commission no guidance as to how the many difficulties set out in Mrs Macciocchi's report might be overcome. If they give us a proposal, however, we will then help them get over the difficulties that that proposal discloses.

My group would ask you to vote for one or other of these amendments and ask the Commission to produce an early proposal, and we shall support the report thus amended.

Mr D'Angelosante (COM). — *(IT)* Madam President, the Italian members of the Communist and Allies Group will vote in favour of the Macciocchi report in the terms in which its author presented it. We therefore return to the original text, which was changed for the worse, in our opinion, by the Legal Affairs Committee with the Malangré amendment.

I believe that no one (not even Mr Malangré, although he made an effort to do so) can dispute the justice of this need, which, moreover, is nothing new, since in 1977 Parliament participated in the elaboration of the position approved by the 1974 Summit on special rights, as just mentioned by Mr Tyrrell. Everyone knows that special rights make it possible to study in one's native language and, in addition, to participate in local elections. I repeat that we asked for this in 1977. If now, after six years, we do no more than ask to be told what progress has been made, this might mean, Mr Malangré, that we had changed our minds, and it might give the impression that we mean to repudiate what we affirmed in 1977.

I am certainly convinced that not even Mr Malangré would wish for this. We ask that the Commission present proposals to us on this matter before the end of the year. I don't think this is asking too much — on the contrary, it is too little! For these reasons, I join with Mr Tyrrell in requesting the Assembly to approve one of the amendments intended to restore

Mrs Macciocchi's text to its original state. I repeat: none of the objections raised has any foundation; besides, the rapporteur has provided exhaustive answers to them.

Finally, I would like to touch on the fear of the so-called 'double vote', that is, the risk that some one might, in the same elections, vote both in his native country and in his country of residence. In elections to the European Parliament there is absolutely no danger of this. The local elections in a French or Italian village are completely different, and those who raise objections of this sort know nothing of the matter. I therefore urge that Mrs Macciocchi's modified text be approved.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I am a little confused about the manner in which we are approaching this subject.

For once we have the chance to debate an issue which concerns the personal lives, the rights, of citizens or some of them and to demonstrate to them that they are really nationals of a Community to which they belong, and not merely nationals of one country or another.

The Legal Affairs Committee discussed a text which now comes to the House completely denatured and modified. After the dialogue initiated — can one call this a dialogue? — in any case, after the requests addressed to the Council and the undertakings made by this latter some ten years ago, we had hoped finally to be able to decide on this question of the vote of Community nationals at the local level. However, nothing has been done. The Legal Affairs Committee has proceeded on the basis of two resolutions, and the plenary sitting has now to deal with them.

In these circumstances, I fear that at a time when we are the most vocal on the subject of European goals, when we continually speak of the obligation to make use of cultural and social as well as economic ties to build our Community, when we say that this Community calls for establishing a European Union, we refuse to act on these convictions even at the lowest level. On a very modest scale, it is simply a matter of participation in local elections, to help ensure that local administrative units are run according to the wishes of all those who live in the Community and who are part of it. There should be no confusion here: this text is addressed to Community nationals and not to immigrant workers. It is a question therefore, of drawing conclusions from the Community which already exists.

I believe that this is not only a human and social issue, as Mrs Macciocchi said, but also a political issue whether we are ready to take an initial step, albeit a tiny one, toward this European Union. The Political Affairs Committee, in contrast to the Legal Affairs

Veil

Committee, decided in favour of this. The arguments of the Legal Affairs Committee do not appear to me to be in any way justified insofar as we know that difficulties exist, but certain countries have solved them: Denmark has solved them, the Netherlands are in the process of solving them, and Ireland as well. We know therefore that if they are not solved tomorrow, they will be solved the next day, and at least we shall have expressed our political will.

This is why the Liberal Group will vote in favour of the text as it has been amended. I must say that all the amendments tabled tend in the same direction. I don't know which will be adopted; I hope we shall find the best possible formula. Perhaps it would be better not to be too much in a hurry, not to impose a time limit on the Commission, for we should run the risk of unduly restricting our efforts and indulging in double talk. There has been mention of the double vote. I am not afraid of the double vote, but I am afraid of double talk; I think we should merely say that we want this possibility to be available to all Community nationals, at least on the local level.

(Applause)

Mr Vié (DEP). — *(FR)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we all know of and appreciate Mrs Macciocchi's intellectual and personal qualities, and I will say immediately that my rather negative judgment of the report she has presented is no reflection on her. I am no doubt one of that minority in the Legal Affairs Committee that she mentioned a moment ago, but I think that her report was a task which it was virtually impossible to perform with success.

On the general political or philosophical level, there is, of course, not the slightest objection to the idea that each citizen of a Community country should some day be able to feel himself a citizen of the other countries as well, and especially of the one where he resides. On a more practical level, it is obvious that the European migrant established in a host country and paying local taxes should have a say concerning them. Whoever pays the piper calls the tune, after all, but, pragmatically speaking, this would fail to allow for the legal and constitutional obstacles which are difficult to overcome at present, particularly in my country. In France, town councillors are the electors of the Senate. Even in keeping strictly to a purely local objective — and even this term 'local' is not explicit: does it mean the municipal level, the departmental level, the regional? — we end up in the highest political sphere. Is it necessary to remind you that in my country, if the Presidency of the Republic falls vacant, the president of the Senate temporarily assumes the post? I shall certainly be told that in any case the debate cannot be taken this far, that the percentage of immigrants in our respective countries is not so large as to exert an influence on such impor-

tant political choices. But this would mean acting hypocritically, granting a right which would give moral satisfaction to a group of electors while being fully aware that it would have no practical results. In my opinion, this is not a very honourable proceeding. In my country, a mayor or a deputy mayor exercises certain precise functions stemming from the authority of the State, functions concerning the registration of births and deaths, elections or the police. The right of non-nationals to vote is an obstacle, and a considerable one, which should for the time being be considered insurmountable.

In any event, it seems to me that there is a flaw in Mrs Macciocchi's philosophical approach — that is to say, an incomplete perception of what a nation really is. Certainly, her own intellectual, personal and political qualities allow her to feel at home in any country of our Community, in Italy as well as in France, and her personal desire to take part in the local political life of one country or another is perfectly understandable. But how many cases are there like hers in the countries of the Community as a whole? The fact of living together economically or socially is not equivalent to belonging to a nation. A nation has much deeper historical roots, and it takes more than a day to feel oneself a part of it. In conclusion, I will say — without fundamentally disagreeing with Mrs Macciocchi — that in my opinion she is putting the cart before the horse. In order to build the Europe we dream of we should solve other practical problems which are equally pressing, and for that we shall need all our energies.

Mr Pesmazoglou (NI). — *(GR)* Madam President, I should like to stress the importance of this matter and to express my agreement with what has been said by many colleagues about the need for the report by Mrs Macciocchi to be supported and endorsed by a large majority.

I do not subscribe to what has been said up to now concerning the legal difficulties that exist. It is abundantly clear that the necessary mechanisms will be evolved to overcome these impediments and, as Mrs Veil stressed a little earlier, we shall soon be able to reach an advanced stage in the implementation of the principle put forward in the report by Mrs Macciocchi.

I would also like to observe, Madam President, that the matter is not only political. It is also a legal matter. It is absurd for the Treaty of Rome to envisage and encourage the movement of workers and commercial enterprises from one country to another without this leading to the exercise, as proposed, of a fundamental right, the right to participate in the election of local authorities. This right is a declaration of the democratic spirit which prevails in the European Community and the European Parliament. Insistence on this principle is particularly timely in view of the elections due to take place in 1984.

Pesmazoglou

I hope and wish, Madam President, that the motion by Mrs Macciocchi is endorsed by a very large majority. This will provide an important piece of publicity for the elections next year.

Mrs Vayssade (S). — (FR) Madam President, since the creation of the Community, freedom of establishment has gradually been developed. The Europeans of the ten countries can move about and take up residence as they choose. Along with this — and I think it is important — there are more and more marriages between nationals of different countries and, as result, more problems of residence or change of residence, which especially affect women with regard to their native countries.

In view of this fact, certain countries have recognized the possibility of obtaining the right to vote and to participate in occupational elections at the place of work; as a corollary, they have admitted that a labour contract can entail the exercise of certain rights in the place where the job is held.

Today we are continuing to study a question which was raised long ago. Among European citizens, should there not also be a right to vote and stand for election at the place of residence, to participate in local administration, to be among those who decide and vote upon what most closely concerns them, i.e., taxes? I believe this is an important goal and that we should begin to work towards it now.

It is certainly not an easy goal to reach, and we know that in several countries there are constitutional and legal obstacles as well as practical ones affecting the possibility of participating in elections as a foreigner; but if we dwell on these obstacles instead of fixing upon a political goal and saying that we are working to reach it, we may well have to wait a long time. Today I urge that this Macciocchi report be approved, and that the Community, with all its countries, really begin to work for the recognition of citizens' rights.

Mr Bournias (PPE). — (GR) Madam President, at this evening's sitting, on the occasion of the statement by the Council about next year's elections, we have the opportunity to voice our regret that it has not been possible to resolve the issue of the participation of citizens living in foreign countries in the elections to the European Parliament.

I understand, of course, that this is a big issue which presents great difficulties and with regard to which disagreements and reservations and delays are justified, just as I also understand that it is not easy for us to find solutions for the great outstanding issues such as the differences between North and South and the question of the Community's own resources, and for all the great issues that we have been debating for years.

However, what I cannot fathom out, colleagues, is why we cannot find a solution on this simplest of all

issues, one which is in keeping — as the motion for a resolution states — with the aims of the Community. As the rapporteur told us, this issue has been under discussion for ten years, and I add that while Greek migrants who have been resident in Belgium since 1955 or 1956 and who are now well into middle age with children and grandchildren, have full social security and welfare rights on a par with Belgian nationals, they have not been able to acquire the right to vote on local issues in the municipality or community in which they reside. They do not have the right, that is, to decide on small matters affecting their communities such as water supply and road-building. I am at a loss, therefore, as to why there has been disagreement amongst us this evening on this issue — I noticed, in fact, that Mrs Veil was herself hesitant — and I want to stress that I am in total agreement with my compatriot Mr Pesmazoglou.

I think this issue must be resolved by the end of 1983, as Mrs Macciocchi has so rightly said. The Commission must submit a proposal to us as a basis for our taking this first step towards a solution of the more general problem facing all those who live in foreign countries.

Mr Kyrkos (COM). — (GR) A very feeble objection has been voiced against the Macciocchi motion. I heard Mr Vié say that there are insurmountable constitutional and legal obstacles. I do not underrate the legal and constitutional difficulties, but I would say that the only obstacle — and I emphasize this — is the lack of political will, on account of which we shall be speaking about obstacles 20 years hence.

Mr Vié also told us that we cannot do things by halves, that we cannot speak about participation in local government, that is, without also speaking about participation in national and the wider-ranging European elections. This is not a question of doing things by halves. I believe that the proposal is for us to make a start, and that once we have done this we shall be able to find solutions to the other problems as they arise.

In other countries, this start has already taken place. I quote the example of Sweden, where the right of immigrants to stand for election has been recognized, and where a Greek immigrant has been elected as a local councillor in the municipality of Stockholm.

This resolution has a special moral value as well. Under the present prevailing conditions of unemployment, a peculiar form of racialism is developing, instigated by the most reactionary forces, and to give a categorical reply unequivocally condemning these racist trends Parliament must endorse the existing proposals without further ado.

Madam President, if we do not support the amendments tabled by our Socialist colleagues and also by other colleagues such as Mrs Veil, then certainly our

Kyrkos

debate will just fade away like a damp squib and be added to the other debates which have gone on for 10 years or more. And if we want Parliament to gain credence in the eyes of at least 8 million migrants who are deprived in foreign countries of their most basic right, we must make a specific decision to support the Macciocchi motion and also the amendments that have been tabled.

Mrs Gredal (S). — *(DA)* Madam President, I am not going to make a long speech, but I want to point out that in Denmark and in the other Nordic countries too we have a tradition of allowing people from the Community and from third countries to vote in local government elections. I agree with Mrs Macciocchi's report, but I do not think it goes far enough. The people who come to our countries — not just Denmark, but the rest of Europe as well — come as full citizens who work and pay their taxes in our countries. It would rebound to Parliament's credit if we went further and included the citizens of third countries. We are dealing here with a group of people who have lived in our countries for many years. I think that we should support the proposed amendment which seeks to extend voting rights in municipal elections to people from third countries. We see no danger in the possibility that we might get a Turkish or Yugoslav mayor in some Danish town or city. They are of equal status with us, and they should therefore have the same opportunities open to them. We can therefore support all the amendments designed to extend voting rights.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — *(GR)* We have no objection to voting for Mrs Macciocchi's motion for a resolution despite our strong reservations on account of its having come before the House after seven years of discussion, because it has occupied three committees and the Commission, and because it is extremely timid.

And it is timid, Madam President, because those who it is proposed should have the right to vote in local elections give their sweat and labour and have suffered serious damage to their health creating value and excess value, and helping to build up the countries to which they have migrated, without receiving treatment on a par with the indigenous workers.

From this point of view, therefore, the report before us should have been bolder if this Parliament wants to be democratic. If it wants the peoples to believe that it is inspired by humanitarian principles, it should joyfully acknowledge the right, not only of migrant workers from the member countries of the Community, but also of those from third countries to vote and stand as candidates in local elections — and this, not as a contribution to the unattainable dream of some sort of united Europe, but because, by virtue of their sacrifice, migrant workers have the inalienable natural

and legal right to vote and stand for election where they live, because the problems there touch on their lives as well.

IN THE CHAIR : MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, the Commission has taken a keen interest in the Macciocchi report and attached motion for a resolution as adopted by the Legal Affairs Committee on the right of Community citizens residing in a Member State other than their own to stand as candidates or vote in local elections. Its implementation might well represent a special right for the Community's citizens and increase their sense of identity and belonging, and it would represent the culmination of Parliament's efforts in this field over a long period.

The working-group established by the European Council of 1974 to examine this whole range of problems looked into the question of electoral rights, but precisely because this field of action is complicated and the problems are difficult, that Council, I may remind the House, decided to set priorities. The first of these was the introduction of a Community passport, which has now been given the green light. The second priority was the lifting of unnecessary personal checks at internal border-posts as a result of the introduction of the Community passport, which Parliament will be discussing this week with the Schieler report. The third is that of unrestricted right of abode, which has got somewhat bogged down but we are working doggedly at it.

At that time the Council did not consider the issue of electoral rights at communal elections to warrant any degree of priority. Seeing the big political problems implied, it hung back. There can be no doubt that the matter calls for a great deal of delicacy, if only because the points of departure and the constitutional conceptions have developed along widely divergent lines in the Member States. Three Member States acknowledge such electoral rights. If I were to include the electoral rights of the Irish in Great Britain, I might modify that to read 3 1/4 Member States. But at least three other Member States — the position of the fourth is less than clear — accord this matter constitutional status. — All of which means that granting citizens resident in a Member State other than their own the right to stand for and vote in local elections, not to mention national elections, would require constitutional adjustments of the Member States in question and all the special procedures — qualified majority or other — which this would necessitate. This would be no easy matter, especially at a time such as the present, when, to our great regret — and this is a

Narjes

signal we should not overlook — the economic difficulties afflicting certain Member States are tending to usher in a recrudescence of xenophobia.

The idea of equal electoral rights for citizens of third countries now resident in the Community has also been mooted. I only raise the matter in order to point out that when choosing the moment for producing a proposal along these lines, one thing we have to consider is whether that moment is politically opportune. It can serve no one's interests to choose the wrong moment and so harden negative or sceptical attitudes to such an extent as to render a subsequent relaxation or retraction by the Member State in question particularly difficult. What we must aim at is, far more, the creation of a climate of political consensus, a readiness to grant electoral rights in communal elections to the citizens of other Member States — that is a matter of leading the way — in order to be able to push through, in more favourable conditions, the appropriate constitutional changes in those Member States where changes would be necessary.

The difficulties surrounding this problem have also been demonstrated by the discussion in this House on the coming elections to the European Parliament. The outcome has been a disappointment for the Commission as well as for practically all the Members of this House. It has to be admitted that a universally applicable electoral system would have made it easier to decide whether the moment was opportune for extending electoral rights in communal elections.

I shall forgo consideration of the individual questions outlined in Mrs Macciocchi's probing report and also the delicate issue of the legal basis of a Community act. The Macciocchi report's motion for a resolution urges the Commission to report on progress within the foreseeable future. The Commission will present a report before the end of this year, which should give both it, the Commission, and Parliament sufficient time within the present parliamentary year, bearing in mind that we are dealing here with a matter where the politically opportune moment is important, to consider further steps. I trust I have thereby offered a basis suitable to all for further progress.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting-time.¹

9. Votes²**Boserup motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-412/83): Decision on early vote**

Mr Fich (S). — (DA) Mr President, on behalf of the Danish Social Democrats, I should like in connection with the oral question by Mr Schwenke to state how we shall be voting. We disagree with the basic features of Mr Schwenke's conception, since we think that the

European Foundation should be the result of inter-state cooperation. We regard that as a necessary condition, though of course not the only one, for us to be able to accept such a proposal.

Regarding the resolution by Mrs Boserup and others, I may say that we are in agreement on two points. We agree that there is no basis in the Treaties for cultural cooperation, and we agree that no money should be taken from the Community budget for this European Foundation. But I would point out that the resolution takes no account of the fact that we are concerned here with inter-state cooperation and that is precisely what we, who were in government at the time, asked for. We are in favour of cultural cooperation with the other nine Community countries and with the other Nordic countries under UN arrangements. We do not think that this sort of thing can be organized within the framework of the Treaty of Rome.

Since the resolution rejects all cultural cooperation, even that pursued on an inter-state basis, we shall vote against it, even though there are a few points in the resolution with which we agree.

President. — Before giving the floor to Mrs Viehoff, I would remind speakers that they may not speak on the substance of the matter, since we are here concerned with a vote on a request for an early vote.

Mrs Viehoff (S). — (NL) Mr President, I wish to draw attention to an error in the Dutch translation which talks of the 'European Fund' when it means the 'European Foundation'; and there is an inaccuracy in the third indent, as Parliament already wrote in appropriations into the budget last year. So apart from the other reason for voting against the motion for a resolution, it is also full of mistakes.

President. — Mrs Viehoff, we will make the necessary corrections.

Macciocchi report (Doc. 1-121/83: Right to vote and stand for election)

Paragraph 1: Amendments Nos 4, 7, 2, 1 and 3

Mrs Macciocchi (S), rapporteur. — (FR) I think we should vote first of all on the amendment which differs most greatly from the report, that is, Amendment No 2, by Mr Tyrrell, Mrs Veil and Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti. I am embarrassed to tell you that, as rapporteur, I cannot support this amendment, but personally I am very much in its favour.

Mr D'Angelosante (COM). — (IT) Mr President, I would like someone to explain to me what Rule of Procedure calls for Mr Tyrrell's text to precede my own and others in the voting. If it is out of consideration or fellow-feeling for the rapporteur, I will naturally raise no objection.

¹ For announcement concerning the topical and urgent debate, see the Minutes.

² See Annex.

President. — Mr D'Angelosante, I did not say that we should begin by putting Amendment No 2, by Mr Tyrrell, to the vote first. In fact, there is little difference between Mr Tyrrell's amendment and your own.

Mrs Veil (L). — (FR) Mr President, I think there is a difference between Amendment No 4 and Amendment No 2. In Mr D'Angelosante's amendment, it says 'for persons residing in a Member State other than their own', meaning that this applies to all persons living in countries other than their own, including persons who are not Community nationals, while Amendment No 2 indicates clearly that the right to vote would be granted only to citizens of Member States residing in a Member State other than their own. On this point, then, there is an important difference between these two amendments.

President. — Mrs Veil, we shall vote as planned, because Amendment No 4 departs furthest from the text.

10. Malta

President. — The next item is the report by Mrs van den Heuvel, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the situation in Malta (Doc. 1-368/83).

Mrs van den Heuvel (S), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, the motions for resolutions which form the basis of this report highlight events in Malta which in view of the high standards expected of such a democracy as Malta warrant close examination at the very least. Although I was dealing in my report with a continually changing situation, I did finally manage to draft a report which, to judge from the support in the Political Affairs Committee, can be regarded as giving a reasonably well-balanced picture of the situation. During my visit to the island in my capacity as rapporteur, all parties assured me that present facts and events cannot be separated from developments in Malta over the last few decades.

It is difficult for present-day visitors to Malta to believe that the social and political life of the island was long characterized by a major political consensus. That was during the common struggle for independence. From 1951 to 1971, the island was ruled almost uninterruptedly by the Nationalist Party. The Labour Party only ruled for three years, from 1955 to 1958. The foundations for the social, political and legal systems of the country were also laid by the Nationalist Party. A study of the election results shows that the number of parties fighting elections is dwindling and that the polarization is becoming ever more evident. The political struggle in Malta at the moment is between the Nationalist Party and the Labour Party, and this political polarization rules almost all the rest of the island's social life.

The situation came to a head after the 1981 elections. In order to meet a requirement in the constitution that there could be no more than a 5 % difference in the number of people entitled to vote in the various constituencies, a proposal was submitted to Parliament to draw up new electoral boundaries. Parliament approved the proposal upon which it was referred under the appropriate regulations to a specially appointed committee for a decision. Immediately after this committee's decision was made known, the Nationalist Party announced that if Labour should emerge victorious from the election — victorious in terms of seats — with fewer votes than the Nationalist Party, then this would be unacceptable to the Nationalist Party. When this indeed appeared to be happening after the elections, for the Nationalist Party got 50.92 % of the votes and 31 seats and Labour 49.07 % and 34 seats, the Nationalist Party decided not to take its seats in Parliament because, they maintained, they were not prepared to put up with a show of democracy while the true democratic situation was in fact so distorted.

The Labour Party, however, countered by saying that the drawing up of new electoral boundaries was required by the constitution, that it had been prepared by an independent committee, that it was ridiculous to impute any party political motives and that furthermore it had already happened in the past that one party had gained more seats with fewer votes. On that occasion not a single protest had been heard from the Nationalist Party.

The events referred to in the motions for resolutions tabled by Members, which I cannot dwell on in detail, really all stem from the same polarization seen in the election. Time and time again, the parties accuse each other of intolerance, misuse of power and even physical violence, and it is dangerous for us outsiders to say whether one or other of the two sides is right or wrong. In such circumstances, only consultation can break the deadlock.

Fortunately, this has been realized in Malta. The two political leaders have come together, particularly at the request of the president of the country, and we are happy to see that this has led to a preliminary agreement on some very contentious issues. Meanwhile, the members of the Nationalist Party have taken their seats in Parliament, so that there is reason to hope that the island will soon return to normal political relations.

The Political Affairs Committee warmly welcomes this improvement in the situation and hopes that relations between Malta and the European Community, encouraged by the normalization in that country, will improve to such an extent that the Council will soon be able to take a positive decision on financial aid to the country.

van den Heuvel

I assume, Mr President, that Parliament can count on being informed by the Council of further events and of the Council's decision on financial aid.

(Applause)

Mr Schmid (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist group supports Mrs van den Heuvel's report. It is, in our opinion, an acceptable compromise. The same is true of the motion for a resolution, which, however, does not contain everything we would have desired. I emphasize this point because, during the debate on Malta last March compromise formulas tabled in plenary sitting by the Socialist Group were wrongly interpreted in Malta and were put out by the opposition Nationalist Party there as the Socialist Group's unadulterated opinion. I am therefore taking this precautionary measure against the risk of abuses and misinterpretations.

We consider Mrs van den Heuvel's report to be exemplary. Its compilation was bedevilled by the constantly changing situation in Malta. Those who have read her report will be struck by the painstaking research underlying it. My wish for the House is that all its reports may show the same qualities. With regard to the internal Maltese political situation, we welcome the reference in the motion to the fact that the opposition Nationalist Party has now taken up its seats in the Maltese Parliament. We further welcome the reference to the need to prevent, whenever possible, such situations in the future. The reference to the particular responsibility borne here by the Maltese Government is not perceived by us as a one-sided judgment but as a simple statement of the fact that the party in office has a greater responsibility for the situation than the opposition.

We particularly welcome paragraph 5 of the motion, which expresses the hope that a decision on Community financial aid to Malta will soon be taken. It is no secret that this view is widely shared across the political divide in Malta, and there is no internal controversy on the need to adopt the Financial Protocol as soon as possible. It is high time — and this paragraph is a warning to the Council — for it at long last to conclude the never-ending negotiations within its own ranks and reach a clear decision.

We further welcome paragraph 5 because it represents a retraction, in the light of the changed political situation, of the House's call in March of this year for a freezing of the Financial Protocol and associated negotiations, given the domestic political situation prevailing in Malta at that time. A change has really taken place, and we are gratified, but we believe at the same time that it behoves the Parliament to draw the consequences by cancelling its call of last March for a kind of sanction. We regret, in the interests of Community-Maltese relations, that this has not been put more clearly: Parliament ought to have taken the

courageous step of recognizing that things there have changed.

Such is the background to the Socialist Group's amendment which aims to introduce a paragraph 2a. Unfortunately, it has not heretofore found majority support in the Political Affairs Committee. Turning particularly to the Christian-Democratic Group, I would ask whether there is still time for us to agree on giving joint support to such a formulation. After all, it says no more than that we take account of the facts and that the situation there has changed. We should all have an interest in fostering improved relations between the Community and Malta.

I reiterate the Socialist Group's conviction that these relations are important. Malta's geographical situation in the centre of the Mediterranean makes it a bridge between European and Arab states. That is an asset which should not be frivolously squandered. We welcome the non-aligned course currently pursued by the Maltese Government. For strategic reasons, we must endeavour to ensure that Malta at least continues on such a course and is not lured into the other camp.

The Community's relations with Malta are also important because with the accession of Spain and Portugal the centre of the Community will shift southward — and not only geographically. It is inevitable that Community policy in the years to come will increasingly be a matter of Mediterranean policy. This being the case, one cannot exclude the small States of that region. For this reason alone, we must concern ourselves with cultivating especially good relations with such States — a point of which the Italian Government has long since been aware.

I appeal to the House to adopt the report. Perhaps the Members on the other side could see their way to accepting the amendment we have tabled.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, the van den Heuvel report and accompanying motion for a resolution are the culmination of a long and painstaking endeavour on the part of the Political Affairs Committee. It was no easy task to find common ground. All the more reason to congratulate the rapporteur on her tireless efforts to produce a balanced report. Fortunately, the political situation in Malta has recently become noticeably less tense. This may well be attributed in no small measure to the Community's attitude.

The Nationalist Party, which saw its electoral majority at the polls transformed into a parliamentary minority, as a result of some last-minute party manoeuvring, has now decided to take up its seats in the Maltese parliament. However, it expressed the desire that there should be no repetition of the incidents of the past and an electoral law be adopted reflecting the will of the electors. Although such an undertaking was given, it has not yet been honoured. Thus the motion clearly

Habsburg

states that, while welcoming the progress which has been attained, we are not prepared to make unilateral concessions. Paragraph 5 is quite clear on this point.

We hope that the Council will soon be in a position to adopt Commission's proposals for financial aid — but only after there have been unmistakable developments towards democracy. If this does not take place, both the Parliament and, most certainly, the Council will have to draw their own conclusions. The next step must now come from Valeta, and the responsibility, of course, lies with the government there, since it has the power to take action. We hope that it now, after having followed various erring paths, will make a determined contribution, together with the Nationalist Party, which represents the majority of the people, to completing the breakthrough to democracy in Malta.

The European People's Party therefore supports the motion for a resolution. We reject Amendment No 1 as legally and factually groundless — indeed, it was thrown out after lengthy deliberation in the Political Affairs Committee: it cannot be the purpose of one resolution to cancel another previously adopted.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: LADY ELLES

Vice-President

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DE) Madam President, the Commission welcomes the motion for a resolution now before the House. It takes account of the latest developments in Malta. The whole Maltese problem was thoroughly debated by the House on 10 March last, when my fellow-Commissioner, Mr Giolitti, gave an exhaustive account of the Commission's position.

During the present debate, attention has been drawn to the improvements which have since taken place in the Maltese situation. The Commission echoes the hopes expressed here that the Council will soon give the signal for opening negotiations with Malta on those aspects of financial aid which are still undecided.

On behalf of the Commission, I would like to assure the rapporteur of our unconditional support and thanks for her extraordinarily painstaking and balanced report.

President. — The debate is closed. The vote will take place at the next voting-time.

I wish to state there has been a slight mistake in that apparently Mrs Baduel Glorioso should have spoken in this debate. Owing to a misunderstanding her name was not inscribed on the list, so she will be invited, if she wishes, to give an explanation of vote orally tomorrow before the vote.

11. *Question-time*

President. — The next item is the first part of Question-time (Doc. 1-389/83). We begin with questions to the Council.

I would point out that in future the document containing the questions for Question-time will indicate the date on which each question was tabled. You will find that in your document for today.

Following the decision taken yesterday, the oral question by Mr Maffre-Baugé to the Council on improving Community rules on fruit and vegetables (Doc. 1-1352/82)¹ will be taken first:

Under Community rules, Community producers of fruit and vegetables do not enjoy the guarantees in respect of income levels and development possibilities which they are entitled to expect by comparison with other sectors of production.

The Council has on many occasions affirmed its desire to improve the market organizations for Mediterranean agricultural products, but has so far been unable to reach the agreement it has promised.

1. Will the Council conclude an agreement to improve the current Community rules at the earliest possible moment and at the very latest by 1 April 1983?
2. Will the Council take account of the proposals put forward in the resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 16 June 1982 on the basis of the Maffre-Baugé report (Doc. 1-279/82)?

This question has been taken over by Mr Pranchère.

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) The Council of Ministers of Agriculture examined this question at its meetings of 8-9 and 14-15 March of this year and submitted a brief report with a summary of the state of progress to the European Council meeting that same month. At its meeting of 13-14 June, essentially to be devoted to problems of the *acquis communautaire*, this Council will, in accordance with the mandate it has received from the European Council, resume its efforts to find solutions for the fruit and vegetable sector. These efforts will be based on the Commission's proposals, supplemented by provisions guaranteeing the maintenance of traditional trade channels with third countries and respect for the free flow of goods. The Council will also take account of the European Parliament's resolution of 16 June 1982. The European Council intends to examine this matter at its next meeting.

¹ Tabled under Rule 42 as an oral question with debate.

Mertes

I would add that the Commission proposals envisage a strengthening of producer cooperatives and also an extension of intervention. There are, however, different views on these matters within the Council of Ministers of Agriculture, with some Member States supporting the Commission proposals, others rejecting them and others yet again finding such proposals too timid.

In the external field, the Commission proposals envisage a reinforcement of external protection by recalculating the reference prices and including an increased number of products in the system. Several Member States fear, however, that undue protection of this sort would lead to an excessive isolation of the market. Others would like to see the Commission proposals going even further in this direction.

At its last meeting of 25-26 May 1983, the Council of Ministers of Agriculture dealt exclusively with the situation concerning Mediterranean produce. It commissioned the market directors of the appropriate agricultural ministries to draw up a satisfactory solution. These top-level officials met on 2 and 6 June 1983 and will report to the Council of Ministers of Agriculture at the latter's meeting of 13-14 June 1983.

I hope you will appreciate that I am anxious not to pre-empt the deliberations of the agricultural ministers and therefore on this occasion must decline further comment on this subject.

President. — Since they deal with the same subject, I call Question No 1, by Mr Cousté (H-643/82):

Can the Council state what progress has been made as regards amendment of the Social Fund arrangements so as to render more effective efforts to combat unemployment in Europe?

and

Question No 17, by Mr Pattison (H-175/83):

Will the Council outline the results of the recent Social Affairs Council meeting and the Social-Education Jumbo Council, particularly in relation to the Social Fund and action to combat youth unemployment?

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) The two Council meetings referred to in these questions took place in a constructive spirit and achieved tangible progress in accordance with the wishes expressed by Parliament. The Council of Employment and Social Affairs Ministers agreed on a joint orientation for the revision of the Community Social Fund, which will shortly be communicated to Parliament under the conciliation procedure.

I shall confine my remarks to the essentials of this important agreement. Some 75 % of the Social Fund's resources shall be earmarked for young people under 25 years of age. Allocations from the Fund may also

be made available for combating unemployment among various groups and individuals over 25. It will also be possible to allocate grants to persons responsible for training, vocational guidance or finding employment. Measures within the framework of Member States' employment policies account for the lion's share of the Fund's allocations, and of these 40 % will be allocated to employment schemes in Greenland, Greece, the French overseas departments, the Republic of Ireland, Northern Ireland and the Mezzogiorno. The allocations to these regions will, as previously, be increased by 10 % in the event of participation.

For specific measures in the implementation of innovative schemes or for testing their efficacy, grants will also be made available. The Commission has confirmed its intention of promoting measures for the reorganization and reduction of working-hours. The resources available for such measures do not exceed 5 % of the total resources of the Fund.

The Council adopted the resolution on vocational training policy, which contains guidelines on Member States' activities and envisages measures to be carried out by the Commission to supplement and reinforce these activities. In particular, the resolution envisages measures in favour of youth. While respecting the competence of employers' and employees' representatives, the Member States will make every endeavour to ensure within the coming 5 years that all young people interested, more particularly those without a school-leaving certificate or a vocational qualification, will have access to a full-time educational programme of at least 6 months and, if possible, one year after the minimum school-leaving age with a view to gaining an elementary training and/or the opportunity of gaining an initial experience in the trade chosen as a preparatory step towards ultimate employment.

The Member States are also continuing their own efforts to create suitable vocational training for young people with insufficient professional qualifications, in particular, for those who are unemployed, in order to increase their chances of ultimate employment.

I know that this subject is of concern to very many Members, and I should like, if I may, to expand on it somewhat.

The agreement reached by the Council with regard to the Social Fund envisages that the resources earmarked for young people under 25 should be allocated primarily for those whose chances of finding employment are particularly remote, because of insufficient or unsuitable training or because they have been out of work for a long time.

Unemployed women, the disabled, migrant workers and those employed by small and medium-sized undertakings constitute the over-25s whose positions can be alleviated by resources from the Social Fund.

Mertes

The Council also approved the directive on workers' protection against the health hazards of asbestos — I need hardly remind the House of the importance of this — and agreed on a common approach — while awaiting Parliament's opinion — to the Second Action Programme on safety and health in the workplace.

The President of the Council of Ministers for employment and social affairs intends to report to the parliamentary Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on 14 June on the entire deliberations of the Council in this sector. The House will appreciate that I should not like to prejudice the outcome of such deliberations.

Mr Cousté (DEP). — (FR) I am particularly satisfied with the substance of this answer, a constructive and encouraging one which responds to the concern we voiced during the special part-session on employment problems, particularly youth employment.

I would like to ask two very brief complementary questions. First, how many young people in the Community will benefit from this 75% of the Fund's resources allocated for youth; how many tens of thousands of young people, boys and girls — for we know there are many girls looking for jobs?

Second, do these measures from the Social Fund provide an incentive, if not for permanent employment, at least for temporary work for young people?

Mr Mertes. — (DE) To take the second question first, the aid programmes are submitted by the Member States and decided on by the Commission. I am unable, at present, to provide an answer to your first supplementary question. While not denying the relevancy of the question, you will appreciate that I cannot provide such a statistical analysis here. However, I will arrange for you to receive a written answer.

Mr Pattison (S). — The Minister has given a very detailed and extensive reply to my question, and I agree fully with him that this subject is one of grave concern to all of us here. I would just like him to expand, if he could, on the comment which he made about further measures for the reorganization and reduction of working-time and working arrangements.

Mr Mertes. — (DE) I would like to thank both you and the preceding speaker for your appreciation of the answer I provided. The question you are now raising has been discussed, but we have not yet reached a decision with regard to the question who is empowered to determine matters concerning wages. However, I would like to underline the importance of your question.

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE). — (GR) As chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, I

am pleased at the position taken by the representative of the Council of Ministers on the tremendously important matter of the Social Fund. I would like, however, to put two questions.

Firstly, last month Parliament endorsed with modification the proposal of the Commission for reform of the Social Fund. Would the Council of Ministers like to confirm that it will enter into discussions with Parliament, as provided for in the Rules of Procedure, so as to take serious note of Parliament's opinion?

Secondly, Parliament has also expressed the view that appropriations to the Social Fund need to be doubled. Does the representative of the Council of Ministers agree with this view?

Mr Mertes. — (DE) I should like to thank you too for your appreciation of my answer. The answer to both questions is 'yes', without prejudice to the results of the conciliation proceedings.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 2 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 3, by Mr Kallias (H-147/83).²

It is obvious that the future of Europe and of the whole world depends on the coming generations, but the future of European unity, in particular, depends on the attitude the European younger generation adopts to the question.

Steps must therefore be taken to tackle the burning problem of youth unemployment, on the one hand, and, on the other, the question of a psychological *rapprochement* with young people.

Both problems are extremely difficult to solve. Unfortunately, however, efforts are being devoted only to the first of them, a wide range of efforts which, it is to be hoped, will very shortly lead to specific measures. There is an urgent need, though, for the second problem, that of a psychological *rapprochement* with the European younger generation, to be confronted, so that the knowledge and experience of older people can be channelled towards the young, for them to use on their own responsibility and initiative. For these reasons, the Commission must urgently address itself to this serious problem.

Can the Council say:

- (a) it has attached particular importance to the dangers inherent in the generation gap, and
- (b) what action, if any, it has taken, or intends to take, to bridge the psychological gap between those at the decision-taking age and those at the age which is coming, or up-and-coming, and what the results of its action have been?

¹ See Annex II to proceedings of 8 June 1983.

² Former oral question without debate (O-185/82), converted into a question for Question-time.

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) Mr Kallias, the Council, mindful of the demands of the European Council, has primarily endeavoured to draw up measures to combat youth unemployment. The problem of bridging the psychological gap and of handing on the knowledge and experience of older people to the young, which equally concerns you and the Council, are phenomena of the development of society which are influenced by a variety of factors and to which the Council can address itself only to the extent that the Treaties allow. Rest assured, however, that we share your salutary preoccupations, but I cannot deny the limits on our action in this sphere.

Mr Kallias (PPE). — (GR) I have listened with great attention and satisfaction to the statement by the President-in-Office, but I would like to pose two questions over and beyond the crucially important subject of unemployment.

Firstly, is not the Council worried that the existing psychological gulf between the generations may become dangerously wide and develop into something unbridgeable?

Secondly, does it not think that it should seek closer communication with the younger generation, not only through the proposed measures but also through *rapprochement* and communication between young people and the Community's institutions?

Permit me to say, finally, that with this end in mind I have personally drafted a message to the youth of Europe which I shall immediately make available to the Minister.

Mr Mertes. — (DE) I take your point very seriously, and I can answer your question with an unequivocal 'yes'. We are all aware of a certain psychological gap, to which you refer. There is little point here in attributing blame. No one chooses to be born at a particular time or place. Since the dawn of Greek civilization, dialogue has been considered the basis of all culture, and it goes without saying that we need to keep open the channels of communication with the young. We must endeavour to explain to them the necessities of our age in a factual, non-paternalistic manner. One of these necessities is, without doubt, European unity.

On a personal basis I would add that I am the father of five children ranging in age from fifteen to thirty years. I constantly have the opportunity of discussing with my children and their friends. On the basis of frequent encounters with the young in my constituency, I can close on a note of optimism. If the older generation is prepared to pursue the dialogue, not on a self-righteous, but self-assured and kindly tone, than it is possible to bridge the psychological age-gap. It is both a matter of wisdom, the 'Sophia', and of willing-

ness. It is obvious that such discussions should also embrace the historical opportunity afforded by European unity. I should like to thank you for your important question, and express the hope that my personal remarks have gone some way towards assuring you that we are of one accord.

Mr Gontikas (PPE). — In the United States, tremendous progress has been marked concerning the problems of the next generation. Can the Council tell us whether they are aware of that and, if so, exactly which of these problems they appreciate and accept?

Mr Mertes. — (DE) The Council is fully aware of such exemplary progress. Whatever I could give in the way of precise information in my previous answer follows this very trend.

President. — Question No 4, by Mr Israël (H-87/83):

In its answer to Written Question No 1810/82, by Mr Rogalla,¹ the Commission indicated that it had submitted a proposal for the creation and free circulation of ECU coins minted in accordance with national procedures.

Since this first fungible European currency would be of great symbolic value for the process of European unification, is the Council prepared to adopt and possibly implement this idea advanced by the Commission?

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) At the end of 1981, the Commission submitted to the Monetary Committee the question of creating an ECU coin minted in accordance with national procedures. The findings were published by the Commission in the July 1982 edition of *European Economy*. From this it became clear that the realization of this idea would encounter considerable legal and technical difficulties. Indeed, the Commission did not submit any formal proposal to the Council on the matter, so that the Council was not called upon to make a decision.

I have asked myself what problems could arise from minting an ECU coin and I came to the following conclusions. The legal provisions of the Member States governing the minting and free circulation of currency must be adjusted if the ECU is to be accepted as legal tender. As has been the case in the past with some national coins minted in limited quantities, the ECU might very quickly disappear from circulation. The uncertainty surrounding its rate of conversion into national currencies might well mitigate against its use in business. Finally, should the ECU be pegged to the EMS middle rates, there would be great difficulties in aligning it with the Pound

¹ OJ No C 78 of 6 April 1981, p. 270.

Mertes

Sterling and Drachma or even with the Belgian franc, since the money markets for these currencies are divided. Moreover, this would introduce a distinction between ECU coins pegged to the EMS middle rate and investments denominated in ECU to which the market-rate is applied. If the market-rate is used, the practical difficulties inherent in a daily fluctuating exchange-rate are all too obvious. The question therefore arises as to the wisdom of introducing a highly complex system, both technically and legally, without being certain of the ultimate political effect. I believe we should wait until greater stability has been restored to the money markets and greater progress has been achieved towards Community economic and monetary integration before contemplating such a step.

Mr Israël (DEP). — *(FR)* Thank you, Mr President, for giving me such a complete and detailed answer. You have set up an array of objections, and I thank you for having done this most skillfully. Nevertheless, don't you feel that all these objections, particularly the last one concerning the need for a permanent alignment of the ECU rate, could be overcome if the Council really had the will to create this purely symbolic ECU coin?

I would add Mr President, that the Commission seems to have made proposals which it hopes will be carefully studied by the Council.

Mr Mertes. — *(DE)* You may rest assured that all such proposals are painstakingly examined. My objections to the idea are not an expression of ill will, just realism. In all matters concerned with money, not only the will is important but also the objective effect, which in turn depend on the confidence of the public in any particular coin. My answer, therefore, was an expression of my understanding for you and also of the will to bear this question in mind. Responsibility, however compels me now to say openly that the time is not yet ripe for such a move. We shall, nevertheless, continue to examine the matter.

Mr Rogalla (S). — *(DE)* Mr President-in-Office, I am personally mentioned in the question, and I should like to thank you for the seriousness and comprehensiveness with which you have dealt with the question. In comparison, some of the things we bring forth here may seem strident and impatient. But then, that is part of our job!

Would you be so good as to convey to the appropriate officials and institutions with greater urgency than hitherto, your personal impressions and tell them that the people want such a coin, at least as an experiment, and that all the legal and financial objections you have mentioned should be set aside at least for the duration of the experiment. My question is whether such reservations cannot only really be gauged after such an experiment has been made throughout the

Community with the active participation of its Community citizens. May I ask you to be so kind as to urge the Commission to act under Article 155 of the Treaty to formulate suitable proposals?

Mr Mertes. — *(DE)* The purpose of Question-time such as this transcends the mere question-and-answer procedure and is a vehicle for the expression of political will — in this case, that of the Parliament. You can rest assured that the political will you have shown here, by means of arguments which I personally find convincing, will be reflected in future deliberations. In this respect I consider the argument for an experimental launching of the ECU particularly helpful.

Given the inherent complexities to which I referred, and taking a realistic rather than pessimistic view, I do not wish to commit myself. Nevertheless I can assure you that the will underlying the question will be taken up in a manner which scrupulously respects the spirit in which it was expressed.

Mr von Wogau (PPE). — *(DE)* I would like to offer a suggestion to complement that of Mr Rogalla. You are aware that, without its actually having been printed, the ECU has found very wide application. In some Member States, one can open a savings account denominated in ECU. Others issue ECU travellers' cheques. The ECU as a loan issue currency has earned a considerable international reputation. Such an operation could be considerably expanded, without resorting to the actual printing or minting of ECU as such, by recognizing the ECU as a currency in each Member State. Such is already the case in some Member States, although not yet in the Federal Republic. Would you be willing to accept such a suggestion and promote the acceptance of the ECU as a currency throughout the Community?

Mr Mertes. — *(DE)* I shall give your suggestion a positive vetting and commend it to those more nearly concerned. You know who the authorities are: in the Federal Republic, the Federal Bank also has a say in such matters.

There is also a psychological factor at work here: for those who have had a grounding in the French language, the word 'ECU' is a majestic-sounding word, akin to 'dukat' in German. The element of lasting value inherent in the word should also be reflected in political reality in the direction desired by you. I will pass on your suggestion.

(Mr Schinzel asked for the floor)

President. — I think we have had quite a long run on that question. Perhaps I should explain to Mr Schinzel that I have been following my usual practice when chairing Question time, of calling only one Member from each nationality within a political party. Mr Rogalla has already put a question on behalf of the Socialist Group.

President

Question No 5, by Miss Quin (H-94/83):

Does the Council consider that it has no obligation to respond to resolutions addressed to it and sent to it by the European Parliament, resolutions which were tabled under Rule 49 of the Parliament's Rules of Procedure and which received the support of an absolute majority of MEPs?

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) The Council has already informed Parliament that it examines with especial care all parliamentary resolutions which contain an opinion. It also examines the other resolutions inasmuch as they affect the Council. The Council makes no distinction between resolutions adopted under Article 49 of Parliament's Rules of Procedure and other resolutions which do not contain an opinion.

Miss Quin (S) — I tabled a resolution under Rule 49 of the Parliament's Rules of Procedure which received the support of an absolute majority of the Members of the Parliament and which called on the Council and Commission to report to Parliament within three months. This resolution was forwarded to the Council at the end of April last year. It concerned aid to redundant shipyard workers. I am wondering whether the Council is ever going to respond to this resolution, which, as I say, received the support of an absolute majority of the Members of Parliament.

President. — Are you putting a question to the Council?

Miss Quin (S) — Yes, I am asking them when they are going to respond to this officially, as they were called on to do in the resolution.

Mr Mertes. — (DE) At the moment I am unable to say which stage the examination of this matter has reached, and I find myself unable to give a precise answer to your question, although it seems reasonable enough to me. I shall, of course, go into the matter.

President. — Question No 6, by Mr Van Minnen (H-128/83):

How does the Council view the proposal that, as a means of eliminating the butter mountain, each EC citizen should be given half a kilo of intervention butter free of charge on purchasing one kilo of fresh butter?

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) The Council is not in a position to express an opinion on the proposal you mention for it has not received an official proposal from the Commission. We are aware that such a recommendation was contained in a resolution adopted by Parliament on 15 October 1982. The Council is always ready to examine any Commission proposal for facilitating

sales of surplus butter on the Community market. Consequently, on the occasion of the decisions of 17 May 1983 on the setting of agricultural prices for 1983/84, the Council asked the Commission to submit without delay a report containing a study of ways of reducing butter surpluses and an analysis of the most economic methods for marketing the surplus butter already in storage.

Mr Van Minnen (S). — (DE) Mr President-in-Office, the suggestion was not official — or perhaps just a little, because it came from your fellow-countryman and party friend Mr Aigner; but, well, it was a proposal, and that's why we asked about it. Reading between the lines of your answer, I would say you would not be averse to regarding this suggestion as a contribution towards getting rid of the butter mountain. However, I cannot see what stimulus such an arrangement could offer, apart from that of stimulating Community production on the one hand and our cardio-vascular diseases on the other. Do you share this view or do you envisage adopting such a suggestion, albeit still an unofficial one, as part of Council policy?

Mr Mertes. — (DE) There is as yet no official proposal, but this does not detract from the political significance of your remarks. Precisely because we are treating it seriously, the Commission is looking into the matter and will report to the Council. When this has been done, we shall see what further steps are to be taken.

Mr Schinzel (S). — (DE) Mr President-in-Office, do you not feel it is high time that the Council stated more clearly how it hopes to tackle the problem of surplus agricultural production instead of leaving matters to the Commission and ordering new studies to be undertaken? Community citizens have now been waiting for years and years for some tangible action. Do you agree with me that a measure similar to the one in Mr Van Minnen's question but relating to the Community wine-lake could be carried out by offering a free bottle of wine for every bottle sold across the counter?

(Applause and laughter)

Mr Mertes. — (DE) I have heard that there will soon be an olive lake. I am fully aware of the problem of mountains and lakes, but there is a distribution of rôles and competences within our Community of Ten. If one were to compare a Question-time such as this present one with the proceedings of a national parliament, one would find that, I think, fully twelve specialist ministers would be called upon to provide answers to the questions I have been fielding. I therefore ask you to accept in good faith that my answer was not meant to be evasive but merely referred to competence-sharing.

Mertes

Allow me to add, however, that the point has not been lost on me. I shall urge the Commission to round off its analyses and conclusions as quickly as possible so that we have a solid judgment. It would be unfair to the Council to depict this as an evasive tactic. It is a procedure dictated by the rules of the game as well as by the Community's rules.

Mr Hord (ED). — Would the President-in-Office agree with me that the Council does have powers and that in the 1983 farm-price review — as in any other farm price review — it is the Council which decides whether or not the prices go up? With regard to dairy products, would he not agree that a price-increase for milk was totally unrealistic when we have a record production of milk and the current level of stocks of butter also runs to record proportions of 400 000 tonnes? On that basis, I would suggest that the Council is responsible. Would he, therefore, not agree that it is urgent that the Council, working with the Commission, should be doing something to reduce the total surpluses and that this could be best done by increasing the subsidy on social sales throughout the Community?

Mr Mertes. — *(DE)* I should like to answer your first question with 'no'. I stick to what I said just now to the preceding speaker, but I recognize that the Council of Ministers of Agriculture, of which I am not a member, does have a particular responsibility to bear. To this extent I can agree with you.

I can fully subscribe to the remarks contained in your second question. We are faced with a very pressing problem and we must, within the confines of the Treaty's stipulations, strive to resolve it.

President. — Question No 7, by Mr Radoux (H-132/83), which has been taken over by Mrs Van Hemeldonck:

At the meeting of 24 January this year between the enlarged bureau of the European Parliament and the Foreign Ministers of the Member States, it was agreed that a Parliament-Council liaison group should be set up quickly to consider what action might be taken on the resolutions on institutional matters drawn up by the Political Affairs Committee and adopted by Parliament. Specific proposals for this have been put forward by Parliament.

Could the Council say:

- why this liaison group has not yet been set up;
- when it will hold its first meeting;
- at what juncture, in the Council's view, it should report on the results of its work?

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — *(DE)* At its meeting of 24-25 April 1983, the Council examined Mr Rumor's proposal that a liaison group be set up to consider what action might be taken on the resolutions on institutional matters adopted by

Parliament. No consensus was reached on such a proposal. The Council did agree, however, to come back to this matter, which the Council presidency considers as being of great importance, at one of its next meetings.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — *(NL)* I am sorry, but that reply does not satisfy me. May I know why no agreement was reached? A promise was made that Parliament's request would be taken up that this liaison group would discuss the resolutions on institutional matters, including the Hänsch and the Van Miert resolutions. What is actually happening, what hiccup has there been along the line? Why has no agreement been reached?

Mr Mertes. — *(DE)* The anger expressed in your supplementary question I find justified. The resistance of certain Member States, which I prefer not to name here, towards the establishment of a European Parliament-Committee of Permanent Representatives liaison group with such a broad mandate will not — this, I am afraid, I must say plainly — be overcome. Nevertheless, the Solemn Declaration on European Union envisages negotiations with the European Parliament on ways to improve and extend the conciliation procedure. At present only one Member State has one reservation. A liaison group will be necessary if such negotiations are to take place — albeit only for some of the themes indicated by Mr Radoux, probably the most important ones. As for the lessons to be drawn, I would suggest that you try to persuade your Danish colleagues of the need to adopt the Solemn Declaration on European Union: this achievement will, among other things, bring you the result you and I desire.

Mrs Hammerich (CDI). — *(DA)* Does the President-in-Office consider that the long-awaited declaration will be signed at all at the next summit in Stuttgart, and does he think that the reservation made by one Member State — that Member State of course being Denmark — regarding consultation with Parliament can be overcome?

Mr Mertes. — *(DE)* You have asked my opinion. I believe that the Solemn Declaration on European Union will be signed at the Stuttgart Summit. I regret that there are still — and, as an optimist, I emphasize the word 'still' — reservations. However, in view of the obvious will in favour of European Union which pervades this House, I believe I have every reason to hope that between now and Stuttgart the Members of the House here today will lobby the recalcitrant governments so assiduously that my optimism will, thanks to them, be even stronger.

(Applause)

Mr Hutton (ED). — Would the President-in-Office accept that it would help Members to lobby effectively if he would say in which Member States the real blockages lie and what the nature of those reservations is?

Mr Mertes. — *(DE)* You are putting me in a somewhat difficult position. You will appreciate that the Member States are particularly sensitive in matters concerning sovereignty — and quite rightly so. I fully appreciate this. But I am constantly astonished at the high level of knowledge demonstrated by the Members of this House, and that knowledge is directly attributable to their personal ties with their national authorities. Given the immense possibilities the Members of this House have for informing themselves on the attitude of their own governments to this theme, I would ask you to appreciate my reluctance to provide the kind of information you requested in this House, with due consideration for the legitimate sensibilities of the various Member States — or rather, of those States to which I have alluded.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* I hope, of course, that the President-in-Office will not repeat his last reply. With reference to the question by Mrs Hammerich concerning the European Union declaration, the aims of which, as so far ascertained, are manifestly opposite to all the declarations of the Greek Government up until now on its relations with the EEC, I would like to ask the President of the Council why he is optimistic that this document will be signed in Stuttgart? Is it to be a document of the Nine without Greek participation?

Mr Mertes. — *(DE)* You are aware that at innumerable international meetings, meetings of NATO bodies or of the European Community, there have been texts which had the support, on the essentials, of all Member States, albeit in the case of some, with reservations. These reservations were indicated in a footnote. However, the inclusion or absence of such footnotes does not detract in any way from my optimism concerning the political substance of what I have just said.

Mr Eisma (NI). — *(NL)* Why does the President-in-Office of the Council name Denmark as obstructive and not any other country which may also be obstructive?

Mr Mertes. — *(DE)* I did not use the expression 'obstructive'. I respect the wishes of every Member State government. I am in no way breaching the secrecy of Council deliberations by saying that everyone knows that Greece, among others, has asked certain questions. Nor do I wish to question the legitimacy of the questions asked by Denmark and Greece. I find grounds for optimism in the substantial progress made in the Ten's secret negotiations during the past few weeks. I have already urged Members to make use of the channels of information at their disposal and so to do their part in the European unification process.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 8 will be answered in writing.¹

¹ See Annex II to proceedings of 8 June 1983.

Question No 9, by Mr von Wogau (H-137/83):

The aim of the Commission proposal for a 14th Directive on the harmonization of turnover taxes is to simplify the VAT procedures and formalities in intra-Community trade and, in conjunction with other measures, to achieve further progress towards creating an internal market.

Is the Council likely to adopt the 14th Directive on the harmonization of turnover taxes in the near future and if not, why not?

Mr Mertes. *President-in-Office of the Council.* — *(DE)* After an initial information debate during its meeting of 1 February 1983, the Council subjected on 1 March the Commission's proposal on the deferred payment of VAT falling due upon importation to a detailed examination in connection with the 14th Directive on the harmonization of turnover taxes. The examination revealed a considerable divergence in Member State's attitudes. To allay Member States' fears with regard to this directive, the Commission undertook to seek a solution to the problems which have emerged through bilateral channels. Once these discussions, whose outcome I do not wish to prejudice, have been completed, the Council will take up the matter again.

Mr von Wogau (PPE). — *(DE)* Is the Presidency aware that, although we all agree upon the need to make progress towards achieving the internal market, those of us who strive to achieve it constantly find themselves in the proverbial hare-and-the-hedgehog situation because they are sent from one office to another. One is told that the VAT can be settled elsewhere rather than at the frontier, but statistical data have to be taken account of. Here one is referred to the MCAs on agricultural produce, there to the inspection of personal data and the possibility of drug-smuggling or yet again to tobacco and alcohol, which are subject to different duties, with the result that one never reaches the end of it. As we are now debating a procedure which has been adopted with success by the Benelux countries and Great Britain, but which, if we are to believe the other Member States, creates insurmountable difficulties for them, we must once and for all break the vicious circle to which I have referred, by making a political decision and pick out one of the important elements in the chain.

One of these is the VAT, which is collected at the frontier in the form of an import turnover tax and which gives rise to a great deal of the administrative proceedings there.

Whence my question: would you be prepared to break this vicious circle by striving within the Council to reach a political rather than administrative solution to this one issue, if possible before the end of the German presidency?

Mr Mertes. — (DE) Mr von Wogau, you have really asked two questions. In the first place you asked whether I was aware of the plethora of problems and the vicious circle you have described. Yes, I am well aware of both, and my personal experience as chairman of the Federal Government's committee of secretaries of state has amply demonstrated how problems of this nature come to the surface time and again and, inasmuch as they are raised in the ministries, are present at the local level. At all events I should be reluctant to underestimate their significance. However, your question has gone to the heart of the matter: should one now try, or is it not now high time, to break the deadlock through a political decision? I can also answer this question with 'yes'. Of course it can only be resolved politically, but those who deal with Community matters and with European union know only too well that it is a very arduous business.

I appreciate the comparison to the hare and the hedgehog. I subscribe to your comments, therefore, both emotionally and politically. The lesson I draw from your remarks and the political will underlying them, which I share, is an undertaking to communicate them to those directly responsible.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) As Parliament's rapporteur on this matter, I would like to thank the President-in-Office for the exhaustive manner in which he has dealt with the questions. I should like to ask two questions with the object of conveying our misgivings to the specialists concerned.

Concerning the reluctant Member States, would he try to persuade them to collect these duties as an experimental method for one year at places other than the border-posts, with the possibility later, on the basis of a report on the results, of resuming the practice? I consider this a contribution towards an eventual solution.

Mr Mertes. — (DE) Under the impression created by what you and Mr von Wogau have said, especially about the experimental method, as you call it, I shall resume my efforts along these lines as soon as the sitting is over — and in a practical way.

(Applause)

Mr Langes (PPE). — (DE) Mr President-in-Office, in addition to the fable of the hare and the hedgehog, there is another about the hare and the fox. Despite the remarks by Mr Rogalla on your laudable endeavours, I have the impression that a chase is still afoot which could lead to a resolution of the problem if one were simply prepared to adopt the Netherlands-Belgium-Luxembourg system.

Do you consider it feasible for the Council to impose the abovementioned system on the remaining Member States, or do you believe that the Federal Republic could give the example by adopting such a

system, thereby making it four Member States? Do you see here any chance of moving forward?

Mr Mertes. — (DE) Mr Langes, if we continue in this vein much longer it will really be fairy-tale time ... Listen with Mother ...

(Laughter)

You are quite correct. I fully concur with your remarks, and indeed take an active interest in seeing matters evolve in this direction, as do the Council and the Commission. There are problems here not only among the Member States but also within them. For example, the removal of internal Community borders conflicts with the legitimate concerns of Member States with regard to internal security or the fight against drug-smuggling. The problem is less one of good will than of reconciling competing interests. You, above all, Mr Langes, appreciate the extent to which I share your views on the necessity of emulating the good example of the Netherlands-Belgium-Luxembourg model. I am making use of this Question-time to make a further step forward; and I shall urge the Council to adopt an even more energetic approach in response to the House's wishes, so clearly expressed. This it has done in the past.

President. — As the author is not present, Question No 10 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 11, by Mr Galland (H-150/83):

The Soviet Union has approached GATT with a request to be granted observer status.

What is the European Community's position on this?

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Council. — (DE) I can only state that I am unaware so far that the Soviet Union has made an official approach to GATT for the purpose of obtaining the status of an observer there.

Mr Galland (L). — (FR) Since three months have passed since I asked this question, I have only to regret that the German presidency has not gone more deeply into the matter I raised and verified the accuracy of my statements. If the German presidency is willing to do this *a posteriori*, it will see that it could have given me a detailed answer on precise facts.

Mr Mertes. — (FR) I am afraid I really do not understand what you have just said, Sir.

Both the Soviet Union and Bulgaria have taken official steps to sound out the possibility of obtaining observer status, more particularly at the air traffic committee. This is so very far removed from even the most tentative introduction of a preliminary request that the Council presidency is unable to make any hypothetical comment at this stage of the proceedings, given the absence of an official request.

¹ See Annex II to proceedings of 8 June 1983.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* With the ending of questions to the Council, I would like to raise a point of order with reference to Question No 13, by Mr Kaloyannis, which was not discussed today but is due to be put back to the next part-session. I would also like to remind you of the point of order which so occupied Parliament at Question-time during the last part-session, and of the view shared by us and the European Democrats — with the intervention of Mr Welsh — and by Mr Genscher, who, in replying, if I am not mistaken, to a question by Mr Papaefstratiou, said categorically that such questions were in no way connected with the Rules of Procedure of Parliament, with the Treaty of Rome or with the policies of the Community, but rather constituted interference in the internal political life of member countries.

You promised then that the Bureau would deal with the matter of these questions. If the Bureau does not deal with this matter it will mean that we are inciting the Council, that the Bureau is inciting the Council, that is, to interfere in the internal affairs of the various countries. Therefore I would like to request that the Bureau examine to what extent this question is admissible, particularly as it will coincide with the first month of the Greek Presidency.

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE). — *(GR)* I am at a loss to justify the matter brought up by Mr Alavanos, and, indeed, the reference to a question which will either not be discussed owing to lack of time or be dealt with on another occasion. Possibly Mr Alavanos — habituated by certain totalitarian régimes — wishes to curb the freedom of Members to put questions and choose topics which interest them.

Please, Madam President, call him to order.

Mr Kaloyannis (PPE). — *(GR)* The question referred to is mine and I insist, since there is no time now, that it be included in the next Question-time. The view expressed by my Greek colleague, albeit baselessly and to no useful purpose, has no place here. I take this opportunity just to remind him that he himself has tabled a question — on the subject of strikes in Greece — which will come up for discussion in this Chamber.

In what way is Parliament competent in matters raised by Mr Alavanos and not competent in the matters relating to freedom of the press which are touched on in my question?

(Applause)

President. — We shall conclude this discussion now. Mr Alavanos has raised a very important point which has been answered by Mr Papaefstratiou and Mr Kaloyannis. In any case the question goes automatically to the next part-session. He does not have to request this. I would inform Mr Alavanos that

tomorrow in the Bureau, the matter of the admissibility of questions raised at the last part-session will be discussed and the point that Mr Alavanos raised today and at the last part-session will be discussed then.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — I deeply respect the manner in which the President directs our endeavours and I think, therefore, that in responding to a political standpoint of ours it was intemperate of our colleague, Mr Papaefstratiou, to use such inadmissible phraseology as 'Mr Alavanos is influenced by totalitarian régimes' and the like. I think that you should call him to order.

With regard to the point raised by Mr Kaloyannis, our question on strikes has to do with Community policy on trade unions. We are asking about the policy of the Community on trade unions, Mr Kaloyannis, not about the policy of the Greek Government.

President. — We are not discussing the substance of the matter. We are discussing a procedural matter which I have informed the House will be considered by the Bureau tomorrow.

We turn now to the questions addressed to the Foreign Ministers.

Question No 18, by Mrs Schleicher (H-127/83):

Are the Foreign Ministers familiar with reports concerning the Bitterfeld (GDR) 'Death Squad' which indicate that inhuman demands are made on the 25 000 people who work in the chemical plant under extremely dubious conditions because of the absence of industrial protection measures? These reports include an eye-witness account from Jürgen Sprenger, a typesetter, who states, 'I have known many cases of comrades collapsing with acute poisoning and being taken away to an unknown destination'. Are the Foreign Ministers prepared to inform the GDR authorities that this situation has come to their notice and produced a sense of outrage among the population, and will they point out that it places a strain on the special relations between the Community and the GDR?

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — *(DE)* Because of the special nature of German-German relations, this question has not been discussed within the framework of European Political Cooperation. I cannot, therefore, comment on the matter.

Mrs Schleicher (PPE). — *(DE)* Would the Foreign Ministers be prepared to bring such matters and the indignation of the population to the attention of the authorities in the GDR and to inform them that such a state of affairs endangers the special relationship the GDR enjoys with the Community?

Mr Mertes. — (DE) The Government of the Federal Republic is well aware of the reports on the Bitterfeld chemical plant and is treating them very seriously. It is in possession of statements by detainees formerly employed in the chemical plant who were permitted to go to the Federal Republic: these speak of individual cases of burns and skin disease.

As the facts which have come to light concern individual cases, it is difficult to ascertain whether they constitute sufficient grounds for action *vis-à-vis* the GDR authorities. The matter is being looked into.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Is the President-in-Office aware, in his fortunate position of being able to observe, that there are many cases of industrial-related diseases reported daily from behind the Iron Curtain? They have much vaunted standards which seem to exist only on paper. These infringements are of interest to those of us who are trying to achieve reasonable standards within the Community for protecting the health of workers and are frequently quoted. Can you, Minister, promise us that you will keep an observing and watchful eye on these matters?

Mr Mertes. — (DE) Mr Sherlock, I am so happy to give you an unequivocal assurance on the matter.

President. — Since they deal with the same subject, I call Question No 19, by Mr Israël (H-160/83):

Do the Ten intend to express the satisfaction and relief felt by the European Community following the conclusion of an agreement between Israel and the Lebanon ending the state of war between the two countries and providing for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon?

Do the Foreign Ministers of the Ten plan to make any diplomatic approach to Syria to ensure that the troops from Damascus and their PLO allies also agree to withdraw from the territory of the ill-fated Lebanon?

Would such a diplomatic initiative not be the most constructive action that could be taken at the present stage?

and Question No 20, by Mr Cousté (H-163/83):

Have the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation duly welcomed the agreement reached between Israel and the Lebanon on the cessation of hostilities, and have they modified their policies on relations with the Lebanon and Israel accordingly?

Mr Mertes, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (DE) I am grateful to you for allowing me to answer Questions No 19 and No 20 together as both concern the conclusion of an agreement between the Lebanon and Israel.

The Ten have discussed the situation in the Near East following the conclusion of the Lebanon-Israel agree-

ment and Syria's attitude to that agreement. In this connection, they were informed of a bilateral approach to the Syrian Government by the Federal Republic's ambassador in Damascus. The Ten are considering what further steps to take. They have not, as yet, completed their deliberations.

They stress their commitment to the sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of the Lebanon. They remain steadfast in their support for President Gemayel's efforts to restore the authority of the State. For the rest, I can only endorse the contents of the latest resolution on the situation in the Lebanon adopted by Parliament on 19 May last.

Mr Israël (DEP). — (FR) The Community has certainly been very active in this affair of the Near East. At the beginning, we adopted the Venice Declaration; we have continued to make solemn declarations by the score.

Has the time not come to make a new solemn declaration saying that peace in this part of the world is seriously endangered by the attitude of Syria and by the troops allied with it, the troops of the PLO? If we do not do it now, when shall we do it?

Mr Mertes. (DE) Mr Israël, as you yourself have pointed out, there has been no joint statement on this particular question.

What is the reason for this? Voting in European Political Cooperation is based on the principle of consensus. If one or more of the Ten are unable to agree with the view of the majority, there can be no joint statement.

Mr Cousté (DEP). — (FR) I am utterly dismayed by the answer I have just heard, for if there is no common action on the part of the Ten, what is the Community? What is the Community waiting for in an affair which is so dangerous for peace and so serious from the standpoint of human rights? And I wonder what the President-in-Office meant when he told us that the German Ambassador, who was evidently acting on behalf of the Ten *vis-à-vis* the Damascus government, has not yet concluded his mission, while we still do not know whether the Syrian and PLO troops will withdraw from the Lebanon, or when; nevertheless he states, in an obvious hurry to conclude, that the Lebanon should be freed from all foreign occupation. I am greatly surprised, and greatly saddened as well.

Mr Mertes. — (DE) I must begin by pointing out something very important. When the German ambassador in Damascus made the approach to which I have just referred, the Syrian Government reaffirmed its categorical rejection of the Lebanon-Israel agreement and stressed that in the present circumstances it had no intention of entering into negotiations with the Lebanon.

Mertes

As you are aware, the Ten have constantly endeavoured to do justice to political developments in the Near East. Because of the fluctuations in the Near East situation, it is still not possible at the present time to make a final assessment or decision on future political initiatives. I therefore share your consternation, but you should realize that the European Council in Stuttgart will be dealing with this matter very seriously. Notwithstanding your criticism, which I appreciate, I feel I should draw your attention to what I said just now. It is not a general but a very specific statement. The Ten stress their commitment to the sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity of the Lebanon. To repeat: they remain steadfast in their support for President Gemayel and his efforts to restore the authority of the State, but I must repeat that the fundamental principle underlying European Political Cooperation is that the absence of a consensus — which I deplore as much as you — precludes the formulation of a common position.

However, I think you should not underestimate the degree of convergence on fundamentals in the Community position; and if even in the United States, in Israel and in all the States directly concerned people are still arguing about the various aspects and the various timings, this should help you to understand the failure so far to arrive at a clear decision on this issue within European Political Cooperation.

Mr Nordman (L). — (FR) Mr President, while fully appreciating the personal slant you have tried to give to your answer, I want to say that I fully share Mr Cousté's consternation. I wonder, and I ask you, whether the lack of a tangible positive reaction from the Community to the agreement which has just been concluded does not tend to confirm the notion that in matters of foreign policy, and especially in the Near East, the Community is unfortunately using a double standard. In fact, each time a reproach has been addressed to the State of Israel, we have seen vigorous and often disproportionate reactions from the Community, while each time — and particularly in the present case — that it is possible to give some credit, if I may say so, to the State of Israel, there is only silence. Are we not in danger of discrediting the diplomatic action now being taken?

(Applause)

Mr Mertes. — (FR) To give you a very candid answer, I will say that I share your consternation and so does the government of the Federal Republic of Germany. Our government has adopted a position similar to yours, but we are a community of States with diverging viewpoints. We are therefore very sorry that up to now it has been so difficult for us to find a common political position. But it must be acknowledged that the Council and the ministers meeting in

Political Cooperation have discussed the matter. There are different points of view and it is not for me, as representative of presidency, to attribute good or bad notes to the various governments.

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S). — (DE) Mr President-in-Office, if Mr Nordmann's contention is true, and if the Ten can only find a consensus when it comes to criticizing Israel, but not the PLO or the other belligerents, would it not be logical for the Council to desist from issuing official declarations condemning Israel until the other members of the Ten, who cannot make up their minds to condemn the remaining belligerents, suddenly find themselves prepared to do so?

Mr Mertes. — (DE) Mr Sieglerschmidt, I should like to begin by answering on behalf of the Government of the Federal Republic and to state that there is an objective need for balance, if you wish to call it that, in issuing condemnations. The European Council of 21-22 March 1983 issued a declaration on the Near East which, I believe, meets the requirements voiced by you. However, I take your remarks very seriously. I appreciate and sympathize with your views, and I shall bring them to the attention of the European Council so that it can deal with your request. One cannot apply double-standards. That is a fundamental principle in international affairs.

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — (GR) I have followed the Minister's replies and received the impression that when he really wished not to be evasive the manner of his reply had the opposite effect.

To put it specifically, he was called on to say why the Council does not issue a statement expressing the view that Syria and the Palestinians are threatening peace in the Middle East. He replied that the Council is not issuing such a statement because of a possible lack of unanimity.

I want to ask him: is that the reason? Do the other members of the Council and he believe, that is, that peace in the Middle East is threatened by Syria and the Palestinians and not by Israel, which is occupying Arab territory and has been responsible for so many attacks? I will not mention the acts of genocide, etc., so as not to inflame the discussion.

I desire a straight reply from the Minister: for what reason is the Council not issuing such a statement?

Mr Mertes. — (DE) Mr Ephremidis, despite your assertion that you followed my answer attentively, I must point out that you did not listen to me carefully. I did not in any way evade Mr Sieglerschmidt's question. I merely indicated some facts, and in my view you are going too far in asserting that I evaded the question.

Mertes

Nor did I maintain that Syria and the Palestinians are a threat to peace. Neither as the representative of the Council nor as a representative of a national government would I allow myself to make such a primitive and simplistic statement. I merely indicated that, because of Syria's attitude the German ambassador to Syria made further enquiries, for, as you are aware, the primary goal in the case of the Lebanon is the withdrawal of all foreign troops, and this also appears to be what the Lebanese people want.

I hope that it is also what you want Mr Ephremidis.

The question arises, from various points of view, as to whether and when Syria will be prepared to participate in such a withdrawal. That Syria has a heavy responsibility to bear in this matter is an objective fact and not an insinuation. I have not attempted to pass judgement on the reasons why Syria has until now adopted this attitude. Since the matter is, understandably, the subject of legitimate discussion within European Political Cooperation, there is in fact no common position and I therefore cannot present a common position on this question to the House.

I should like to draw attention to a word you used towards the end and which I feel to be particularly irresponsible. You used the word 'genocide'. During the Second World War, genocide was practised in the name, albeit falsely, of the German people.

In Auschwitz systematic genocide was carried out against Jews, gypsies and a part of the Polish people.

This was deliberate genocide. It is an insult to the victims of that systematic genocide when you use this word to describe the events that took place in the Lebanon last summer.

(Applause)

President. — The first part of Question Time is closed.¹

On behalf of the House I thank both the acting Foreign Minister and Mr Genscher, who, during the six months of the German presidency, have made every effort to answer most fully all the questions put to them by Members of this House.

Mr Kaloyannis (PPE). — *(GR)* Because Question No 21, which remains to be discussed, is mine, and the time at our disposal has run out, I request that this question be included in Question-time during the next part-session.

President. — Mr Kaloyannis, if you would be kind enough to listen to me, I did say that your earlier question would automatically be taken next month and that is also the case with this question. It is not necessary to ask formally.²

1

(The sitting closed at 7.05 p.m.)

¹ See Annex II to proceedings of 8 June 1983.

² For the agenda of the next sitting, see the Minutes.

*ANNEX**Votes*

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

**BOCKLET REPORT (Doc. 1-78/83 : Community Youth Exchange Programme) :
ADOPTED**

The rapporteur spoke

IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 2, 3 and 4; and

AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 and 5.

Explanations of vote

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (*GR*) Cooperation between young people, irrespective of nationality, is more than necessary in Europe today. There are the critical problems of peace, of the American missiles, of the struggle to win the right to work. However, the Youth Committee's motion for a resolution falls right outside this context. Its title, 'youth exchanges', is, in our opinion, misleading. In reality it constitutes an attempt by the Community to take political control of the youth movement. It is clear from the resolution and from what the rapporteur has said that the political aim of the exchanges is the promotion of European political union.

Secondly, it constitutes an attempt to supervise the development of the youth movement. Except for those which have given tangible proof of loyalty to the European Idea the youth organizations are by-passed and ignored, just as national bodies are disregarded in paragraph 5, while responsibility for the shape and content of the exchanges will rest with the Community institutions alone.

Finally, in our opinion, it constitutes unacceptable financial interference in matters which concern the international youth movement. The rapporteur asked for 16 million drachmas to be earmarked for propagandizing the concept of political unity. In 'bankers' language', I fear, the Greek spokesman for the Legal Affairs Committee thought the proposal a good investment. Both these colleagues should know that youth cannot and will not be bought off, that there is no chance of its abandoning the great objectives of peace, disarmament and the right to work on account of some sort of European 'Great Idea' which I doubt exists outside the walls of the European Parliament.

The Communist Party of Greece will vote against the Bocklet report, and from this platform we urge the Greek Government to reject any commitment by our country in this field both publicly and in the Council, and more generally to reject the institutionalizing of ideological, cultural and educational interference by the EEC on a pretext of cultural cooperation in the framework of European unity, particularly as all of this is extraneous to the obligations imposed by the Treaty of Rome and the Treaty of Accession.

Mrs Boserup (COM) (in writing). — (DA) I have nothing against people with common interests getting together to promote their ideas. It would undoubtedly be very nice and jolly to have EEC football, EEC concerts, EEC paintings and EEC dog-shows.

But the Foundation is intended as a means to serve the end of European integration, and any use whatsoever of taxpayers' money for this purpose is an inadmissible transgression against those who think differently.

The Danish Government must — together with the like-minded Governments of Great Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany — on this issue invoke the much-vaunted idea of privatization and refrain from obliging the citizens of the Community to defray the losses *via* public funds.

Mr Fernandez (COM) (in writing). — (FR) I will not dispute the intentions expressed in Mr Bocklet's report. Youth exchanges in the countries of the Community are not unworthy of interest, but for my part, I should like to touch on some major issues which affect the young people of the ten countries of the Community.

At the time of the first Frenchman in space, what are the lives of too many young people? Five million are unemployed. Others have what they call 'little jobs' — work that leads nowhere. Many lack vocational training and have no prospect of some day holding a position where they can acquire skills.

The young do not ask for charity, but they justly assert their claim to a place in society and demand the right to a steady job with training potential. They told us this with great vehemence at the extraordinary part-session of our Parliament recently held in Brussels.

Let us be clear about it! We cannot isolate young people from economic and social life and then view them as an inevitable burden. Vocational training should be organized with a view to providing skilled jobs at the end of the training periods, for the problem cannot be solved with austerity policies. The facts show this. The dismantling of industry for the immediate benefit of certain trusts, the redistribution of capital, the financial speculation, have produced this ever-growing number of unemployed, particularly young unemployed persons in the Community.

And so we have to *produce* in the Community countries. This means rebuilding an industrial fabric, creating employment, the source of new wealth, and launching a new flow of trade among the countries of the EEC and with the developing countries. Youth responds to this idea of cooperation, in a spirit of equality and justice, with the countries of the third world. It is aware of the problems of world peace, and we understand its indignation at the huge sums spent on missiles, so many permanent threats to peace, at a time when we are surrounded by problems.

In conclusion, I will invite the young people of Europe to come to Paris on 19 June for the great festival for world peace. That, too, I think is a good way to promote exchanges among the young people of the Community.

Mr Kyrkos (COM) (in writing). — (GR) We shall vote for the Bocklet report, since we consider that exchanges of young people promote the construction of Europe and, above all, the consolidation of peace throughout the world, as well as promoting the education of the individual and his knowledge of European culture and civilization.

In our view, the Community, in collaboration with the Member States, must bear the economic burden of augmenting youth-exchange programmes. We would also emphasize that young migrants should take part not only in programmes for teaching them their mother tongue and the language of their host countries but also in schemes enabling them to get to know the young people of the countries where they are living, in order to avoid the phenomenon of racialism which is to be observed today.

BOSERUP MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-412/83 : Decision on early vote) : REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

* * *

JANSSEN VAN RAAY REPORT (Doc. 1-264/83 : Memorandum on Greenland's withdrawal from the EEC) : ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke

IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 14 and 15 ; and

AGAINST Amendments Nos 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 18

Explanations of vote

Mr Muntigh (S). — *(NL)* Greenland, a country as big as the European Community, one of the most beautiful and interesting I know, a country with magnificent landscapes and hence a major responsibility for preserving nature, wants to leave the European Community and stand on its own feet. That means that 50 000 people will have to manage this enormous island with its gigantic coast-line and the logistical difficulties that entails. Big powers such as Canada, the United States, Russia, Scandinavia, the European Community will be its partners on the international scene, powers which will certainly try to exploit the land and natural resources of Greenland. An administration chosen from 50 000 people, no matter how charming and intelligent, will have to compete with the administrations of those powers and with organized international business.

My view is that they will not manage. Greenland is forgetting the law of nature, *homo homini lupus est*, that man is a wolf to his fellow men. Greenland will be mangled by the international pack of wolves, including, I am perfectly sure, the European Community. Greenland would have been better advised, Mr President, to strengthen its alliance with one of the strongest wolves in the pack and form a lasting friendship. The chance of being eaten up can thus be measured. The Greenlanders, I am convinced, will be in great danger.

The Greenlanders have decided otherwise, and that I respect, which is why I shall regretfully vote in favour of the motion for a resolution.

Mr D'Angelosante (COM). — *(IT)* The opposing vote of the Italian Communists is amply justified by the foregoing debate. In spite of the very many opinions to the contrary, the situation is characterized by the following incontrovertible facts :

First : our Community is a 'Community of States'. It is therefore impossible for a State to remain in the Community while a part of it withdraws. Anyone who says that it can is not speaking in good faith — or if he is, that makes it even worse.

Second : a country which does not respect the primary condition for fulfilling the intentions of the Treaty — very low income and unfavourable economic situation — cannot be considered for status as an associated country. It would be not only questionable but infamous to take a country which is fairly well-developed from the economic standpoint and assert that it has these qualities.

It has been said that Greenland belongs to another continent. Sicily, Mr President, was under Arab domination until the eleventh century, and, geographically speaking, some parts of Sicily are farther south than Tunisia ! Therefore it is pure foolishness to say that the conditions to justify OCT status exist for Greenland.

There has undoubtedly been some haggling on the part of the Commission. I think that the fishing issue is behind all this ; I also think, however, that the Commission was unlucky in this regard...

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

I am truly astounded that this Parliament, which, to accomplish political union, is prepared to ask for a modification of the Treaty, can tolerate this bargaining and grant an unjustifiable request.

Mr Cotrell (ED). — I wanted briefly to explain why I will not support this motion for a resolution and this report and why I have supported some of Mr D'Angelosante's amendments — which will, of course, amaze him equally.

Certainly I think that granting OCT status will require an amendment to the Treaties, which I do not think is possible. Secondly, I think that the resolution of Greenland's problems lies within Denmark. You see, I think what we are discussing here this afternoon is whether Greenland is a nation or not.

I certainly do not regard the Community as a prison of nations. If any one wants to leave, they should be entitled to leave. But that does not equally mean that while we will not place any stones in their path we are actually going to lay out the red carpet as well. I think the Greenlanders must accept the consequences of their own referendum or, alternatively, they could hold another one based on the knowledge of the problems that they now face. If we are to ease the exit of the Greenlanders by making special arrangements for them to leave their responsibilities as participants in the Community, then we shall face a problem which I think Members of this House ought to address themselves to more seriously — and it is one that Mr D'Angelosante has mentioned. If parts of nations are to withdraw from the European Community, then I would suggest to you that this Community will unravel at its edges as the years go by. I think we have to address ourselves to the constitutional propriety of the Community and I think we have to suggest to the Greenlanders very firmly that if they want to be members of the Community we will continue to welcome them; but if they want to leave the Community, then we should wish them farewell.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (*GR*) Although a great distance separates us from the political standpoint of the rapporteur and consequently we see the problem of Greenland from a different standpoint as well, we must confess that the report and the motion for a resolution are both creditable and in line with the basic principles of international law.

The Members who belong to the Communist Party of Greece will therefore vote in favour of the motion for a resolution submitted by the Legal Affairs Committee, and with greater alacrity now that the amendments tabled by our colleague Mr D'Angelosante have been rejected. Because Mr D'Angelosante is a member of the Communist Group, and in order for there to be no misunderstanding, I should like to make it clear that, in our opinion, the views of this colleague are not only untenable but also dangerous. We consider that they could be turned against the interests of the Member States of the Community, where only the people have the sovereign right to decide on their international links, and I fear they run counter to the United Nations' Charter, which recognizes the right of peoples to self-determination, something that I am afraid was not recognized in Mr D'Angelosante's amendments.

* * *

**MACCIOCHI REPORT (Doc. 1-121/83 : Right to vote and stand for election):
ADOPTED**

The rapporteur spoke

IN FAVOUR OF Amendment No 6; and

AGAINST Amendment No 5.

Explanation of vote

Mr Van Minnen (S). — *(NL)* I shall vote in favour of this motion for a resolution, but with a heavy heart. This motion has remained so limited that it is anything but a masterpiece. Note carefully that exactly one year before we want to try to persuade the European electorate that there is some such thing as a European democracy we venture to publish a report on the right to vote without even daring to mention the European elections.

If you ever have the insolence to speak of a European idea, then this is a real slap in the face for such a European idea. If the European Parliament ever had a chance to keep its promise of four years ago, that in the next European elections all citizens in the Community would have the right to vote and stand in elections, then that chance was certainly Mrs Macciocchi's report. This Parliament has thrown away that chance.

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 8 JUNE 1983

Contents

Mr von Hassel	100	<i>Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Mr Kirk; Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Mr Purvis; Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Mr Nyborg; Mr Haferkamp (Commission)</i>	132
1. <i>Decision on urgency</i>			
<i>Mr Barbagli; Mr Sutra; Mr Hord; Mr Lange; Mr Alavanos; Mr Beazley</i>	100		
2. <i>Williamsburg Summit</i>		— <i>Question No 22 by Mr Cousté: Strengthening the Community's internal market:</i>	
<i>Mr Thorn (Commission); Mr Glinne; Mr Croux; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Piquet; Mr Galland; Mr De Goede; Mr Bonaccini; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mr Thorn (Commission)</i>	101	<i>Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Cousté; Mr Narjes; Mr Rogalla; Mr Narjes; Sir Jack Stewart-Clark; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	134
3. <i>Shipment of hazardous wastes (Doc. 1-370/83) (continuation)</i>		— <i>Question No 25 by Mr Gontikas: Obstructions to the production and circulation of pharmaceutical products in Greece:</i>	
<i>Mrs Weber; Mrs Lentz-Cornette; Mr Sherlock; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Eisma; Mrs Le Roux; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	110	<i>Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Gontikas; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Alavanos; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Gontikas</i>	135
4. <i>Ethyl alcohol — Second report (Doc. 1-240/83) by Mr Dalsass</i>		— <i>Question No 26 by Mr Eisma: European Parliament's resolution on the standardization of car bumpers:</i>	
<i>Mr Hord; Mr Dalsass; Mr Purvis; Mr Dalsass; Mr Sutra; Mr Früh; Mr Hord; Mr Dalsass; Mr Gautier; Mr Dalsass; Mr Hord; Mr Luster; Mr Prout; Mr D'Angelosante; Mr Dalsass; Mr Luster; Mr Hord; Mrs Vayssade; Mr Prout; Mr Hord; Mr Louwes; Mr Gautier; Mr Früh; Mr Hord; Mr Martin; Mr Louwes; Mr Sutra; Mr Purvis; Mr Sablé; Mr Prout; Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Purvis; Mr Dalsager (Commission)</i>	116	<i>Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Eisma; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Cousté; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Notenboom; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	136
5. <i>Agricultural incomes — Interim report (Doc. 1-1327/82) by Mr Maher</i>		— <i>Question No 31 by Mr Adonnino: Establishment of the European Monetary System:</i>	
<i>Mr Maher; Mr Purvis; Mr Eyraud; Mr Diana; Mr Provan; Mrs Barbarella</i>	128	<i>Mr Ortoli (Commission); Mr Adonnino; Mr Simpson; Mr Ortoli (Commission); Mr Chanterie; Mr Ortoli (Commission)</i>	137
6. <i>Topical and urgent debate (objections)</i>		— <i>Question No 37 by Mr Davern: Abolition of farm modernization scheme grants under the terms of the coalition's 1983 budget — Ireland:</i>	
<i>Mr Israël</i>	132	<i>Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Davern; Mr Dalsager (Commission)</i>	138
7. <i>Question Time (Doc. 1-389/83) (continuation)</i>			
<i>Questions to the Commission</i>			
— <i>Question by Mr Møller (former Oral question with debate)</i>			

— Question No 38 by Mr Kallias: Problems of the European younger generation: Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Kallias; Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Chanterie; Mr Richard (Commission); Mrs Hoff; Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Purvis; Mr Richard (Commission); Sir Jack Stewart-Clark; Mr Richard (Commission)	138	Mr Thorn (Commission)	144
— Question No 40 by Mr Simmonds: Postal communication within the EEC: Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Battersby; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Habsburg; Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Purvis; Mr Narjes (Commission)	140	— Question No 55 by Mrs Tove Nielsen: Pigmeat prices: Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Beazley; Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Maher; Mr Dalsager (Commission)	145
— Question No 42 by Mr Kirk: Dumping prices on imported Christmas trees: Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Mr Kirk; Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Mr Habsburg; Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Mr Bonde; Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Sir Jack Stewart-Clark; Mr Haferkamp (Commission)	141	8. Agricultural incomes (Doc. 1-1327/82) (continuation) Mr Davern; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mr Gautier; Mr Clinton; Mr Fernandez; Mrs Spaak; Mr Vgenopoulos; Mr Helms; Mr Treacy; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Tolman; Mr Dalsager (Commission)	146
— Question No 44 by Mr Donnez: Infrastructure financed out of the Regional Fund in the Nord-Pas de Calais region: Mr Giolitti (Commission); Mr Donnez	142	9. Fruit and vegetables — Report (Doc. 1-224/83) by Mr Colleselli — Oral question with debate (Doc. 1-187/83) by Mr Kyrkos and others, to the Commission Mr Colleselli; Mr Vgenopoulos; Mr Kaloyannis; Mr Kyrkos; Mrs Pauwelyn; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mrs Pery; Mr Müller-Hermann; Mr Adamou; Mr Dalsager (Commission)	153
— Question No 47 by Mr Habsburg: The situation in Nicaragua: Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Mr Habsburg; Mr Haferkamp (Commission)	142	10. Votes Mr Hord; Mrs Schleicher; Mr Sherlock; Mrs Schleicher; Mrs van Hemeldonck; Mr Simpson; Mr Donnez; Mrs van Hemeldonck; Mr Sherlock; Mrs van Hemeldonck; Mr Sherlock; Mrs Weber	158
— Question No 48 by Mrs Lizin: New procedure under Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty: Mr Narjes (Commission); Mrs Lizin; Mr Narjes (Commission)	142	11. Statement by the President Mr Israël; Mr Cottrell; Mr Davern; Mr Bangemann; Mr Cottrell; Mr von der Vring; Mr Arndt; Mr Nord; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Barbi; Mr Alavanos; Mr Simpson; Mr Arndt; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Cottrell; Mr Israël	160
— Question No 49 by Mr Purvis: 1981 Analytical Tables of Foreign Trade: Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Purvis; Mr Narjes (Commission)	143	12. Votes (continuation) Mr Sherlock; Mr Prout; Mr Dalsass; Mr Purvis	163
— Question No 52 by Mr Früh: Submission of a programme to reform the common agricultural policy: Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Früh; Mr Dalsager (Commission)	143	13. Agenda for next sitting Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Maher	163
— Question No 53 by Mr Rogalla: Administrative committee procedure Mr Thorn (Commission); Mr Rogalla; Mr Thorn (Commission); Mr Purvis;		Annexes Mr Ephremidis; Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mr Ephremidis; Mrs van Hemeldonck; Mr Bombard; Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mrs Weber; Mr Cottrell; Mr Chanterie; Mr De Gucht; Mr Skovmand; Mr Adamou; Mr Hord; Sir Fred Catherwood	165

IN THE CHAIR : LADY ELLES

*Vice-President**(The sitting was opened at 9 a. m.)¹*

Mr von Hassel (PPE). — *(DE)* Madam President, on a point of order. This morning I received the Bulletin of the European Parliament of 6 June. On page 9 under 'Most important decisions taken by the Bureau' it says that the resolution on the introduction of the European flag only concerns the flag of the European Community and that the use of the European Parliament's symbol is not questioned. I wish to ask the President whether he or the Bureau may change a decision taken by the House, because the resolution Parliament adopted explicitly states that the European Parliament's present flag is to be included.

The present blue flag is flying outside this House. The emblem consists of a laurel wreath embracing the letters E and P. By a decision of the House this flag is replaced by twelve gold stars, similarly on a blue background. If you were to say, Madam President, that, for example, writing paper bearing the old emblem will not be replaced immediately, I would say that your interpretation of the resolution is correct. But as rapporteur I would like to know whether you and the Bureau agree that it is unacceptable for a decision taken by the Members of the European Parliament to be reversed by the Bureau.

(Applause)

President. — Mr von Hassel, you will not, of course, expect me to give you a reply immediately. This matter will be looked into and a reply will be given to you, possibly by 3 o'clock this afternoon. Your point has been noted².

1. *Decision on urgency*

Proposal from the Commission to the Council on : IV a Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 516/77 on the common organization of the markets in the sector of products processed from fruits and vegetables (Doc. 1-422/83).

Mr Barbagli (PPE), rapporteur. — *(IT)* Mr President, following the Council's request for urgent procedure, the Committee on Agriculture met yesterday afternoon. It noted that the request only concerns the fourth part of the more general measure regarding the

situation of the fruit and vegetable growers, which is under consideration by Parliament, and has not yet come to the attention of our Committee. The Committee on Agriculture, which has appointed me rapporteur in this matter, will be meeting in the next few days to discuss it.

What we have to do in this instance, on the other hand, is to solve a problem going back to 1981, regarding the surpluses of raisins and dried figs in Greece which, because of difficulties in their disposal, are still in store and in danger of deterioration, whilst storage costs are about one million ECU a month. Our Committee therefore proposes that this dried fruit — about 55 thousand tonnes of raisins, and 3 500 tonnes of dried figs — should be sent for distillation.

The Committee on Agriculture supports this request for urgent procedure, and asks Parliament to adopt it.

President. — Does anyone wish to speak in favour of Mr Barbagli's request ?

Mr Sutra (S). — *(FR)* Madam President, my dear colleagues, the quantities in store in Greece have risen to their present level as a direct result of the manner in which the Community is run. I do not wish to be critical of the Commission, which, in my opinion, had no other course available to it. When Greece joined the Community, a relatively high intervention price was announced for raisins which could not be marketed, a perfectly justifiable measure to assist that country at the time of its accession ; in the event, intervention was required for large quantities of raisins. The accumulation of these stocks is therefore of our own doing.

Secondly, these raisins have remained in store because we have failed to observe Community preference. There was no surplus in Europe since raisins, whose properties are well established, have always been a traditional part of the European diet, but we chose to ignore Community preference and imported raisins when supplies were available from within the Community, from Greece, so that it is because of two successive mistakes on our part that Greece now has these stocks on its hands.

We should therefore accept the consequences of our own action and honour our responsibilities. It would be scandalous if Greece had to pay for Europe's mistakes ; it would be scandalous for Greece, after three years of membership, to be penalized for having joined the Community. This, in my view, is a matter of fair treatment and respect for a new partner. If we wish to promote the right image of Europe in Greece, well then we should grant this request for urgency.

(Applause)

¹ *Approval of the Minutes* : see Minutes

² *Motion for a resolution (rule 49 of the Rules of Procedure)* : see Minutes.

Mr Hord (ED). — Madam President I rise to speak against this proposal for urgency, not because I have anything against the Greek dried fruit industry but because I do not believe that this is a subject that warrants urgency from this House. I agree that it is a very important matter, but, as we have just heard from the rapporteur, it is fruit which has been in store since 1981. If it has been in store for that time. I do not see why it is suddenly so urgent or why this House should not be given time to discuss it. It comprises a very substantial amount of dried fruit — some 58 500 tonnes — and probably more importantly, the proposed cost of the disposal of this dried fruit will be something close to 60 million ECU.

In those circumstances, and bearing in mind this House's concern over increased agricultural spending, and the fact that this is a matter which has been in existence since 1981, I sincerely believe it would be inappropriate for this House to grant urgency. Being an important matter it should be debated in the usual way and we should have the opinions from the other relevant committees.

Mr Lange (S), chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (DE) Madam President, the Committee on Budgets was asked for its opinion. We knew nothing of this request for urgency. The Committee on Budgets did not have an opportunity to express its views on this request. The matter is on the agenda for our meeting next week, and what difference does it make if it is held over for four weeks to enable the committees asked for their opinions to state their views on the costs involved, because the financial statement, as it now stands, is incomplete as regards the costs to which this operation will give rise.

We must be very thorough in our consideration of the money that the Community will have to pay for such purposes. I therefore agree with Mr Hord that we can easily consider this matter by the standard procedure. We could put it on the agenda for July, and Parliament could then devote the necessary time and care to taking a decision. What is more, it is an old trick of the Commission's and Council's to leave certain things until they think they can put us under pressure by claiming that time is short. That is another reason for rejecting this request for urgency.

(Applause)

President. — In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, I have taken the rapporteur, I have taken the chairman of a committee involved and I have taken two speakers, one in favour and one against, I am not taking any more speakers on this item.

(Parliament adopted the request for urgent procedure)

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

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Madam President, you said that this matter was to be included on the agenda for Friday. May I request that, if possible, it should be placed first on the agenda, because we Greek Members are due to depart early on Friday. The matter is one of particular concern to Greece and we would appreciate the opportunity to be present, both during the debate and for the voting.

President. — Mr Alavanos, I cannot, of course, guarantee the position on the agenda, but I am certain that every effort will be made to meet your request.

Mr Beazley (ED). — Madam President, we have a very important debate on the Commission amendments to Regulation 67/67 which this House must debate during this part-session. It is possible that it will be pushed out of the Thursday night sitting and into the Friday sitting. I feel therefore that in the interests of the House, since this is an institutional matter, it should certainly get precedence so that we may be certain of debating it on Friday morning. I would therefore not like any commitment to any other debate to put that in doubt.

President. — Mr Beazley, no commitment has been made by the Chair and your point will be noted.

2. Williamsburg Summit

President. — The next item is the Commission statement on the results of the Williamsburg Summit.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen, allow me to say from the outset that the Western Summit at Williamsburg was an economic Summit, and in particular that since the Commission, which I represented, was not involved in the discussions or policy statement on security issues, I shall confine myself to the declaration on economic problems, to which we were party.

In order to make a valid assessment of the results achieved by the Williamsburg Summit, it is necessary to bear in mind the particular nature of this type of meeting. A summit meeting is not a decision-making organ, nor could it be. Indeed, none of those taking part would allow such a summit to become the source of binding decisions affecting national policies or, in our case, Community policies.

Nor is it an institution, with all that that would imply in terms of procedures for the preparation and follow-up of meetings.

A summit is rather an occasion for face-to-face exchanges of views and consultations among the representatives of the leading industrialized countries.

Thorn

In a crisis such as that which we have been experiencing for all too many years, such exchanges of views are essential in order to reduce the risks of confrontation, exacerbated as they are by protectionist pressures and the host of difficulties created by rising unemployment and budget deficits in particular, secondly in order to ensure that each country's reading of the course of the crisis, in terms of a context which may be specific to itself, is made known to all the others, and finally in order to secure a convergence of views as to the impact of national and international policies which affect the international economic system as a whole.

Seen in this light, the Williamsburg Summit strikes me as one of the most useful of the three in which I have taken part. From the standpoint of the European Community, it was important in present circumstances that this Summit should be focused on a dominant theme: expansion of the world economy and consolidation of the economic recovery which is undoubtedly under way, but is still vulnerable and precarious.

This European message was conveyed clearly to our American friends during the preparations for the Summit.

All those aspects of the economic recovery that we considered essential were discussed frankly, and no attempt was made to gloss over any of them in the final declaration, although there were of course inevitably some slight or not so slight divergences of approach, as you will have seen.

I was also struck by the unity displayed by all the European participants both in their diagnosis and in their proposals, despite all that was written and said on this subject during the months of preparation prior to the Summit.

On the matter of interest rates, our American friends could not have failed to be impressed by the virtual unanimity with which the scale of the current and foreseeable deficit in the American federal budget was held to be the main reason why real interest rates remain at unacceptably high levels and, *ipso facto*, why the dollar is overvalued. On the monetary side, the Summit showed that positions have drawn closer together since Versailles.

It is now at least recognized, although no specific or binding commitments were entered into on this matter, that intervention on foreign exchange markets can be helpful in the short term as a means of dealing with disorderly situations.

In addition, clarification was given of the scope of the consultations to be conducted through the IMF, and the methods to be used in them, with a view to achieving progress in co-ordination of economic policies and convergence of economic trends, thereby esta-

blishing the basic conditions for greater monetary stability. This last point was in fact the subject of an annex to the joint declaration, which has been too widely — and unjustly — overlooked.

The Summit went further, calling upon the finance ministers to define the conditions required for improvement of the international monetary system, which could, if appropriate, be confirmed by a monetary conference at the highest level. The European Community will have to define and defend its position in the discussions on improvement of the international monetary system.

When considering this aspect in particular of the final communiqué, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is necessary to avoid both cynicism and naivety. Granted, we did not agree on the immediate convening of a second Bretton Woods conference, but no-one had any intention of doing so. Nor was anyone contemplating reproducing the Bretton Woods system forty years on. There have been great changes from the conditions which prevailed then, as we know, but a process has now been set in train which we hope will lead to a gradual reduction in the differences of approach between the leading interested parties.

It is in the fields of finance, development and trade that the differences of emphasis and the differences between the Community and the United States are regrettably still most pronounced.

The communiqué accurately reflects the degree of consensus achieved on these various points. We are agreed, for instance, on the importance of bilateral aid and multilateral aid, such as that of the IDA, especially in the eyes of the poorest countries. We are agreed on the need to combat protectionism with greater determination and, as the recovery takes a hold, to dismantle the barriers to trade that the crisis has brought in its train and to seek ways of achieving further progress in the liberalization of trade.

Speaking on behalf of the Community, I should nevertheless have preferred the communiqué to be more specific and more binding — and I said as much — in dealing with the need to increase aid flows to the poorest countries and the relationship between the treatment of debt positions and the availability of finance to promote both adjustment and development in Third World countries.

Nor, Madam President, do we share the American opinion that economic recovery and liberalization of trade will suffice in themselves to provide a safeguard, even in the short term, against the risks of further debt crises capable of disrupting the stability of the financial system and compromising the prospects for progress in the developing countries concerned.

Prior to the Summit, the preparations helped to concentrate discussions on the matters that we considered essential. During the Summit, the climate of

Thorn

debate improved in proportion to the understanding of each participant's standpoint developed through the exchange of views.

I hope that the course of events will confirm that this climate of mutual understanding can be sustained and improved during the post-Summit period. In the form that it has taken, the Williamsburg final communiqué at least has the merit of clarity, reflecting the full and frank discussions that took place. It also gives measured and somewhat cautious expression to a mood of optimism, or guarded optimism, about the prospects for consolidation of the recovery, of which there are, happily, increasing signs.

This said, let us be under no misapprehension as to the task confronting us. The crisis is not simply a protracted recession from which we can hope to emerge with the benefit of an upturn in the economic cycle; the crisis in Europe presents structural characteristics which the recovery taking shape in the United States will not eradicate and which no national policy pursued in isolation can overcome. If it is to defeat the crisis, Europe must transform its industrial structures, and it must therefore press forward in the process of economic, financial and monetary integration.

This, as you will appreciate, is not the concern of Western economic summit meetings, but it is what we should be taking action to promote in about ten days' time at our own Summit in Stuttgart.

(Applause)

Mr Glinne (S). — *(FR)* Madam President, Mr President, my dear colleagues, the Summit of the seven leading industrialized countries may well be neither a decision-making organ with formally binding powers nor an institution, but it is much more than an occasion for exchanges of views and consultations. In particular, taking the span from Versailles to Williamsburg, it is a measure of the viability of the European Community. The majority of the Socialist Group do not believe — and they are saddened by this — that the Williamsburg performances of the Community representatives, whether of the Member States or of the Commission, showed Europe to be sufficiently independent and determined, sufficiently concerned for equality in co-operation, sufficiently capable of identifying the real priorities in relation to the present Administration in the United States. The disproportion of roles was clear in the procedure and even in the choice of topics for debate.

President Thorn himself has just acknowledged that, in European eyes, and I quote, 'such a Summit should be focused on a dominant theme, namely expansion of the world economy', but the crucial fact is that the Reagan Administration did not accept this priority, either before or during Williamsburg, let alone what

its attitude will be now. The Williamsburg Summit lost its way, but there was nothing accidental about that. Having been arranged in order to examine whether the leading industrialized nations of the West together with Japan are capable of concerting their efforts to sustain a recovery in international trade and find a solution to the monetary problems, the Summit has very paradoxically temporized on the essential elements of economic solidarity — exchange rates, indebtedness, the danger of protectionism — and improvised on strategic solidarity. We are therefore dissatisfied and discontented, being convinced, as Socialists, that unemployment and the failure to meet blatantly obvious needs in our societies and in the Third World are the fundamental threats to international equilibrium. The East-West confrontation — and it is as well to emphasize this since it dominated Williamsburg — cannot be singled out for exclusive priority treatment to the extent of becoming an obsession, an ideological scapegoat for all shortcomings, a pretext for shirking more serious responsibilities.

The surest way to defend the values of freedom and democracy is, in our opinion, to eliminate unemployment, social privation and institutionalized injustice. Williamsburg was a far cry from all that. The Summit in Virginia failed to find the beginnings of a solution to the key problems of an overvalued dollar and excessive interest rates in the United States. According to President Thorn, and I quote once again, 'our American friends could not have failed to be impressed by the virtual unanimity with which the scale of the current and foreseeable deficit in the American federal budget was held by the European participants to be the main reason why real interest rates remain at unacceptably high levels and, *ipso facto*, why the dollar is overvalued'. But what practical results are there to show for their having been impressed, Mr President, apart from the futile gesture of conceding that an international monetary conference could take place on some unnamed day and that coordinated intervention on foreign exchange markets could perhaps prove 'helpful' (that was the word used), but God knows when.

Meanwhile, it is calculated by the competent authorities in France that every rise of 1,25 cents in the exchange valuation of the dollar increases the country's bill for essential imports by \$260 million. The central bank in the Federal Republic of Germany is having to draw heavily on its reserves to protect the Deutschmark and is even said to be considering an increase in interest rates, to the detriment of any possibility of an economic recovery. The overvaluation of the dollar is having disastrous effects on the price that we have to pay for our oil imports and on the circumstances of Third World countries with heavy debts. There are many other pernicious effects of such heavy dominance that I could mention if I had more time.

Glinne

At a time when the world economy is sinking deeper into stagnation, the Reagan Administration is not prepared to recognize that the recovery officially announced in America, if it takes place, will have a much slower ripple effect than the threatened collapse of the ripple effect economy. It is ideology, which can sometimes become a secular form of hidebound religion, that is leading the Reagan Administration to maintain that the free market can be relied upon to solve the problems, and to reject intervention on the foreign exchange markets and effective extension of regulation of the banking system to include international transactions. The fact is, however, that the troubles from which we are suffering will not go away of their own accord. The West's deterrence of the East will never be simply a matter of defence spending. Washington's budget deficits, which it is currently running to the accompaniment of intensive anti-taxation demagoguery, cannot be abhorrent when they are attributable to social spending and welcome when they are the result of increasingly massive military expenditure.

The necessary interdependence between Western Europe and America becomes a soured relationship when by far the more powerful partner arrogantly refuses to recognize that its own problems — an over-valued dollar, excessive interest rates, runaway federal deficits — are doing far more damage to others than to itself.

Madam President, our group was not expecting much from Williamsburg, so that it is not disappointed. However, the statement by President Thorn, who has made a very strange journey, having left as a negotiator and practically come back as a general, does contain one lucid point with which our group, in the main, is in agreement. You said, Mr President, if I may quote you again, that 'the crisis in Europe presents structural characteristics which the recovery taking shape in the United States will not eradicate and which no national policy pursued in isolation can overcome'. You are right, the more so in that you add, with good reason, that Europe needs to integrate more fully if it is to defeat the crisis, but that this is not the concern of Western summits, but the task to be tackled at Stuttgart.

We would happily forget Williamsburg if Stuttgart held out the promise of greater European cohesion and less competition between deflationary policies. The tragedy of our Community and its Member States is perhaps that it looks elsewhere for justifications or stimuli and is unwilling to present the need for radical action to save ourselves in terms of the needs of our own people, who long for peace and social justice.

(Applaus)

Mr Croux (PPE). — *(NL)* Madam President, our group's opinion on Williamsburg is perhaps more

refined than that of my honourable colleague Ernest Glinne. We know from experience, of course, that summit meetings, especially those of the industrialized countries, are even less well planned than those of the European Community. We have learned not to be over-optimistic about them, but we equally do not want to be defeatist in our attitude. We agree with Mr Thorn that it has been an important summit and wish to congratulate him and the whole Commission on their thorough preparation and on the forthright way in which he represented the European Community in Williamsburg. A realistic and constructive analysis shows us that this summit was indeed more important than previous ones, especially that of Versailles although we concede that the Versailles summit was held under more difficult circumstances. There are signs now of a certain revival, a more optimistic atmosphere, albeit with many reservations.

In view of the long crisis behind us the time has come to take the issues discussed at Williamsburg and put them into action. Monetary stability, convergence, continued rejection of protectionism, employment, concern for the Third World, preparations for an international monetary conference, the relationship between trade and finance via the IMF and GATT, all these issues were discussed at Williamsburg. Furthermore, and here too our views differ somewhat from those of our Socialist colleagues, the economic problems were seen in a wider context.

There are admittedly doubts as to whether it is wise from the institutional angle to discuss security and peace. But on the other hand it is unthinkable under present circumstances that the leaders of the Western world should meet and not discuss these matters. We have read the texts very carefully and we detect two main concerns there, on the one hand a major concern to maintain peace whereby, as appears from many press reports, the European presence was very important, and on the other hand a constant concern to be able to defend ourselves against any threat in the world. But there are also other matters, such as the need for an international policy on the environment and on public health. These are vague statements of principle but nonetheless positive indications, which may help advance more international cooperation in the various spheres of preoccupation to people everywhere at the moment.

And now we would like to ask a few questions on the follow-up to Williamsburg. As you yourself said, Mr Thorn, the declaration of Williamsburg is very vague and reticent on the Third World and the debt situation of some countries, and this at a time when a new UNCTAD conference has opened in Belgrade. We have always maintained, and still do, that the main economic problems in the world cannot be solved by ignoring the tremendous problems in the Third World.

Croux

Secondly, managing the financial problems of the world, too high interest rates, the large budgetary deficit of the United States, the rate of the dollar. I share Mr Glinne's concern on this point and we wonder when the United States will start changing things. We see the evolution of the dollar after Williamsburg. We also see the confrontation of the President and Congress. To reduce the United States deficit expenditure will have to be cut drastically and tax revenue increased. The President and Congress of the United States are discussing that just now. But be that as it may, we Europeans must push forward. The Commission wants to, as do the Council and Parliament. I refer to what the Political Affairs Committee said recently, that it wants to strengthen its relationships with Congress and a question on this is shortly to be addressed to the other Parliamentary committees. This is very important and takes up a point made by our group as long ago as last year.

Thirdly, the trade relationships between the United States and the Community. We are very worried about what is happening to the export act. On 30 September the present system expires and a review is being prepared in the United States. We know the Commission is following this very closely and we wish to encourage it to keep a very close watch on things. But the most important decision, Mr President of the Commission, and I would also address the Council, the most important decision is the final part of your declaration, namely Stuttgart. We must always ensure continuity in world events. Stuttgart will be extremely important for convergence, for the internal market, for our own resources, for the accession of Spain and Portugal, for strengthening the institutions, the basis for the European act. Parliament has repeatedly called for action over the last few months, and will do so again tomorrow in important urgent debates.

If we do not make considerable progress in Stuttgart in starting lasting action in the important areas just mentioned, then difficult times undoubtedly lie ahead for the Community. It is always said that Europe is our only alternative. That is perfectly true. But it can also mean something else. It can also mean that we find ourselves with no more constructive and positive choices to offer, that Europe will indeed sink in the short or longer term. That is the reverse of the coin that we sometimes forget. We often get the impression that our heads of state and governments are too concerned, understandably, with their national problems and too little involved in developments in Europe. We urge the Commission and the representatives of the Council and the German presidency to do everything possible in the remaining days to make Stuttgart a real milestone in the development of the Community.

(Applause)

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — President Thorn has told us this morning that nothing happened at Williamsburg and we expected nothing and we got

nothing. I do not think personally that we should blame this institution of the summit because summits are only any good if we have our signatures to put on an agreement which we have already reached in substance in our institutions, that we have already reached technically and that we have already reached politically. If you have done those two things you can then hold a summit and in that short time the statesman can go in front of the television cameras and put their signatures on.

The real problem here is that we have not got an agreed analysis of the problem either economically or politically. When we get that in our two institutions — in the Commission technically and in the Parliament politically — we can then put it to our Member States and they can then go off to a summit and they can then get agreement. But until we have precise proposals on which we all agree, to put them off to a summit is to get nothing out of these summits. And so we really have got to produce that kind of agreement between us. We need an agreed analysis much more profound than we have so far had and we also need agreed political solutions.

Now it is alright to say that the conditions are not the same as those for Bretton Woods and, of course, that is absolutely true. But that is not an excuse. Mr President, for saying oh well you cannot have Bretton Woods again. The fact of the matter is that we are still living on Bretton Woods, that is the existing agreement. The IMF was set up to give currency stability and for 25 years it did give currency stability. The GATT encouraged liberalization of trade and it was the biggest liberalization of trade in the entire history of the world. And the World Bank financed the development first of Europe and then of the Third World. Those three institutions still exist. We have no institutions but those institutions and those institutions, therefore, have got to be made to function in the new situation. We do not want another Bretton Woods in the sense that we need to set up three new institutions. But we need to see that those three institutions function in the world that we now live in.

Now it seems to me that we must recognize that Bretton Woods gave us actually the greatest increase in trade, in wealth and in employment in the entire history of the world. So we cannot simply say oh well we cannot have another Bretton Woods. The fact is that if we do not put Bretton Woods right; if we do not revise Bretton Woods for the existing situation, what we have left over from Bretton Woods will actually disappear. The system of Bretton Woods is now at risk. We have unemployment at 32 million in the OECD. But that represents a still functioning system. If that system ceases to function 32 million unemployed is going to look a low rate of unemployment and 12 million in the Community is going to look a low rate of unemployment in the Community. We have a system which has been a superb system and that system is still at a very high degree of risk. And if

Catherwood

we do not put that right within the next year then we are going to be answerable for the immense damage that will come. So we cannot look at this summit and say unfortunately the summit did not work; unfortunately we cannot have another Bretton Woods because the system has changed. We must, as these two institutions — the Commission and the Parliament — find answers.

The currency stability that we used to have, when the dollar was a stable currency, has gone and we have got to have that currency stability back again. We cannot maintain free trade without that currency stability. The pressures of protectionism will go on so long as the United States dollar can be carelessly overvalued and the yen carelessly undervalued. That is going to put immense pressures of protectionism on us all. And those of us who have to live in this particular business of international trade know those problems and they are not going away. We cannot recover the debts of the Third World or prevent bankruptcy of the Third World or prevent bankruptcy of our own banking system unless we recover. That is all still poised and still being rolled over but is not going to be rolled over forever. Within a year we have got to put that right again. We cannot simply wait for the cycle to come right.

I would suggest that the problem here is that we are bigger than the United States in world trade and more internationally oriented and, therefore, to some extent we have to give a lead. The trouble is that although we are 50 % bigger than the United States in world trade the USA still has 80 % of the world's reserve currency. So it has a completely disproportionate position in the world's reserve currency while still treating that currency as a mainly domestic United States problem. And that is the problem. And until we get that right it is not going to come right.

Well there are some very straightforward things that we should do. First of all, we have simply got to build our own reserve currency system which is as capable of attracting international funds as is the United States dollar to remove the entirely disproportionate influence of the dollar. That means that we have got to build up, President Thorn, the European Monetary System with all the vigour that we can muster.

Secondly, we have got to try to have currency stability and, therefore, we must put interest rates and currencies back into international negotiations. It is ridiculous that we should be arguing about the fine points of the GATT and the little nuances of the GATT while these enormous things, like the rates of interest in the United States and the stability of currency between the United States and the European system, are not in negotiation. We have got to put those back into negotiation.

And then we must not allow the subsidy war in agriculture which we have with the United States to sour our relations with the United States. And here I would

say to the farm lobby, I appreciate what the common agricultural policy has done but for goodness sake we must not put the 90 % of our trade which is not agricultural at risk because of a subsidy war with the United States in agriculture. That is absolute madness. If we do that there will be a great deal to answer for.

Finally, I think we have got to have a short-term economic *relance* which is not entirely based on the enormous deficit of the United States which is most unhealthy.

So, President Thorn, those are a few concrete ideas. I think we must get those ideas agreed within the next year so that when the London Summit comes we have something in London that can be signed by all those people on a piece of paper. We hope we will all be back here in a year's time and we will welcome from you, President Thorn, a response on how successful the London Summit, has been in implementing all the things that you and we have decided between us.

(Applause)

Mr Piquet (COM). — *(FR)* President Thorn was relatively modest in what he had to say. I am almost inclined to congratulate him on this. Not least because he spoke only of the economic and monetary problems, which is gratifying since the other problems do not come within our purview. However, I believe that you were right to be cautious, Mr President, because the results from Williamsburg are, to put it euphemistically, virtually non-existent. I for my part would submit that the lack of results cannot but give our Community cause for concern.

On the economic plane, Mr President, you said, broadly speaking, that Williamsburg was perhaps a little better than Versailles. My view is that in fact, despite the commitments entered into, this summit at Williamsburg produced no more positive, concrete results than the one at Versailles, and we can only deplore the fact.

The combination of a rising dollar and inordinately high American interest rates is creating very severe problems for our countries in terms of their external deficits; it is encouraging the speculative export of capital to the United States. From now on, therefore, countries in Europe will be having to meet a substantially heavier bill than hitherto, because of this American policy.

Moreover, it is significant — if we cast our minds back — that the boycott was declared immediately after a summit at which an effort was supposed to have been made to improve the monetary situation. The dollar is continuing to rise, breaking one record after another, as we are constantly told, and unfortunately there seems to be no end in sight. This is unacceptable to our countries.

Let us not pretend to ourselves that Mr Reagan is not bringing strong pressure to bear on our countries to get us to apply harsher austerity policies and to

Piquet

undermine the rights that have been won in some of our countries. This too, in our view, is unacceptable. I therefore take note of the statement that has just been made by the Commission on the economic aspects, but we nevertheless wish to reiterate our disappointment that, despite what you have said, the Europeans failed on this occasion to mount a sturdier, more vigorous response to the American pressures. I believe, Mr President, that we have the necessary means for such a response at our disposal: we have the EMS, our commercial policy and other means with which to resist these pressures from the Americans. Speaking on behalf of my group, I should like to see these means used more explicitly, in a more determined manner, in pursuit of a policy of economic expansion, with a convergence of our economies promoting such expansion and creating jobs. If we really have the will to meet these needs that have been created by contemporary realities, Mr President, the opportunity for a strong affirmation of this will must be grasped at Stuttgart.

(Applause from the benches of the Communist and Allies Group)

Mr Galland (L). — *(FR)* Madam President, my dear colleagues, the Western economic summit at Williamsburg, the eighth in the series, is now over and there are two questions that we could be asking ourselves today.

The first is: did this Summit achieve the things that could have been expected of it, and in particular the objectives set by President Thorn before it met? President Thorn had hoped that the opportunity for fostering the as yet fragile beginnings of a recovery would be seized at Williamsburg, that greater convergence of economic policies would emerge, and that this Summit could have an effect on three areas of major concern in the Community: the unduly high level of interest rates, monetary instability, and indebtedness in the Third World.

The second question is closely linked to the first. Are the rules according to which these summit meetings are held appropriate in the context of the crisis that the seven most highly industrialized countries in the world have to tackle, a crisis whose character has changed significantly since the first of these meetings was held in 1975, at the instigation of Valéry Giscard d'Estaing? President Thorn opened his speech by defining the limitations of this type of meeting, explaining that it could be neither a decision-making organ nor an institution. Following the Versailles Summit of June 1982, which was very disappointing, perhaps because its organizers were over-ambitious about its objectives and powers of decision, can it be said that Williamsburg is more satisfactory or less disappointing?

On the credit side, we have the united front presented by the Europeans to the Americans. We also have the political declaration on the balance of power and arms

between the East and West, and the unanimous affirmation that East-West economic relations should — I am quoting the communiqué here — 'be compatible with our security interests'. Again on the credit side, we have the declaration of intent to halt protectionism, an intent which Japan, for instance, should translate into action in order to secure the trend which appears to be gathering momentum — albeit all too uncertainly — in that country.

On the debit side, however, we have to record the absence of any clearly defined concrete commitments entered into by the participants. This is rather worrying, because the rules of diplomatic etiquette should not be allowed to obscure disagreements or arouse false hope. The catalogue of very laudable intentions concerning economic recovery contained in the Williamsburg declaration must be followed up by some modicum of effective action, since otherwise these meetings will forfeit their credibility and their very usefulness could be called in question. We shall be keeping a close watch on developments in this area to see what action is taken in practice on some of the points contained in the Williamsburg declaration.

In the field of economic policy, will the United States really reduce its interest rates? Will the budgetary stringency recently adopted in France be enough to 'reduce structural budget deficits, in particular by limiting the growth of expenditures'? Will the Ten forswear their covertly protectionist practices? On trade policy, will the intention to halt protectionism — which again can only be described as laudable — declared by the Seven at Williamsburg prove to be no more than a pious hope, or will it be given real effect?

On North-South relations — the Summit is very disappointing here, as President Thorn has stressed — the wording of the communiqué is to say the least vague. I quote: 'Restoring sound economic growth (in the developing countries) while keeping our markets open is crucial'. The least that can be said in the light of an analysis of the text is that it is to be feared that the unanimity achieved by the draftsmen will have done no more than whet the appetites of the developing countries. However, we accept that many of these matters cannot be more than partially settled at such a meeting, and we are thankful for small mercies, in that Williamsburg represents a step forward from Versailles. But now — let us be clear on this, as Gaston Thorn has been — our eyes are already turned towards Stuttgart. The Community must do more than merely exchange views — it is a decision-making organ. One of the benefits of Williamsburg is that it has thoroughly prepared the ground for Stuttgart. In the estimation of Liberals and all Europeans, it will be an enormous disappointment and the consequences will be grave if Stuttgart should prove to be another missed opportunity.

(Applause from the centre and right)

Mr De Goede (NI). — *(NL)* Madam President, the conference of Western heads of state and government in Williamsburg sent out a message of unanimity to the outside world at least, but whether this unanimity goes deeper than an analysis of the problems is doubtful, at least as far as the economic problems are concerned. For specific solutions were hardly forthcoming.

And so, for example, on one of the central issues, the American dollar, hardly any decisions were taken, as has already been said this morning. The great deficits in the American budget, resulting in stringency on the capital market accompanied by high interest rates, mean that the economic revival in Europe has been slowed down. And both Helmut Schmidt in the past and François Mitterrand now have repeatedly and rightly maintained that the American budgetary and monetary policy constantly creates major problems for us. Have any specific decisions been taken in this sphere, I ask Commissioner Thorn?

A second point is the situation of the developing countries. The burden of their debts and the low world market prices for their products still remain a big problem. The fine speeches emanating from Williamsburg on this subject only take on significance in my eyes if UNCTAD in Belgrade comes up with proposals, and expectations are not all that high on that score. Again I ask, have any specific decisions been taken in this sphere?

My third question is on security in Europe. We welcome the West's unanimity in its approach to the Soviet Union, especially now as discussions in Geneva are slowly entering a decisive stage. What I am particularly interested in is the answer to the question what role the President of the European Commission plays in such a discussion, that of a silent observer or of an active participant, or is he not present at all at such a discussion? I look forward to the answer to that question.

Finally Madam President, I agree with all those who said this morning that Stuttgart is more significant to our Community than Williamsburg. Let us hope that our assessment of Stuttgart will be more positive than that of Williamsburg.

Mr Bonaccini (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, on the eve of the Williamsburg Summit, someone said that the meeting ought to bring about joint understanding and strategic agreement on the future of our society.

I have, alas! to say that the only 'strategic' thing to appear was something in the military sense of the word, regarding problems that are of concern to our continent and all the nations in it.

I have noted the opening remarks in your statement, Mr Thorn, which I consider to be a denial of the rumours widely current in Europe to the effect that you, also, on behalf of the EEC, were involved in this part of the Williamsburg debate.

The verdict on Williamsburg has already been given by public opinion in Europe: in a nutshell, it was a mini-summit. I should like to quote the opinion — not of my own political party, but of the *Corriere della Sera* — which said the following day: 'The Williamsburg Summit has given the green light to a wave of monetary disorder, in which the markets will set about giving short shrift to the optimism and the cooperation which the Seven profess'. Never was there an easier verdict to reach, nor one that hit the mark more fairly and squarely. The declaration issued at the end of the Summit seems, in fact, particularly pathetic, as indeed — if I may say so — does the official defence put up by President Thorn, especially if it is compared to the realism of Baron Edmond Rothschild, who, the morning after the Summit, declared that anyone who expects an early fall in America interest rates is mistaken.

It is for this reason, Mr President, that I think the Summit was a festival of paradox and contradiction. The paradox of calling the Williamsburg Summit before Stuttgart.

I wish, Mr Galland, that you were right, but Stuttgart will be determined, as you moreover said, by Williamsburg, and so here again the results can only be those of a mini-summit.

It is paradoxical to set up a study group, after Versailles, that reaches conclusions on the question of monetary intervention that are the exact opposite of what was stated at Williamsburg and was then, in the final communiqué, ignored with the promise that this group will continue to study the same things, and for who knows how long? Therefore: paradox and contradiction in relation to the resolutions adopted by our Parliament on the question of unemployment, and on Williamsburg itself, on the eve of the Summit: the paradox regarding the budget deficit, which seems to be solely a European question, and ignores the two hundred thousand million deficit in the United States, to the point of legitimising the colossal impudence of the American Treasury Secretary, who has said he sees no connection between the amount of his country's budget deficit and the high level of interest rates.

Lastly, I should like to emphasize the problem of indebtedness, which has been a source of so much concern to my illustrious friend from the EPP Group. From this point of view, Williamsburg is very clear indeed: the adjustment and auditing of the accounts of developing countries will be done 'by indebted nations' and, as far as my knowledge of English goes, this has a perfectly unmistakable meaning and certainly does not directly commit all of us here.

There is, in essence, a considerable time lag, an open contradiction, a paradox, between preparation and conclusion, i.e. this 'small matter' of monetary stability, which should be pursued 'as the case arises'.

Bonaccini

The case is already here now. I do not think that Europe can go on any longer between the 'planning for the very very long-term future' of Mitterand, and the 'day-to-day' approach (to save the British financial empire) of Mrs Thatcher, but must instead be directed towards the aim of conservation realistically imposed by the President of the United States — an eclectic aim, maybe, and one that is very hard on our budget deficits.

To you, President Thorn, I should like to say: 'And what about Europe?' Europe, its identity, its desire to stand as a great, pacific force, culturally open to progress and the full understanding of the lessons of history. Europe was represented by the workers of every European country who met recently in Stuttgart. Nothing of that was in evidence at Williamsburg, and that raises doubts whether it can be given any prominence a week hence at Stuttgart. I hope I am wrong, but, whilst the dollar attack rages, Europe stutters. This is the tragic reality?

We reject such a picture and assessment of Europe, and we propose a Europe that will bravely build its own unity — creating, that is, a stronger capability to face all other realities and all other countries, whether industrialized or not.

IN THE CHAIR : MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

Mr Pasmazoglou (NI). — (GR) Mr President, the Williamsburg communiqué was a vague, and for that reason weak declaration of the need to coordinate the economic policies of the major politico-economic entities in the world, the United States, Europe and Japan. At the same time, it highlighted the great international economic problems that we speak about nearly every day in the European Parliament and the other organs of the Community.

The Williamsburg communiqué should not be regarded as negative or meaningless. What is certain, however, is that it is unacceptably inadequate. It has far too little to offer for the very acute economic problems faced by our peoples and for the very difficult international economic problems highlighted a little while ago by Sir Fred Catherwood. Nevertheless, at Williamsburg the need was recognized to coordinate economic policy. This was a vague but still substantial victory. However this places a very great responsibility on Europe, including of course the European Community. The Community must be organized in such a way that it can assume a leading initiative in these efforts, and impose this necessary coordination on an international scale.

With these introductory remarks, I wish to make the following very general comments :

My first comment is that there is a large gulf, a distance, a void between the currents prevailing in the European Parliament and the Commission, and the

decisions and actions of the governments, the Council of Ministers and, I am afraid to say, the views that often prevail within the political parties in our countries. This gap must be bridged. Unless there is decisive progress in strengthening the Community's institutions and in coordinating our activities, the European Community will not be able to assume this leadership initiative and we will continue to receive communiqués like the one from Williamsburg. In other words, there will be stagnation in the great economic problems that beset us. The lack of an analysis, emphasized by Sir Fred Catherwood, is ultimately a political problem, and from this standpoint a great deal of blame can be laid at the door of the governments and the political parties.

My second comment is that the Community's institutions must be reinforced, and this underlines the importance of the reorganizations we are considering in Parliament and in the Council of Ministers, and indeed with significant contributions from the Commission.

My third comment concerns the European Monetary System. It is necessary to intensify the coordination between the activities of the techno-political organs of the European Monetary System and the necessary political decisions. Mr President, unless this is achieved I fear that vague communiqués such as that of Williamsburg will continue to appear, and progress towards dealing with the problems of our peoples and of the world economy will be much too slow, and in the final analysis, negative.

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) Very briefly, Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I should like to thank all those who have spoken in this interesting debate. I should merely like to clarify a number of points, without going into details, since it is not for me to defend any Williamsburg policy. My role this morning was simply to report on what was said. It is not our policy, the Community's, the Commission's, that is under consideration here, nor was it at Williamsburg.

It should not be forgotten, as Mr Glinne pointed out a moment ago, that none of us, neither the Community nor the Member States, would countenance the taking of decisions on national policies at a meeting such as the Williamsburg Summit. Consequently, no such decisions should have been expected. When fanciful illusions are harboured, bitter disillusionment can be expected to follow. An exchange of views was held on an analysis of the situation and the course to be pursued in future. I believe that we should be thinking in terms of the three stages : preparation for the meeting, the meeting itself, and events thereafter.

During the preparatory phase, the Community had an important role to play, co-ordinating the activities and positions of four of our Member States with those of the six others which would not be represented at the Summit. This part of the mission, which I feel should not be underestimated, was accomplished. Never has a

Thorn

Summit been as well prepared on our side; the ten Member States were kept informed of every detail of the progress of preparations.

We were also able to ensure that certain topics, such as those which led to the setbacks of the 'post-Versailles' period, were not put back on the agenda for this meeting. Perhaps I was too discreet in saying this earlier on, but we succeeded in getting the agenda we wanted.

During the Williamsburg Summit, the climate improved. Will it prove to have been a great Summit, a success? Only the future will tell. Do not forget, Ladies and Gentlemen, that Versailles was a good summit on the whole. But it was not until later, two, three or four weeks afterwards, that we saw that our American friends were not abiding by the spirit of Versailles, as you were reminding us a while ago. I do not need to go into what they did. We shall therefore have to wait before judging the merits of Williamsburg. Will the accord which seemed to prevail be sustained? Will it beget greater cohesion or will it fail to stand the test of time? I should like to say to Mr Glinne that he is perhaps seeing things in too negative a light, bearing in mind that he himself stressed that we were not there to take decisions. To those who tell us that we did nothing about interest rates, that there was no unison, I would quote from the communiqué: 'We must all focus on ... reducing interest rates from their present too-high level'. Until last year, the Americans were disputing that interest rates were too high and that action needed to be taken to lower them. We go on to renew our joint commitment to reduce structural budget deficits. This is the first time that the Americans have agreed to reduce their budget deficit. Are they going to do so? That is another matter, I concede. But at least, at a meeting of this nature, we have endeavoured to persuade them to follow this course.

The procedure aimed at promoting convergence of the economic performance of our countries is to be strengthened. Let us not forget that we too have commitments here, and that action is needed to achieve greater stability of exchange rates. We are willing to undertake co-ordinated intervention in exchange markets, in instances where such intervention would be helpful. We do, therefore, have the beginnings of a strategy. Only time will tell whether all this is actually going to be done.

A final word on the developing countries. We share the disappointment of various earlier speakers at the difference of approach between the Americans and ourselves as regards what should be done about the debt burdens of developing countries. But believe me when I say that the Community, the European countries and the Commission especially, were in the thick of the fray fighting to get something more substantial in this sphere. And thus far we have at least secured a

commitment from the President of the United States to take all necessary steps to ensure compliance with IDA VI, albeit rather late, and then we shall be rolling up our sleeves for IDA VII. There has been a positive response, therefore, even though it may seem inadequate.

In conclusion, I would refer to the frequent talk of a European identity. When monetary matters are discussed, it is said — rightly — that there should be a European reserve currency, the ECU. Very well, then, let us talk about this identity. I see that the British colleague who was calling for it is no longer present, but I should like to say to him that, if we on our side are to affirm our identity, the United Kingdom should join the European Monetary System. We should begin by convincing ourselves!

(Applause)

We should not always be trying to put the burden of responsibility elsewhere, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is why the forthcoming Summit at Stuttgart will be more important, since it is there that we shall see whether or not there really is a European identity. I am counting on the support of all of you to prevail upon our Governments to make a serious effort, since otherwise Europe faces a deep crisis, and I have to tell this House that the state of preparations fills me with forebodings.

President. — The debate is closed.

3. Shipment of hazardous waste (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the report by Mrs Van Hemeldonck (Doc. 1-370/83)¹.

Mrs Weber (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission proposal we are discussing today, which is in itself to be welcomed, has been overtaken by the events involved in the game of transfrontier hide-and-seek with the extremely dangerous waste materials from Seveso. It very quickly became apparent how tragic the omissions of the past have been. If the Member States had observed the 1978 directive as required, this incident should not have occurred. Nor would it have occurred if the Commission had acted promptly in urging the enforcement of the directive rather than waiting, as the other question I put in May confirmed, until February 1983 to bring an action against Italy for failure to fulfil an obligation under the Treaty. Furthermore, it is not clear even now what was going to be done with the waste after it was removed from the abattoir. This directive should change the situation entirely. It is to be hoped there will be no recurrence of criminal activities on the part of unscrupulous

¹ See Debates of 6. 6. 83.

Weber

profiteers acting, inexplicably, in cooperation with multinational pharmaceutical companies, which are otherwise so quick to boast of their responsible behaviour.

We believe, however, that it is not only hazardous wastes which should be carefully observed when transported across the Community's frontiers, because the danger inherent in a substance has nothing whatsoever to do with its intended purpose. It is completely immaterial whether arsenic or dioxin is later processed, stored or disposed of if they are involved in an accident or improperly stored. These substances are lethal whatever happens. Hence the need to extend the list of dangerous wastes to include the poisonous and dangerous substances listed in the 1978 directive, as the European Parliament's resolution of 16 May quite clearly demanded, not least because of the possibility of wastes being designated reusable raw materials as a means of circumventing all the checks. We take the view that the optimal method of disposal must always be chosen. This does not, of course, mean the scandalous storage of waste in an abattoir without any form of protection or storage when burning is likely to be the only safe way of disposing of the substance. Nor does it mean throwing the remaining 133 drums of Seveso waste into the sea, a possibility being discussed in Italy at the moment, when it is known that they will begin to rust after about a hundred years and release the dioxin they contain. What we want is disposal in the country in which the waste arises. There is no place for poisonous-waste tourism. Only when it can be proved that the disposal of dangerous substances in the country of origin is impossible, should its transport across a frontier be permitted. Each country should draw up a plan for improving the infrastructure needed for this purpose. The number of points at which poisonous wastes may continue to cross frontiers must be substantially reduced to enable expert personnel to carry out effective checks of freight and documents. The number of products in whose manufacture dioxin occurs or during whose disposal it is later released must be reduced. We expect the Council to have more than a fact-finding discussion at its meeting on 16 June. We think it will be too late if the working party does not begin its work until May. Parliament has shown how these things can be dealt with responsibly. I suggest that as soon as possible the Commission should investigate dumps which have already been closed, some of which are unauthorized: in the Federal Republic of Germany there are five thousand of these in Bavaria alone. We cannot allow future generations to be burdened in this way. What we need as quickly as possible is an accurate record of existing dumps and precise plans showing when they will be inspected and made safe or removed. We need an integrated concept for the treatment, storage and transport

of hazardous wastes, or we shall not be fulfilling our mandate to protect our countries from harm.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs Lentz-Cornette (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, to say that it is an ill wind that blows nobody any good is certainly appropriate in the case of the disappearance and equally mysterious reappearance of the 41 drums of dioxin.

As a result of that episode, this proposal for a directive and the report on it have been produced in record time. It has taken such a shock to its system to focus Europe's attention on the problem of toxic wastes and its possible implications for man and his environment.

The industrial society is producing an ever-widening range of products, and therefore an increasing variety of types of waste. Dumps for the disposal of these wastes and centres for their treatment or incineration have been set up, and many more are required. The illegal activities in this sphere, especially the running of unauthorized dumps, must be ended once and for all.

That is the aim of this proposal for a directive. However, we believe that it can be achieved more expeditiously by bringing in a regulation. It is for this reason that my group, the European People's Party, will be supporting the relevant amendment. This opinion is shared by the Economic and Social Committee, which is proposing that, should introduction of the regulation require protracted preparatory work on account of the many points of detail to be settled, this directive could be kept in the form of a framework directive, to be complemented by specific sets of rules to be applied directly in the various essential fields.

However, my group does not share the opinion of the Socialist Group that the scope of the proposal should be extended to all dangerous substances. We frankly believe that it is better to restrict it to those dangerous and toxic wastes which are clearly defined in Article 2; trying to be too comprehensive can be counter-productive.

The term 'dangerous substances' is too broad and many dangerous substances which are transported are used somewhere and their safe transport by road, rail, air and sea is already covered by many conventions and regulations.

The Gatto report of 30 September 1981 acknowledges this, as do the 1978 rules on the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances.

I would nevertheless invite the Commission to direct its attention to substances which are wastes to some companies but can still be re-used, that is to say recycled, by others, so that it should avoid labelling them as 'dangerous substances': these are wastes, although re-usable by another company.

Lentz-Cornette

Article 3 makes the producer or consignor responsible for waste, and requires the former or either of the two to give notice to the competent authorities in the country of destination, transit or despatch.

We believe — and we submitted an amendment to this effect which was accepted by our committee — that the producer should bear sole responsibility. There is no reason why he should not entrust his waste to a haulier or disposal expert, subject to all the necessary guarantees. It is the producer who should render account to the competent authority for the waste that he creates and the arrangements that he makes for its transport, treatment or storage.

Since such transport and final disposal are fully taken into account when calculating the price of the finished product, it is only natural that the producer alone should assume full moral and financial responsibility. As we have seen in the case of the drums of dioxin, Hoffmann-Laroche has felt itself to be responsible and is now making arrangements for what we can only hope will be their final disposal.

Another point raised by our committee was that each Member State should, as far as possible, attend to the arrangements for disposal of its own waste, so that no one State gradually becomes the dustbin of the Community. I grant that this may sometimes be difficult on account of the instability or permeability of the substrata in some regions, but I believe that the general principle should be that everyone looks after his own dustbins and his own waste.

At the same time, we have incorporated into the motion for a resolution a call for fuller co-operation to develop appropriate methods for the treatment, storage and disposal of dangerous wastes in accordance with the regulations.

We are all conscious of the dangers presented by toxic wastes. This is why very severe sanctions need to be applied in cases of non-compliance with the rules in force. The Seveso drums episode happily caused no harm to life or limb, but it did cost a great deal of money. Consider the expense of carrying out investigations at numerous dumps in various parts of Europe. One official told us that his ministry had to go through the procedure of equipping teams of men and carrying out searches etc. in response to each anonymous telephone call that was received. But consider also the cost to the various States in terms of their authority, because the people's sense of security received a severe jolt. There must be no recurrence of the dioxin scandal, we must put an end to cases of negligence and unnecessary complexity: everyone in this Chamber is of the same opinion. We therefore hope that this motion for a resolution, with our amendments, will be carried and put into effect without delay.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President, may I begin by saying that across all the political complexions and

sections which make up the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, there is agreement — and agreement comes from my group too — that this is a matter which should be dealt with effectively and should be dealt with urgently. We therefore support the proposal that a regulation would be appropriate in this particular matter. We also urge that speed is of the essence and therefore feel that the words proposed in the original idea of the Commission for a directive are more appropriate and should be restricted to the transport of hazardous waste materials. We fear that any attempt to extend this would result in difficulties for the Commission, in difficulties and delay in the implementation of these essential procedures.

Much has already been said. My colleague, Mrs Lentz-Cornette in particular, has drawn attention to the fact that one man's poison in this case can very well be another industry's raw feed stock. This is a concept for recycling of materials which has been underwritten and endorsed by every environmentalist authority in the western world as being worthwhile, as giving employment opportunities and as solving in an acceptable way the problems of toxic and dangerous substances accumulating at the end of industrial processes. I think to risk jeopardizing this newly-emerging industry would be a dangerous thing. I feel therefore that to get this matter through, and through swiftly this morning with a strong vote in favour tonight, will be of the greatest assistance to the Commission in the next stage of their task.

I have particularly been asked by one of my colleagues to point out that Hazchem labelling would be effective on those loads which are moved within Community States and across Community frontiers. I would like to underline one further final point. It is highly likely that one or other of the Member States may acquire particular skills in the disposal of particular types of material. For this purpose again it is important not to put too many difficulties in the way of legitimate movements. To try and condemn such emerging industries with the pirates and the cowboys of industry would be a risk better avoided.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, we are in full agreement with the resolution proposed by Mrs van Hemeldonck and the amendments that have been proposed, above all the one on the question of changing the directive into a Regulation. The question of the disposal and transportation of hazardous wastes is one that cannot be taken lightly and that requires a uniform approach from all States, since the dangers are uniform, as well as serious.

I think that this directive, which, I hope, will be converted into a Regulation, meets the demands of European people (which we saw on the occasion of the eventful, shameful transport of dioxin) regarding

Squarcialupi

the production, shipment and elimination of hazardous wastes. I thought I would look into what I would call the great ecological scandals of the year. Well, in this last year, all the ecological scandals, all the various ecological accidents, concerned toxic waste and hazardous waste. Whether they involved Holland, or Italy, or other countries, they always concerned the disposal or irresponsible shipment of dangerous waste.

That is why I want to dwell a moment on the other decision, which was taken by the Committee on the Environment: namely, the decision to include dangerous substances in the directive — or Regulation, as we hope — on dangerous waste. Our Group abstained on this point. We are in fact convinced that a tough regulation is necessary on the question of the shipment of dangerous substances. We consider, however, that it is not a good thing to link this question with the question of waste, for the purposes of control, because of the different psychological approach. The two substances are both dangerous: but, whereas someone wants the product and someone produces it, no-one wants the waste!

Another sore point — which, as rapporteur of the Committee on the Environment, I cannot forget — is the inadequacy of the Community budget: even though we do not yet know the precise figures, they are always inadequate to the needs of improving Community policies and applying those already in existence, especially where waste is concerned.

Some people are concerned about higher costs arising from these very strict rules on waste shipments and disposal. We must however look more carefully at environmental preventive policy, and provide incentives for clean technology — technology, that is, that produces less of the waste that causes us so much concern; a reversal of the trend, therefore, which I hope may have been started by the thorough and meticulous way in which the Committee on the Environment has faced up to this problem, which is not a problem limited to Member States, but one that goes beyond the frontiers of Europe.

Mr Eisma (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, we welcome the proposals from the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection to change the directive to a regulation, to extend 'waste substances' to 'all hazardous substances' and to require a permit instead of a simple notification.

Some speakers, Mr President, have said it will be difficult and take longer to have the Council pass a regulation than a directive. Nonetheless we believe that Parliament should vote in favour of a regulation. If the Commission thinks that this will meet with insurmountable difficulties in the Council, then we are sure that Commissioner Narjes will show sufficient skill to weaken the proposal.

He has already done so in the participation procedures proposed by myself and accepted by this House

for transfrontier environmental pollution in the third action programme for the environment. So we have fullest confidence in the negotiating skills of the Commission.

Mrs Lentz-Cornette and others said that we would be submerged if we were to extend this to all hazardous substances. We think this vastly exaggerated so long as hazardous substances are properly defined. Mrs Weber also made that point. This could be done on the basis of the annex to directive 78/319 which lists 27 hazardous substances, which is sufficient for the purposes of this directive. That should get rid of any difficulties in this sphere. We look forward to the Commission's views here.

We also welcome the amendment to article 3, para. 1 which states that hazardous wastes should in principle be eliminated in the country in which they originated. Only if that is impossible may they be transported to another country. So the latter alternative is kept to a minimum.

In conclusion, Mr President, I would say that the impression is created in the motion for a resolution and the explanatory statement in the report from the Committee on Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection that the disappearance of the 41 drums of dioxin alone gave rise to this proposal from the European Commission. I think this is being unfair to the Commission. Long before those drums went missing the Commission was already preparing the proposal, for which I respect them. We often criticise the Commission but now we are pleased to congratulate them.

This does not mean, Mr President, that the business of the 41 drums has not impressed on us the urgency of these problems. We therefore hope that the Council will tackle this proposal as soon as possible, preferably at its meeting next week on 16 June.

Mrs Le Roux (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, the debate on the Commission's proposal concerning the shipment of hazardous wastes within the Community has been given especial significance by the case of the dioxin from Seveso. This matter has come as a great shock to the people concerned, but without a shadow of doubt it is only the tip of the iceberg.

What are the quantities of toxic wastes and substances — there is no need to distinguish between wastes and substances, since their effects are the same — that are transported in this way without any special controls, without any distinctive markings on the vehicle, without the driver even knowing what he is carrying? Is it not time to put an end to this industrial secrecy, which is inimical to personal safety and the integrity of the natural environment? Is not this debate basically the same as the one on the movements of oil tankers, which are technically easy to monitor but not

Le Roux

always known, because of all this industrial secrecy? Is it not time that the employees of the companies concerned and the elected representatives of the localities where these substances are to be stored were kept informed and consulted?

This is what we had in mind when amending the motion for a resolution presented to us. It is important to emphasize the grave responsibility of Hoffmann-Laroche, whose name has already attracted unwelcome publicity from two previous cases: the hexachlorophene case, with the poisoning of 200 children, and the Seveso catastrophe. This further anomaly of this capitalist firm could have led to a further tragedy, and that is not acceptable. No, it is not acceptable that a preoccupation with making the biggest and most immediate profit possible should be allowed to lead to such proceedings. We believe that it is vital to impose effective sanctions on the people who cause pollution and accidents arising out of it, those who break the rules intended to protect mankind and nature. It is right that there should be common rules which leave no loopholes. Compromise is out of the question when the future of humanity and its environment is at stake!

With pollution, there can be no miracles. We have to rely on prevention, because there is no cure, but much remains to be done before we shall have progressed to the stage of having adequate prevention. It is noteworthy, for instance, that a number of provisions contained in international conventions on the storage and disposal of toxic substances and wastes cannot be applied because the necessary technical facilities are not available, either because they do not exist or because States have not deployed the efforts needed to make them effective. We therefore believe, in common with the rapporteur, that our countries should co-operate closely on research in the field of the treatment, storage and disposal of waste. This is in fact in line with the charter for the environment proposed in 1979 by the French Communist Members. This is our conception of Europe, a Europe of co-operation serving the interests of mankind and its environment, a Europe promoting scientific and technical interchange. We shall therefore be voting in favour of Mrs van Hemeldonck's motion for a resolution and hoping that the constructive amendments which we have tabled will receive the support of our colleagues.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like to begin by thanking the House very warmly for dealing so quickly and so thoroughly with the proposal we submitted in January and for already being in a position to deliver its opinion. My very sincere thanks go in particular to the committee responsible, the rapporteur and everyone else involved for dealing with this proposal so

constructively, making a great many suggestions and proposing constructive amendments, most of which we shall incorporate in our proposal.

But I should also like to take this opportunity to refer to the incident that sparked off the public debate on the risks inherent in waste management: the handling of the Seveso waste. I agree with all the speakers who have again mentioned this incident, and we would be particularly grateful if, rather than leaving it at this one aspect, we managed to make real changes in the general policy on all aspects of waste management. It is an area of enormous potential danger if we fail to recognize the sources of this danger, bring them under control and introduce appropriate legislation to govern them. We therefore set very great store by the earliest possible adoption and entry into force of the proposed Community system. The time factor has top priority for us.

The Commission drew up this proposal for a directive when it became clear after the adoption of the 1978 directive that increasing quantities of these wastes were being transported across frontiers for disposal and treatment and that there was growing uncertainty about the ability of the competent authorities of the countries concerned to ensure fail-safe checks and supervision. In the Member States of the Community some 160 m tonnes of industrial waste occur every year. Of this, 20 to 30 m tonnes must be classified as toxic, and therefore hazardous, waste and is consequently governed by the 1978 directive. About 10 % of these toxic, hazardous wastes, or 2 to 3 m tonnes, is transported across frontiers for disposal or treatment, and the quantity is on the increase. As an illustration, if we convert this quantity into 10-tonne lorry loads, it means that there are 200,000 to 300,000 road transport operations involving toxic wastes across European frontiers every year.

What we therefore need as soon as possible is directly applicable Community legislation that prevents the recurrence of such incidents. Consequently, the Commission in principle shares the view of Parliament's Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection that a regulation is a more appropriate legal instrument for this purpose than a directive. The Commission is therefore prepared to change its proposal for a directive into a proposal for a regulation, since a regulation has the dual advantage of immediately entering into force and of making for the greater legal uniformity of the provisions to be applied than the national legislation on application and implementation to which a directive would lead.

Something which originally caused me to hesitate, the fact that provision cannot be made in a regulation for more stringent penal legislation, will now form the subject of further discussions on a separate legal act designed to induce the Member States to tighten up

Narjes

and amend their penal law so that, as a general rule at least, serious offences are punished with imprisonment rather than being treated as no more than minor breaches of the rules. We have not quite completed our deliberations on this, but as it has no place in a regulation, it will form the subject of a separate legal act.

The Commission cannot unfortunately agree to one of the requests made by the House. This concerns the extension of our proposal to include dangerous substances and goods. The representatives of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and of the Committee on Transport have already advanced a wide range of arguments in this respect. The Commission takes the view that dangerous substances and goods in general and their transfrontier transport are already governed by numerous provisions: international conventions, Community directives and national legislation and administrative provisions. I would merely remind you, for example, of the various debates the House has had on Directive No 27/67 on the classification, packaging and labelling of dangerous substances with particular reference to the sixth directive amending this 1967 directive. Let me remind you of two of the requirements: communication of all important data on these substances and notification of the competent authorities no later than 45 days before the date on which they are to be marketed. It is, in short, a very general directive designed to protect the environment and public health against dangerous substances.

The transfrontier transport of dangerous substances is governed by a number of international conventions, which also apply to the transport of dangerous goods. These international conventions have similarly resulted in the adoption of national implementing legislation in the various Member States and have thus created a kind of legal system, which we cannot, however, consider completely adequate. If this extremely complex area, with its wide range of provisions and the changes it would necessitate, was included in the Commission proposal we are now discussing, it is unlikely that an early decision would be taken on Community legislation on hazardous wastes or that it would enter into force in the near future. It can only be adopted on 16 June if the original sphere of application of the Commission's initiative is retained. If we include the whole area of transport policy, I estimate that it will take another year at least. We do not believe that would be acceptable. I therefore ask you to appreciate our position and to drop the idea of a general extension to include the transport of dangerous substances.

(Applause)

This proposal and separate Community legislation on the transport of dangerous substances are not mutually exclusive. Nor do they exclude the possibility of the

Community taking action relating specifically to dangerous substances. Considerable progress has already been made in the preparations for this. The appropriate Directorate-General tells us that a proposal on the transport aspects of this subject matter can be submitted in early 1984.

You also prefer an authorization procedure to the notification we propose.

Our views do not differ substantially in this respect. The notification we propose would also entail confirmation of entry or, if necessary, the lodging of an objection at the time of the notification. If we went further than this and formalized the procedure by having a special authorization procedure for wastes from third countries, we would expose ourselves to the criticism of discriminating within the Community in favour of undertakings in a given Member State and against undertakings from other Member States. We have therefore proposed an approval procedure rather than a formal authorization procedure, which would discriminate against the undertakings of other Member States. That is the subtle difference between our notification procedure, under which approval is in fact required and objections can be made, and the authorization procedure proposed by the committee. It must be said, of course, that such notifications cannot be regarded as formal import permits, because we could then be accused of introducing new frontier checks.

Another major principle you wish to see adopted in the proposal is that as a general rule hazardous waste must be disposed of in the country in which it arises so as to reduce the number of movements across frontiers. This proposal is not completely unjustified. Although the Commission similarly feels — and this is our principal concern — that all risks and dangers attaching to disposal must be excluded, we believe that disposal in the most suitable facilities under the best possible conditions conforms more closely to the principle of reducing the risks than the general principle of disposal in the country in which the waste arises. We do not consider nationalism in waste management to be a worthwhile goal.

To give a practical example, it is surely better for hazardous waste arising here in Strasbourg to be disposed of in a suitable industrial plant near the frontier on the other side of the Rhine than for it to be transported 400 or 500 km to the South of France simply to satisfy the requirement that it be disposed of in the country in which it arises. I believe this example shows that we cannot regard national frontiers as an optimal arrangement, quite apart from the fact that a number of smaller Member States do not have suitable facilities for the disposal of every conceivable type of waste. We have 50 incineration plants in the Community, for example. Of these, only eight are suitable for the disposal of waste of the Seveso type.

Narjes

Are we going to force two Member States to install appropriate facilities, or would it be better to think in terms of a division of labour in waste management and to drop the idea of national waste management systems. I will not go into other implications involved.

Then there are a number of amendments which are extremely constructive. I should like to pick out three, which concern sanctions, liability and the fixing of a restricted number of border crossing-points. As regards the sanctions, I have already mentioned that we too are in favour of severe penalties in serious cases. As for liability, we agree to Parliament's suggestion that a stringent liability provision should be added, whereby the conventional liability for negligence would be replaced by the stricter form of the manufacturer's absolute liability. Incidentally, I should stress that in 1976 the Commission proposed absolute liability in a proposal for a directive on toxic and dangerous waste, but most of the Member States disagreed at that time and would not accept this proposal. We hope that now, with recent events still fresh in their minds, the majority will approve absolute liability.

It has also been proposed that the number of border crossing-points should be reduced. If the supervision of the transfrontier transport of waste is to be improved, it is undoubtedly important for staff at crossing-points to be appropriately trained, and this may not be the case at more than a few crossing-points at present. But it must be ensured — and we attach great importance to this — that these crossing-points are designated only with the Commission's approval. The Commission cannot agree to unilateral national decisions. Other amendments seek more accurate wording for the provisions on labelling, packaging, insurance and safety, and notification and accompanying documents. The Commission will either incorporate these amendments or take account of them in the implementing regulation. As we now have the regulation as the basis, appropriate technical details must be included in the implementing regulation. I would also ask you to appreciate that I cannot go into every point here. To conclude, I should like to express my sincere thanks to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, the committees asked for their opinions, the rapporteurs and draftsmen and say that we all hope to make a great deal of progress at the 16th Council meeting with the regulation in the form in which it will be approved today. I have some hope that we shall be successful.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at the next voting time.

4. Ethyl alcohol

President. — The next item is the second report by Mr Dalsass, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on

- I. The amended proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation on a common organization of the market in Ethyl alcohol of agricultural origin and laying down additional provisions for certain products containing Ethyl alcohol (Doc. 504/76 — COM(76) 274 final) and
- II. amendments thereto submitted by the Commission to the Council pursuant to the second paragraph of Article 149 of EEC Treaty (Doc. 209/79 — COM(79)237 final).

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, I rise on a point of order in connection with the Dalsass report and more particularly the Commission's proposals for an ethyl alcohol regulation. In this connection, in view of the fact that Parliament's own Legal Affairs Committee has come to certain conclusions on parts of the Commission's own proposals — and in particular Article 8 (3) and Article 9 — would it not be appropriate, having regard to the fact that the Commission's proposals do not conform to the Treaty, that the Commission should take back their proposals or at least that they should be taken back to committee so that the relevant committees can discuss with Commission officials those areas of the Commission's proposals which are in contravention of the Treaty? Perhaps, Mr President, you will be kind enough to ask the Commission whether they will be prepared to respond in that regard?

President. — Mr Hord, I must point out that the objection you have just made has already been raised at an earlier sitting. It was decided by the Assembly itself that the Dalsass report should appear on today's agenda.

Mr Dalsass (PPE), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is right that we should be debating this report today, because we considered this procedural question in March.

I should like briefly to revert to the contents of my report, which dates back to 1972. This makes it eleven years old, and it is therefore high time it was approved by Parliament. It has already been debated in the European Parliament, in 1978 but it was then that the question of competence was raised, and as a result Parliament referred it back to the committee responsible.

Dalsass

As rapporteur I then undertook to draw up a fresh report, which also goes back a few years now. This very extensive report also advocated a common organization of the market in ethyl alcohol of agricultural origin, entailing intervention, refunds and levies. It also proposed a price guarantee. The organization of the market would therefore be of the standard type with which we are familiar. This report was really all-embracing, since it covered not only alcohol of agricultural origin but also molasses alcohol, and it even covered alcoholic beverages.

As has already been mentioned, the Legal Affairs Committee delivered an adverse opinion, and I was also somewhat concerned that we might have the same situation as in 1978. I therefore tried to prevent this from happening. I wanted to settle the question of competence. To this end, a hearing was held to which only representatives of the Legal Affairs Committee, the Committee on Agriculture, the Commission and the Council were invited. During this hearing it was decided that the Commission was indeed competent, and the matter was therefore again referred back to the Legal Affairs Committee. I had reason to hope that the Legal Affairs Committee would now deliver a positive opinion, but this was unfortunately not the case, which is why I have again amended my report.

In so doing, I had recourse to Article 40 (2) (b) of the Treaty, which I saw as a possible way of finding a suitable arrangement for alcohol of agricultural origin. Article 40 (2) (b) provides for the possibility of the compulsory coordination of the various national market organizations. When I presented a report along these lines in the Committee on Agriculture, I immediately encountered reluctance to apply Article 40 (2) (b) because it had never been applied before and because it really would have caused difficulties.

I therefore went back to the beginning again and drew up this completely new proposal. I have departed completely from the Commission's original proposal. The proposal is no longer for a market organization in the usual sense, with refunds, levies and intervention. All that has been dropped, and we have also taken out the alcoholic beverages. Consequently, everything is now a great deal simpler.

We propose that the price of alcohol of agricultural origin should be reduced to the price of molasses alcohol. If this causes farmers difficulties in that it threatens their livelihood and the set price cannot be obtained for alcohol of agricultural origin, we propose that it should be possible for them to be granted aid.

As I have just said, all mention of alcoholic beverages has been removed, because the Commission has meanwhile drawn up and submitted a proposal specifically concerning the definition of alcoholic beverages, where appropriate account can be taken of them.

I did something else which at the time came in for particular criticism from the Legal Affairs Committee and was said to be illegal. The original proposal set aside specific uses for alcohol of agricultural origin, with the object of making it easier, cheaper and safer to market such alcohol. The areas specified included alcoholic beverages, semi-luxuries, acetic fermentation and pharmaceuticals. We dropped these reserved areas for the use of alcohol of agricultural origin to overcome an objection from the Legal Affairs Committee. We also dropped them because we felt that they are not absolutely essential, since the market organization can function without difficulty in its present form. I therefore believe it is now time for this proposal to be approved. I feel that those who have a genuine interest in agriculture will find it easy to give their approval, even if it is a very modest, a very simple arrangement, but at least it is an arrangement of some kind.

It is not right, after all, that the various national systems should continue to exist. We know that there have already been difficulties with the Court of Justice, which has denounced and criticized these different national systems and to all intents and purposes invalidated them. It is high time there was a Community arrangement that applied equally to all the Member States. In the form we have devised it will be simple and in no way costly, and even those people who do not have a great deal of time for agriculture will, in my opinion, be able to approve this arrangement, because it is very simple and will not cost a great deal.

I now come to the amendments that have been tabled by Members of various shades of political opinion. It has been suggested, for example, that rum should also be included in this proposal for a regulation. In reply, I must say that we have taken out any reference to alcoholic beverages and that a separate proposal has been put forward for such beverages, including rum. I therefore ask the author of this amendment to realize that I must oppose this proposal.

Various Members also feel the reserved areas for use should be reinstated in the proposal for a regulation. I ask these Members too to forgive me if I oppose this suggestion, because if they were reinstated, the whole concept of the proposal would be changed and the principles underlying this regulation would in fact be infringed. We would be reverting to the original position, which the Legal Affairs Committee, of course, criticized.

I invite Parliament to give its approval to this proposal for a regulation, which has now been on the table for eleven years, which I believe is the longest any proposal has ever had to wait for Parliament's approval.

Dalsass

I express the hope that Parliament will today adopt and approve this proposal for a regulation by a large majority.

IN THE CHAIR : MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, your immediate predecessor was dealing with a point of order from Mr Hord when Mr Dalsass intervened — apparently on a procedural motion — and then went on to give his ten-minute speech.

Your predecessor had not resolved the question that Mr Hord asked as to whether the Commission would respond on the legality of this whole procedure. I would also remind your predecessor in the Chair that the question of referral back to committee was not dealt with last month. I put that motion and I was told that it could only be brought up when the debate was in progress. The debate is now in progress. Barring the possibility of Mr Dalsager responding to Mr Hord's point, I would now like to put the motion which I put last month, under Rule 85, that in view of the legal complications of this particular situation, it be referred back to committee.

President. — I have received a request for referral to committee from Mr Purvis. I shall therefore ask the rapporteur for his opinion.

Mr Dalsass (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, your predecessor in the Chair answered Mr Hord's question to the extent that he told me that I need not comment on his request but should present my report. Of course, in this group we are accustomed to difficulties, and we expected there to be difficulties where British interests are at stake.

However, I would be grateful to you for one thing. It has just been requested that the Commission state its views in this matter. The Commission in fact stated its views in March. I feel, on the other hand, that we should conclude the debate now, and the Commission should comment on my proposal at the end, not before.

President. — Mr Dalsass, you may perhaps not have properly understood my question. Mr Purvis asked me to suspend the debate under Rule 85 and to refer the report back to the Committee. I therefore asked you for your opinion.

Mr Dalsass (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, this report was referred back to the committee responsible in March. The committee responsible has again considered the report and again approved it. It has also considered all the amendments to be discussed in

the House today. It therefore has nothing new to add. Consequently, there is absolutely no point in referring the report back to the committee responsible yet again. I at least am totally opposed to its referral back to the committee simply because certain Members never want to discuss it.

Mr Sutra (S). — (FR) On a point of order, Mr President, I feel that the account of what was said by your predecessor in the Chair given by Mr Purvis was to say the least incomplete. Mr Pflimlin was very clear and unequivocal in saying that Parliament decided during the last part-session to put this report on the agenda for this part-session. That is what was said by Mr Pflimlin and I am sorry to see advantage being taken of a change of occupancy of the Chair to bring up the same procedural wrangle within the space of ten minutes. If we are going to start behaving like this ...

President. — No, Mr Sutra, that is not what is happening.

A new point has been raised, namely a request for referral to committee. I have heard the rapporteur, I now want one speaker for and one against. Then we shall proceed to the vote.

Mr Sutra (S). — (FR) But that is quite wrong, Mr President. I consider that this point has been dealt with by Mr Pflimlin and that you no longer have the right to put it to a vote now. That is an end to it! A debate which has been settled cannot be reopened just because there has been a change in the Chair. I am absolutely opposed to this and feel that it will be necessary to refer the matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions if you propose to put this to a vote.

You cannot hold a vote on a matter on which Mr Pflimlin gave a ruling ten minutes ago.

President. — I was not in the Chamber when my predecessor took his decision, but I have just been informed that there was a request for the Commission's opinion on the legal aspects of the question and this was what Mr Pflimlin settled. I have now received a request from Mr Purvis for referral to committee. I am now observing the Rule which stipulates that I hear the rapporteur, the committee Chairman, then one speaker for, one speaker against, and then we proceed to the vote.

Mr Sutra (S). — (FR) Mr President, I fully appreciate your point of view, but I think that that was before the opening of the debate. Since the debate has started and the rapporteur has presented his report, I do not see how it can now be decided to refer the matter back to committee, when the rapporteur has already presented his report. This also seems to me impossible.

President

President. — On the contrary, Mr Sutra. You have to wait until the debate has been announced or is in progress since Rule 85 states very clearly: 'Referral back to committee may be requested by any Member at any time.'

A request for referral back to committee may be made 'at any time' during the debate. Before final voting begins, subject to Rule 81 (2). So, it is quite clear.

Mr Früh (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, as you are apparently going to take a vote on a matter on which your predecessor in the Chair has already decided, which means there will be one speaker for and one speaker against, perhaps you will permit me to say the following as vice-chairman of the Committee on Agriculture: we have been discussing this report for ten years. We have had it on the agenda two or three times this year. We have consulted all the other committees on the matter. Time and again we find someone trying to hold the report over by saying there is no quorum or by some other means. In committee we have discussed and decided on the report and all the amendments that have been tabled in the House since it was referred back the last time. I have no idea what else we can do in committee if this attempt to refer the report back again is successful. Are we supposed to do the same again and reintroduce it in July, only to see it deferred indefinitely through the cunning use of the Rules of Procedure? As vice-chairman of the Committee on Agriculture I strongly object to this procedure. It deprives our work here of any purpose whatsoever. I am therefore in favour of the debate continuing and of the report at last being put to the vote this evening.

(Applause)

President. — You are asking for the debate to be continued, that is, you are opposed to referral back to committee.

I shall now put the request for referral back to committee to the vote ...

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, under Rule 71 (3) I request that it be ascertained whether there is a quorum present.

President. — Mr Hord, I note that there are ten colleagues who support you.

Mr Dalsass (PPE), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, we played this game in March. President Dankert said then that this procedure was inadmissible. At best, it could be established whether or not a quorum exists before we vote this evening. If you look at the minutes of Monday, 6 June, you will find, in the German version at least, that we give an interpretation

of Rule 71 designed to prevent this game being played all the time. A request that it be ascertained whether a quorum exists may not therefore be made at this stage. That is also the interpretation given by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

President. — You are quite right, Mr Dalsass. Unfortunately, the Plenary has rejected this interpretation. The vote will not take place until tomorrow. I, for my part, accept the interpretation of the committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and shall proceed accordingly.

Mr Gautier (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, I fail to understand why it should not be ascertained whether a quorum exists, because we are now talking about Mr Purvis's request for the referral of the report to the committee. If a quorum does not exist and a vote may not therefore be taken on this request, the debate will continue and that is an end to the matter. Nor do I understand what is behind all this. You need have no compunction about ascertaining that a quorum does not exist, because we can then get on with the debate.

Mr Dalsass (PPE), rapporteur. — *(DE)* I should like to explain to Mr Gautier why we cannot allow this. If it is twice ascertained that a quorum does not exist, the report automatically goes back to the committee, and we must prevent that because it is in no way admissible.

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, I take great exception to Mr Dalsass saying that I am playing games. I have a set of the Rules like every other Member of this House and I am promoting the business in this House in accordance with the Rules.

(Protests)

What I think Mr Dalsass should understand is that there are people in this House who are very concerned with certain proposals being put before it and the reason why we are trying to get the matter fully debated, why we want it to go back to the committee is that we believe that the Commission's proposals are illegal. I think Mr Dalsass should perhaps discuss his own interests before he starts referring to people playing games with this House.

I would insist, Mr President, that you proceed with my request for a check as to whether there is a quorum present.

Mr Luster (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, my view is that it should not be admissible for a group to request that it be ascertained whether a quorum exists and for its members then to leave the Chamber to ensure that a quorum does not exist. It is like a man accused of murdering his mother and father pleading mitigating circumstances because he is now an orphan.

President. — Mr Luster, I have here two requests: the request for referral of this report back to the Committee and a request to establish the existence of a quorum. As I understand it — and here I am following the interpretation of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions — a latter request can only be made when a vote is being taken on the report. That will be this evening, not now. But I still have to deal with the request for referral back to committee. I have heard the rapporteur, I have also heard one speaker against referral. None has spoken in favour. Therefore, we shall now proceed to the vote.

Mr Prout (ED). — Mr President, with great respect, I must disagree with your interpretation over the quorum on procedural votes. Irrespective of what the House decides about Rule 85 (2), the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, in its interpretation published on 17 May 1983 (Doc. PE 84.967), expressly states that the quorum applies not only to motions of substance but also to motions of procedure. I submit that you are bound to check the quorum on this motion of procedure quite independently of the issue of the double quorum under Rule 85 (2), which is an issue which only arises after the quorum has been asked for under two procedural votes. So you must distinguish between the validity of a quorum requested on a procedural motion and the effect of Rule 85 (2) after two such quorums have been asked for and checked.

Mr D'Angelosante (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, Mr Prout has forgotten to point out that in those pink pages that he had in his hand it says that, if the quorum is checked in relation to a request for referral back to committee, and the quorum is lacking, then the referral back to committee is rejected and the discussion continues. That is what it says, but he doesn't read all the text, as is sometimes the case with lawyers in small Local Magistrates Courts. It is written there, but the wily old fox takes care not to read it in its entirety.

Mr Dalsass (PPE), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, I would ask you to follow the interpretation given by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, even though Parliament has not yet expressed its opinion. I ask you not to take a vote. But if you do take a vote, immediate steps should be taken to ensure that the same request is not made in five or ten minutes, before the end of the debate. Otherwise, we run the danger of everything automatically being referred back to the committee. We cannot have that. That would really be the vilest trickery on the part of that group over there.

(Applause)

Mr Luster (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, what we are discussing here is a procedure governed not by Rule

84 but by Rule 85. Rule 84 (2) says that the vote must be taken immediately. Rule 85, on the other hand, does not say this, which allows the conclusion that in the case of requests made pursuant to Rule 85 it is for the President to decide when the vote is taken.

President. — That is correct, Mr Luster, I cannot deny it. That being so, we can take the vote this evening.

(Applause)

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, I would refer you to an interpretation by the Presidency of Rule 85, which Mr Purvis previously referred to, at the last part-session, where we were told that under Rule 85 reference to committee 'at any time' means — rather strangely, but this is the view of the Presidency — during the debate, and therefore I would suggest that any request for reference to committee automatically requires a vote. Therefore, as a request under Rule 85 must be made during the debate, the vote on such a request must also be taken during the debate, i.e., when Rule 85 is actually invoked. So I would suggest to you that we have the right situation here for dealing with a vote under Rule 85 during the actual debate. That is the only time when Rule 85 is appropriate according to the Presidency.

Therefore I feel that you would be out of order not to accept Mr Purvis's request under Rule 85, because a former president has said that Rule 85 is only relevant during the debate. We are now invoking Rule 85 during the debate and, that being the case, you can only put it to the vote during the debate if Rule 85 is to be of any value at all.

So, with respect, Mr President, we, this House, are obliged to take the request under Rule 85 and vote on it now.

President. — Mr Hord, I am now going to close this debate and will not accept any more interventions. I do not claim to be infallible, I can make a mistake, but I must point out that Rule 45 stipulates that a request for referral to committee can be made at any time. The President, who is responsible for the organization of work, does however decide when the vote will actually take place, as Mr Luster mentioned. Well now, I appeal to the sense of fairplay peculiar to the British, if I am to believe their parliamentary tradition: you have good reasons for wishing referral to committee and you will defer in this connection to the judgement of the Assembly. Give it a chance to express its position in this matter in full knowledge of the facts and let us now get on with the debate.

Mr Hord (ED). — A point of order, Mr President.
(Protests)

Hord

I think, Mr President, with due respect, this is an indictment of the Rules, because previously we applied Rule 85 outside the debate and we were told specifically that Rule 85 only applied within the debate. That is what we are doing today — calling for Rule 85 during the debate — and now you, from the Chair, are saying it is out of order. How can it be out of order both outside and during the debate? You are negating an important rule of this House by not taking this application, and I believe, Mr President, your action will lead to a severe censure on the Presidency for flouting the rules of this House.

President. My reply to you is that the day I am found to have violated the Rules of Procedure, I shall resign as Vice-President of this Parliament.

(Applause)

I have told you very explicitly that we will be voting on the request for referral to committee when we vote this evening on other texts. To go on discussing this all morning would not get us anywhere but would really give the impression that we do not wish to observe the democratic rules of a parliamentary Assembly.

(Applause)

We shall now resume the debate; this does not prejudice in any way the final decision whether to refer back to committee or not.

Mrs Vayssade (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to remind our British colleagues that, during the last part-session, the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions proposed an interpretation according to which there would be an immediate vote in the case of a referral back to committee and that the majority in this House challenged that interpretation. The position that you have just adopted, Mr President, is therefore shared by the majority of Members of this House and I do not think that it can be challenged further.

(Applause)

Mr Prout (ED). — Mr President, first of all I would like to say on behalf of my group that we intend no malice or ill will towards the Presidency in making the points that we do and, if I may say so, we think that you have conducted this very difficult debate with immense skill and considerable tolerance. *(Cries of 'Hear, hear!')*

So there is absolutely no question of anybody on my side of the House holding this against the President or believing that the Presidency has in any way behaved wrongly in the course of this debate.

At the same time, I would like to say that making points under the Rules of Procedure is a perfectly legitimate right of any Member of this House, and if we tend to raise rather more points of procedure than

other groups it is because we understand the Rules rather better than other groups!

I would like to make one observation on your own interpretation of Rule 85 (1),

(Protests) and I am very grateful for Mrs Vayssade's intervention, because she is quite right: the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions did pass a report saying that the right moment to vote on a request under Rule 85(1) was immediately and the House, together with a number of other matters, decided to send that back to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions for further consideration.

Meanwhile, Mr President, I would submit that you are bound by the precedent set by yourself and by other occupants of the Chair, and the invariable practice of the Presidency has been that when a request under Rule 85(1) has been made, the President has always asked for a vote immediately. I need only refer you to the practice of this House in March this year in relation to this report, when such a request was made and the President took the vote immediately. That was consistent with the tradition always followed by the Presidency; so I submit that if you do not allow us to vote now, you will, in fact, be inconsistent with the practice followed before by very distinguished occupants of the Chair.

President. — I want to start by expressing my appreciation of two things: first, the rather flattering words you have addressed to me and, second, I know very well that our British colleagues have always demonstrated the utmost respect for our Rules of Procedure. I understand your problems, but I also have my own which I would ask you too to consider and to make an effort at cooperation. We have here a very sharp controversy and it is in your own interest, in the interest of the cause you support and that of this Assembly, that in actual fact the Assembly should be able to declare its position in its majority on this matter. That is why I have decided to allow the request for referral to committee but to put it to the vote when the voting is scheduled today, and I shall not go back on this decision, since I want to be consistent. I would therefore ask you once again, Mr Hord, to make your speech on behalf of the Committee on Budgets.

Mr Hord (ED), draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on Budgets — Mr President, Members of this House will recall that when this matter was last debated, it was agreed that it should be referred back to committee so that opinions from the other committees could be obtained. The prime reason for this was that Mr Dalsass, as rapporteur, had tabled something like 70 amendments which sought very substantial changes to the Commission's proposals.

Hord

In this context the Committee on Budgets examined the Dalsass amendments alongside the Commission proposals and found that there was really no great benefit to the Community in terms of the budgetary cost. I think Members will be aware that Mr Dalsass was of the view that the 120 m ECU originally proposed by the Commission could be reduced to 60 m ECU in consequence of his own recommendations. However, the Committee on Budgets was not impressed by this approach, because Mr Dalsass was recommending that the price at which alcohol would be sold would be the molasses price rather than the grain alcohol price, as proposed by the Commission. This would make the cost to the Community even greater. From a budgetary standpoint, the bulk of Mr Dalsass' amendments are unacceptable.

All this, Mr President, takes place at a time when surpluses abound and there is even more pressure for surplus agricultural produce to be put into distillation. Last year we dealt with substantial provisions for the distillation of surplus wine under the wine regulation. We have a very substantial surplus of sugar beet. Only this morning we were concerning ourselves with an urgency proposal in regard to Greek dried fruit, some 58 000 tonnes of it which is going to end up in distillation. So we can see that the surplus of wine and the surplus of many other kinds of agricultural produce, are going to have the 'solution' of distillation. That would all be very well if we did not have a surplus of alcohol already.

The Committee on Budgets, Mr President, is still as concerned as it was in its original opinion. There is still no consideration of the consequences of enlargement. I think it is fair to say that when the two countries in the Iberian Peninsula join the Community, there will again be very substantial pressure on agricultural surpluses, and it is likely that there will be proposals to distil even more of those. In view of the costs and the overall fear of the future, the Committee on Budgets is not in favour of this report. I should perhaps add that the Committee on Budgets is concerned that the proposals are discriminating against synthetic or industrial alcohol and that, with the growing surplus of expensive agricultural alcohol, there could be serious repercussions in the industrial sector, possibly leading to unemployment.

The overall attitude of the Committee on Budgets, Mr President, is unchanged. The committee considers that the current proposals should not only be rejected but that the idea of an ethyl alcohol regulation should be abandoned altogether.

Mr Louwes (L), *draftsman of an opinion for the Committee on External Economic Relations*. — (NL) Mr President, about three or four years ago the committee on External Economic Relations forwarded an opinion to the Committee on Agriculture. It stated that the Commission's proposed regulation would not

cause any obstacles to the Community's external trade, and the opinion given to the committee responsible, the Committee on Agriculture, was therefore neutral, indeed you could call it positive. It did comment, however, that this effect on the Community's external trade could change if alcohol of agricultural origin were to be used in significant quantities for the Community's energy supply. But until that happens this regulation does not restrict the Community's external trade. I believe that the opinion of the committee, of which I am no longer a member, has not changed.

Mr Gautier (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of many members of my group I should like to say that we shall be voting for Mr Dalsass's report. We too see the need for measures to be taken in the alcohol sector at Community level in the long term, not only in view of the judgments handed down by the European Court of Justice, our supreme legal authority, which we naturally intend to respect, but also because the European Community's alcohol market is at present subject to considerable disturbances due to the use of the different national market organizations. I do not want to single out any one Member State. As you all know, because of the application of the market organization, the Commission has already initiated proceedings against France, but the German market organization also leaves something to be desired. We therefore believe something sensible needs to be done at European level.

For a variety of reasons my group has always opposed the Commission's proposal, and in this respect we agreed with the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and the Legal Affairs Committee.

The new proposal put forward by the Committee on Agriculture has, in our view, removed the grounds for a number of the objections we had previously made. When presenting his report, Mr Dalsass also pointed out that alcoholic beverages were not to be included in the market organization. They require a different arrangement, which is the subject of another Commission proposal. We also had serious doubts about the areas reserved for the use of alcohol of agricultural origin, particularly as regards the pharmaceutical and cosmetic sectors. Reference to these reserved areas has been removed, and I hope the Council does not reintroduce them. Nor did we think the proposed intervention arrangement was suitable for a reasonable alcohol policy at Community level in the long term. Many members of the group therefore now find it possible to approve the proposal. Here are undoubtedly a number of minor matters that will have to be settled in forthcoming discussions at a different level. I would also say, Mr Dalsass, that molasses alcohol is perhaps not the optimal reference base: it might be better to take alcohol obtained from cereals, but that is really no more than a technical detail.

Gautier

To conclude, I should like to say to the Commission that I find it strange that its structural report on this sector has still not appeared and that it makes the publication of this report conditional on the existence of the organization of the market in alcohol. I would consider it more logical to draw up a report first and then to propose a market organization for alcohol, but it is not always possible to understand the Commission's logic.

A final word to my British colleagues: the situation at the moment is that many areas of the Community's alcohol policy are governed by other market organizations — wine, for example, by the organization of the market in wine, whisky by the organization of the market in cereals and so on. What we have here is an area that has so far been left out and is at present financed nationally, but with the taxpayer's money nonetheless. Is responsibility for just this one area not to be transferred to the Community? I and many of my political friends therefore believe that we should try to make the breakthrough and introduce this organization of the market in alcohol.

Mr Früh (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad that this debate has been brought back down to an objective level. It is, of course, a rare occurrence for me to agree with the previous speaker, Mr Gautier, on an agricultural matter, but by and large I can endorse what he had to say. In this connection, I should like to say a word to the Member who presented the opinion of the Committee on Budgets. Mr Hord, I hope that your opinion of 21 April did not form the basis of your comments. Mr Gautier said that the rapporteur has submitted a completely different proposal. Unfortunately, your opinion concludes by saying that the Commission's proposal for a common organization of the market in ethyl alcohol should be rejected. Did you really discuss the old Commission proposal without trying — as the rapporteur has done in years of cooperation with the Commission — to put forward something entirely new that completely upsets your budgetary ideas? When you add the qualification that it is not advisable to consider the adoption of an alcohol regulation until the system of tariffs applicable to alcoholic beverages has been harmonized in all the Member States, it is quite obvious what you are after. You want to put this organization of the alcohol market off indefinitely, now that you have found a neat solution to the whisky problem at the Community's expense. We cannot accept this. I do not believe that you are so unfair as to want that, and I therefore ask you and the Committee on Budgets to consider once again on what basis it has conducted its discussions.

I have a few more points to make. Ever since the Treaties came into being, there has been a dispute over whether alcohol comes under the agricultural policy. Then, about ten years ago, the Commission submitted

a proposal. It was never discussed. Now Parliament has found a way of showing what course might be adopted in this difficult matter. We cannot make things difficult for the Council or bring an action before the Court of Justice. Nothing will happen unless we ourselves take political action to indicate the course that should be adopted. I should therefore like to thank the rapporteur sincerely for this great achievement and for the tenacity with which he has undertaken this task.

I share Mr Hord's concern about Greek sultanas. Everyone pushes his problems off on to this sector, where a solution has yet to be found. There are sultanas from 1981 that cannot be disposed of, and so alcohol will be made out of them. Nor do I agree with the Commission's proposal that sales to distilleries must not be allowed to disturb the alcohol and spirits market in the Community. These are pious hopes, because there is no organization of this sector. I therefore ask you to withdraw your objections and to stop thinking that you can constantly block action, as you have tried to do in the past.

To conclude I should like to say a word on my own behalf. In this debate a criticism has been made of me personally. According to *Who's who*, I am the president of the distillers' association. This information did not come from me, but I am deeply concerned about it. We have decided to declare our interests. I can tell you what I am. I am the chairman of the association of small distillers in Germany, people who are allowed to produce a tiny quota of three hectolitres and whose livelihood will be threatened or destroyed by this organization of the alcohol market. But one thing I must say to you: it is inadmissible and unacceptable that these small and very small distillers should face difficulties. These distilleries, a source of supplementary income, play an important role because they process fruit and, as they produce specialities, intervention is not necessary. In so doing, they protect the landscape because there would otherwise be no fruit-growing in difficult areas. For all these reasons, I ask you to approve this directive, which is designed to improve structures and which has been so worded by Mr Dalsass that it will not do anyone any harm or impose an excessive burden on the budget.

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, time does not permit me to respond fully to Mr Früh's remarks. He suggested that my comments are old hat. But what is clear is that the Commission's proposals are old hat — they are more than 12 years old. Whilst I respect the work that Mr Dalsass has been doing on the Commission's proposals for the Committee on Agriculture, all he has done is to exacerbate the cost to the Community by proposing the molasses price instead of the grain alcohol price which will cost the Community more, and also the proposals by him now include once again wine alcohol, of which there is an excess and which is expensive to boot.

Hord

But what I want to say on behalf of my group. Mr President, is that we believe that the proposals are a mess; they are irrelevant: they are hugely expensive and as we have heard earlier this morning they fail to conform to the Treaties. The Dalsass report, with all its numerous amendments, as I have just been saying, only makes the situation worse, more complicated and more contradictory. First we have the reserve sectors in. Now Mr Dalsass thinks they should come out. First we have molasses alcohol in. Then he thinks it should come out. Then it has gone back again. First we have wine alcohol in. Mr Dalsass thinks it should come out. The Committee on Agriculture thinks it should go in. Then we should have the grain alcohol price replaced by the molasses price. No wonder nobody can keep up with it. But I can and I am telling you, Mr President and this House that the whole thing is totally irrelevant and, as I say, very expensive indeed. In fact, I have information that instead of the 60 million which is estimated this alcohol regulation will cost 560 million ECU a year. This is 10 times what Mr Dalsass refers to! When we have situations like these 58 000 tonnes of dried fruit and the excess wine all going into distillation as surplus, we can understand how quickly the alcohol regulation will become a great drain on the resources of the Community.

Already, Mr President, we are saddled with surplus alcohol. It would not be so bad if we had a shortage of alcohol. But already there is something like 500 million litres in storage and the present output of alcohol is such that we have an ongoing annual surplus of 150 million litres of alcohol, without all the Greek dried fruit; without the whey from Ireland being distilled; without the proposals for straw distillation, and so on and so forth. I would suggest to you, Mr President that this is a very dangerous set of proposals for a new regulation.

As I have mentioned earlier, my group and, of course, The Legal Affairs Committee, are of the view that the Commission has undermined the Treaty. We are particularly concerned, Mr Früh, for the industrial alcohol producers. They do not do any harm to the Community. They do a great service to the taxpayers of Europe because the cost of industrial alcohol is only one-fifth of the cost of agricultural alcohol. Therefore, with European taxpayers' hard-earned money being used to subsidize huge and increasing amounts of agricultural alcohol for which there is no demand, not only do we taxpayers have to suffer that huge and growing bill but it will completely ruin the existing industrial sector of industrial alcohol which, as I say, is infinitely more efficient and can compete with agricultural alcohol at any time — particularly when we are so concerned about energy costs, because that is where the cost of distillation comes in. I believe that this House and the Community should seriously

consider, as the Committee on Budgets concluded, that we do not need an alcohol regime and I believe that it should be left to those Member States involving themselves in what is an industrial process of producing alcohol to agree a set of regulations which is fair and in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty in terms of fair competition between one Member State and another.

On that basis, Mr President, I would like to say more. My group is of the view that the Commission's proposals are totally unacceptable and Mr Dalsass' amendments and report do nothing to improve the original Commission proposal.

Mr M. Martin (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, my dear colleagues, it is true that regulation of the market in alcohol is necessary in order to rectify the present lack of organization. The Commission originally submitted proposals which broadly complied with Community principles, with a marketing guarantee and machinery for intervention. However, divergences of interests between Member States prevented their adoption.

With the passage of years, the crisis on the market in alcohol has become more serious. The multinationals, whose role has been exposed for what it is in an UNCTAD report, have strengthened their domination and found backers for their cause in many quarters, including this Assembly. The massive output of synthetic alcohol by the British firm BP is, as it were, the last straw.

The report by the Committee on Agriculture takes account of this situation and, at our instigation, takes the line that it is necessary to preserve Community production of agricultural alcohols in the face of competition from synthetic alcohols. It also has the merit of tackling the problem of the common organization of markets. But it has the great demerit, in our view, of yielding to pressure by proposing a common organization of the market on the cheap, one which flies in the face of Community principles. Marketing guarantees, price maintenance, Community preferences — all these principles have been swept away and replaced by alignment with world prices for molasses alcohol, coupled with a system of budgetary aid, but with no guarantees and no protection against imports. In order to counter this move, we have tabled several amendments which obey a different logic and adhere to Community principles.

First of all, we consider it necessary to preserve Community production of agricultural alcohols in the face of competition from synthetic alcohol, which is in the hands of the multinationals. This organization of the market in alcohol of agricultural origin should adhere to the fundamental principles of the common agricultural policy. However, in order to take account of the specific characteristics of this sector, it could take the form of compulsory co-ordination of the

Martin

various national market organizations, an option for which provision is made in Article 40 of the Treaty. This original form would offer three advantages: it would mean that agricultural alcohol would be subject to a common regime; it would allow the essential provisions of national market organizations to be maintained, and it would safeguard the interests of the regions for which alcohol production is vital.

This form of market organization would secure outlets for alcohol in certain reserved sectors, namely not only oral consumption and vinegar-making, but also the pharmaceutical and cosmetics sectors. It would also provide machinery for price maintenance and prevent fluctuations in prices on the world market from disrupting agricultural prices. Finally, this organization would be coupled with the introduction of a minimum price for intra-Community trade.

Before ending, I would reiterate that we also consider it necessary to establish true equality of competition among the various agricultural alcohols and alcoholic beverages through harmonization of excise duties, so that wine producers are no longer penalized. How we eventually vote on the Dalsass report will depend on the response to our amendments, but under no circumstances shall we vote with the British Conservatives, who are defending the interests of the firms which benefit most from the present lack of organization of the market.

(Applause from the left)

IN THE CHAIR : MR NIKOLAOU

Vice-President

Mr Louwes (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, first of all I should like to inform the House that I have held a position in the management of the alcohol industry in my country for many years. Furthermore, I was chairman of the COPA working party on alcohol for a long time. But I do not have any direct financial interests in the production of alcohol. I believe, Mr President, that I ought to make this statement at the outset.

Since time immemorial authorities have been concerned with the production and use of alcohol. Over the centuries this product has been surrounded by a large number of regulations and the legislation on alcohol in nearly all societies is a reflection of its legislative traditions. This is also certainly true of the Member States of the Community. But that is also what makes harmonization so difficult. There is, however, a dividing line in our Community. In the north west agricultural alcohol is systematically produced in a limited number of undertakings and the authorities are almost exclusively interested in excise, which is often twenty times the production costs. In the south east the situation is more colourful

and in addition to systematic production there are dozens of small producers. Depending on the regions the distilleries produce alcoholic liquids from which just as many farmers' families earn part of their income. But they do not produce alcohol in the sense of this proposal for a regulation. The proposed market regulation only refers to neutral alcohol of 96 % or more of agricultural origin, the origin of which cannot be identified by the taste. But up until now, for over twenty years, it has been impossible to avoid involving the interests of the many small producers, which is neither illogical nor unreasonable since we are dealing with a common regulation of the agricultural market. It is due to Mr Dalsass that we are shown the way out of this and other dilemmas. I wish to congratulate him on that and also on his proposal to solve the problem of the reserved sectors.

But nevertheless we have certain reservations. Firstly the rapporteur excludes the alcohol which is most systematically produced, namely molasses alcohol, from this regulation and its guarantees. But molasses alcohol is an agricultural product. He throws this molasses alcohol to the wolves of synthetic alcohol of chemical origin. Secondly, he includes alcohol distilled from surplus wine. The uncertain yield pattern of wine and the resulting varying quantities of wine alcohol produced have a very unsettling effect on the normal wine market.

Nonetheless our group is tempted to give the report the benefit of the doubt and vote in favour of it. We do need a market regulation to tackle the present chaos and to protect our market against disruptions from third countries. My colleague Mr Sablé will take up that issue in a moment. We only hope then that after more than ten years Parliament will finally give an opinion on this proposal for a common market regulation and that the Council will speedily correct the shortcomings we have enumerated. The Council cannot unfortunately do anything before we give an opinion which is why we are tempted to adopt Mr Dalsass's report now and forward it to Council. Our final assessment, Mr President, will naturally depend on the voting on the amendments in which we shall follow the rapporteur's opinion.

Mr Sutra (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, my dear colleagues, the excellent contribution from my colleague and neighbour Mr Martin will enable me to shorten my own, but I should like to say first of all that I endorse every word he said, not least his conclusion.

After eleven years of neglect and at the end of three years' work for us, Mr Dalsass has accomplished a remarkable feat in the Committee on Agriculture, in the face of enormous difficulties at a time when it is clear that a regulation on alcohol has become an absolute necessity in Europe.

Sutra

However, we are not without our misgivings, first of all because distillation (and hence creation of alcohol) is often the only intervention measure available for dealing with certain products, notably Mediterranean products, which, incidentally, receive extremely unfavourable treatment as a result of the imbalance in the common agricultural policy.

During the first ten years of the common organization of the market in wine products and fruit and vegetables, 1970 to 1980, wine attracted 1.5 % of the EAGGF budget, fruit and vegetables 0.8 %. They account for 8 % and 12 % respectively of the value of Europe's agricultural output. 2.3 % of the budget as against 20 % of output in value terms: there we see the imbalance in the CAP, and as soon as some little progress is made — as has been the case over the last two or three years — we find that one section of this House is immediately on the offensive to ensure that the southern regions of the Community remain forever at a total disadvantage.

If I may make a friendly criticism of Mr Dalsass' report, we find that it does not emphasize sufficiently the relationship between the hierarchy of agricultural prices and the regions of origin. I would remind Mr Hord and his friends that I gave clear support in this House to the regulation on whisky and incorporation of whisky in the regulation on cereals, saying that we were in favour of restitutions on exports of all products, including finished products.

I would add that whereas we have been talking this morning about the distillation of a quantity of raisins which can be counted in tens of tonnes, it was known full well when it was decided to build the British Petroleum plant in Scotland that capacity was being created for production of a million hectolitres a year. We gave a timely warning that this sort of thing was courting disaster for the agricultural policy and the Community budget. You were given due warning, I have repeated this any number of times in the Committee on Agriculture, three years ago and ever since during the life of this Parliament.

Where is the sense in attacking the man who has a three-hectolitre distillery and supporting the BP plant which produces one million hectolitres a year? If another plant is built in Europe, its minimum capacity, given considerations of economy of scale, will be one million hectolitres a year. If this happens — and there are plans afoot — there will be total chaos.

Now I should like to say to Mr Hord that enough is enough and too much is too much. Wine? There was talk of distilling wine throughout the first ten years of the common market in wine products, during which time the Community distilled 36 million hectolitres. Over the same period, it imported 44 million hectolitres in defiance of Community preference. Think on

those figures. The budget that you are attacking is the consequence of your refusal to apply Community preference.

Finally, we are also worried about the future of the French alcohol monopoly. We are disappointed that there is no preference for agricultural alcohol, for cosmetics and for various other products.

In conclusion, as a Mediterranean farmer and a Frenchman, I am bound to have reservations. But, as a responsible European parliamentarian, I accept the need for a regulation.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, may I first of all put right a couple of misapprehensions that seem to be going around this House. Mr Früh referred to the question of restitutions on Scotch whisky exports. It should be carefully borne in mind that they reflect the very high import levies on imported grain and the very high prices on CAP grain that the whisky industry has to bear and that the restitutions only apply to exports to countries outside the European Community.

The second misapprehension concerns Mr Sutra and Mr Martin who claim to represent parties that represent the working man. I would like to bring to their attention that there are a lot of working men whom I represent in this Parliament, dependent on their jobs at the petrochemical plant at Grangemouth.

I now have three questions to put to the Commission. I have written to Mr Dalsager several times and asked several questions in this Parliament as to how he squares the circle. He says he is going to subsidize agricultural alcohol so that it will be competitive with industrial alcohol. In the same sentence he says it will not be allowed to disrupt the market for industrial alcohol. He has not yet explained how he squares this extraordinary, contradictory circle. I would appreciate a specific answer on that today.

The second question concerns the French alcohol monopoly, the way it has been restricting imports of alcohol into France and is now dumping cheap alcohol all over the Community to the point where all the countries, namely the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Britain, Denmark, Italy and Ireland, are calling for action. What is the Commission doing? Delay and procrastination will only mean a *fait accompli* which we cannot match. We accept that maybe one day we will have to have some organization of the alcohol system in the Community, but it is ridiculous for Mr Dalsass, the Commission and Mr Früh to steamroller through a partisan, interested system which has no hope of success in the Council of Ministers.

As my last question to Mr Dalsager I would ask what hope he has in the Council of Ministers with this proposal? Does it go as it is or with Mr Dalsass' amendments? If he has no expectations of success in

Purvis

the Council of Ministers, is he not just being cynical in wasting our time in pursuing this matter?

(Applause from the right)

Mr Sablé (L). — (FR) Mr President, my dear colleagues, the report by our colleague Mr Dalsass reflects the difference of approach between national Governments and the conflicts of interest in an area where trade and industry cannot be dissociated from agriculture. It should therefore surprise no-one that, on 17 March last, the Committee on Budgets, having made an exhaustive examination, confirmed its opinion of April 1980 and called for rejection of this proposal.

After twelve years of negotiations, the leading producer countries in the Community had hoped that the regulation would be founded on the general principles of the common agricultural policy and would set up a system for coordination of national market organizations pursuant to Article 40 (2) of the Treaty.

The Commission's original text, with a few modifications, could have served the purpose, on the whole adequately. This being the case, we look forward with interest to hearing its views now that its text has been changed out of all recognition, and shall bear them in mind when the time comes to vote, because the tangle of contradictory amendments gives numerous grounds for complaint and concern.

Let me take the single example of rum. On the pretext that this alcohol is a spirituous beverage, some brands of which are, moreover, legally protected by designations of origin, this product is excluded from the system of Community guarantees in the proposal brought before us. Now on 10 March last, when adopting the Hopper report, Parliament agreed to only a two-year extension of the reduced rate of duty on rum, while at the same time inviting the Commission to look into other means whereby the already vulnerable economies of the Overseas Departments could be supported. The adoption of the Hopper report was a first blow to the economies of the Overseas Departments, which are peripheral regions among the poorest in the Community, and the consequences will be even graver if the Dalsass report is adopted in its present form.

It was only yesterday evening that we learned that a proposal for a regulation on spirituous beverages had been submitted by the Commission to the Council. It would have been logical, my dear colleagues, in view of the obvious connection between alcohols of agricultural origin and spirituous beverages, to hold a joint debate on these two problems, so as to avoid the unwelcome eventuality of reaching incompatible conclusions. It is for this reason that the further request for referral back was fully justified.

Well now, my dear colleagues, it was in order to mitigate what were found to be unacceptable discrimina-

tory aspects of these provisions that the rapporteur of the Committee on Agriculture sought the exclusion of spirituous beverages and the financing of aid for synthetic alcohol. However, the Legal Affairs Committee and the Committee on Budgets have rightly pointed out that exclusion of these alcohols of agricultural origin from the common organization of the market would have very damaging effects on them and that, in the light of the provisions on whisky contained in Protocol 19 of the Act of Accession, it was only fair to include them, taking Articles 38 and 235 of the EEC Treaty as the legal basis.

Moreover, the removal of all controls on designations of origin would encourage passing off. It is not difficult to foresee that synthetic alcohol, which certain oil companies are making ready to produce in industrial quantities selling at low prices, would be bought and used to produce spirituous beverages, compounding the already intolerable unfair commercial practices with which producers of superior alcohols have to contend.

It is precisely this type of danger that we were seeking to avoid at the meeting of the ACP-EEC Joint Committee held in Kingston last February, when we rejected an apparently anodine proposal submitted by a number of countries, according to which rum should be treated as an industrial product. Adoption of this proposal would have led inevitably to a decline in sugar-cane growing, which is so necessary to the maintenance of economic and social equilibrium in the Caribbean region. Any commercial company setting up a plant in an associated country or in a Community port could buy cheap surplus molasses from third countries, such as Puerto Rico or Cuba, South Africa or Brazil, to produce rum on an industrial scale and take advantage of the system of generalized tariff preferences to flood the European market.

It is in order to draw the attention of the House to the threat to producers of alcohol and consumers in the Community and the risk of massive imports of rum and various tafias, with no controls on their geographical origin, that I have tabled an amendment anticipating the debate on the new document circulated only last evening. If it is not adopted, I shall have no alternative but to concur with the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee and the Committee on Budgets.

Mr Prout (ED). — Mr President, I have already made my views on this matter clear during the previous debate in March. I continue to believe, as does Parliament's Legal Affairs Committee — and in the absence of its rapporteur I feel I must emphasize this fact — that Article 8 (3) and Article 9 of the regulation are in breach of the Treaty of Rome.

Prout

Although the Treaty provisions on agriculture do not specifically prohibit discrimination between producers of agricultural and industrial products, they must be interpreted in the general context of the Treaty; and this includes Article 3 (f), which lists as one of the Community's basic objectives the institution of a system ensuring that competition is not distorted.

The Commission's latest amended regulation — and Mr Dalsass's initial working document — at least demonstrated a greater awareness of these difficulties; but the Committee on Agriculture has overruled Mr Dalsass and the Commission by reintroducing wine. Surely, Commissioner, in view of your recent wine regulation, you will be informing us that amendments reintroducing wine will be unacceptable to you.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, Honourable Members, I have of course listened very closely to the many different points of view which have been presented on this difficult question. As during the March part-session, I should like to thank Mr Dalsass for his report for I think there is reason to do so again because of the redrafting to which Mr Dalsass has subjected his report since March. In my view Mr Dalsass, by omitting all reference to particular uses of agricultural alcohol, has removed the last remaining objections, after previously deleting all reference to alcoholic beverages. This new concession became possible because the Commission nearly a year ago presented a proposal to the Council for a regulation on the definition of alcoholic beverages, which takes account of this question. It has in fact been shown that no-one in the Community uses ethyl alcohol not of agricultural origin for the production of alcoholic beverages.

The Committee's three objections to the Commission's proposal are no longer relevant because Mr Dalsass has omitted all reference to alcoholic beverages for particular uses and because the support arrangement he proposes is compatible with the provisions of the Treaty according to the Commission's interpretation. This arrangement also follows the proportionality principle. What the question hinges upon is that distillation will disappear without these support measures, and the agricultural producers' extra income from this distillation will be jeopardized. The Commission can go along with Mr Dalsass' concern to have the Commission take over the support payments under Community rules in place of the national financing arrangements currently applied. I would stress that the solution of this whole problem depends to a very great extent on the various national interests and on the negotiating positions of the various national delegations in the Council, and for that reason the Commission will of course in the meantime present Parliament's opinion if it is adopted — which I hope it will be — to the Council, so that we shall have a chance of resolving a question which has

been on the table both in the Council and in Parliament for some considerable time.

Mr Purvis (ED). — On a point of order Mr President, Rule 64(4) I put some very specific questions to the Commissioner in my speech and I would ask you if he could be permitted to reply to those very specific questions as he has not done so in his speech.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, Mr Purvis put a question on prices, and it is the Commission's view that the support should not lead to a price for agricultural alcohol which is below that of synthetic alcohol. It is necessary to show caution and to bear in mind that there is competition between the two forms of alcohol. I think it was rather that which Mr Purvis was concerned about.

Mr President. — (GR) The debate is closed.

May I remind you that this evening at 6 p.m. a vote will be taken on the referral of the Dalsass report back to the committee responsible. In the event that there is a unanimous rejection of the call for the report to be referred back to the committee responsible then the Dalsass report will be put to the vote at 6 p.m.

5. Agricultural incomes

President. — (GR) The next item is the interim report (Doc. 1-1327/82) by Mr Maher on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, concerning agricultural income levels.

Mr Maher (L), rapporteur. — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, if the European Economic Community had made more progress over these past years in achieving economic and monetary union, I would not be standing here today presenting this report. That is the fundamental reason why this report became necessary.

It is, in my view, to be deplored that we have not achieved monetary union and that we do not have a single currency. If we had, then the problems confronting agriculture, farmers and the operation of the common agricultural policy in the European Community would certainly not be so great. One fundamental problem that we are concerned with and that takes up a major part of my report is the differing rates of inflation from Member State to Member State. We are operating a common agricultural policy that is common to all States, with a common pricing structure, common conditions and free trade in agricultural products over our countries' boundaries. Therefore, we have a single price and common conditions, but the farmers to whom these elements apply are operating under very differing economic circumstances. Hence we have serious difficulties arising in the Member States, particularly in those areas where inflation happens to be high and the currency is weak, as distinct from those areas where inflation is low and the currency is strong.

Maher

Mr President, I want to make this point. I am very conscious of the fact that I do not want to do anything in my report which would suggest that I am relieving governments of the responsibility for taking measures to control inflation inside their own national boundaries. In the past I have been extremely critical of governments, including my own, for failing to take the necessary measures to ensure that inflation is controlled. Some governments have been partly successful, others have not. However, it is difficult to blame the farmers in a given country for the level of inflation within that particular state. They are not responsible for it, generally speaking. As distinct from the rest of the population, they have to operate under prices that are fixed at common level in the Community taking into account the average levels of inflation. Yet their costs are related directly to the level of inflation within their Member States. That, therefore, obviously produces a gap.

I accept that it is unrealistic to think that monetary union, more common economic policies and a common economic strategy are feasible within the immediate future. I think that is more in the long term. In the meantime, if we are to ensure that the common agricultural policy applies in an equitable fashion and is seen to be equitable — because not only must justice be done but it must be seen to be done — then it is important, in my view, that the necessary measures be taken which will ensure that it is more equitable and more fair to farmers across the Community.

This is important, Mr President, for another reason. The policy is under considerable attack from many quarters. Many people are dissatisfied with it. They say it is too costly, that it is not operating in the most efficient way and so on. Therefore, the more transparent we can make it and the clearer it is to the European Communities in general, the better chance there will be of ensuring that the policy continues and that the taxpayers of the European Community who are responsible for supporting it will be more satisfied with its operation.

Indeed, Mr President, another important part of my report is concerned with trying to ensure that more effective research is done and that better measurements are used by the Commission. This would enable us to have more information so that we can continue to shape the policy in a more effective way, thus ensuring that it will apply more efficiently and particularly, Mr President, if I might say so, be more fair, taking account of the relative importance of agriculture in a given Member State. We have to accept that in some countries agriculture, as a part of the economy, is absolutely central and critical, whereas in other Member States it is a minimal part of the overall economic activity and as regards its impact on the welfare of the people as a whole in that Member State, it is not too critical.

I shall be seen in this report to take the Commission to task to a certain degree. In response to a demand from the Council, the Commission last March drew up a report dealing with differential rates of inflation and the operation of the CAP, and the principal conclusion that it drew was:

It does not appear that a higher-than-average rate of inflation has been associated with the lower-than-average rate of increase in agricultural incomes.

This basic conclusion was given wide publicity throughout the Community, and generally speaking I think it could be accepted as correct. I must however challenge this conclusion because it seems so contradictory to the reality experienced by farmers in Member States where rates of inflation are high. It cannot be left just like that: hence the reason for this particular report.

I wish also to make the point that in compiling this report, the Commission has left out some very important considerations. First of all, it uses the sectorial index, as a method of measuring farm incomes. However, that is a general measurement which takes into account the average value of increases in agricultural prices but not the situation sector by sector or farmer by farmer — an important element. I make the point in passing that averages, of course, are not very precise: they very often hide more than they reveal. For example, it could be said that if a man has his head in the freezer and his feet in the fire, on average he should be comfortable. Obviously, that hides something and is, I think, a good illustration of what an average measurement gives. The index, therefore, does not take account of the problems of farmers in the various Member States sector by sector. In particular, it does not take into account the difference between very large-scale farming and very small-scale farming. It ignores such elements as labour charges, rent and interest payments, which are very important — particularly interest payments — and have a very profound effect on the level of incomes of the farmers in the various Member States.

The other problem is that the Commission's conclusions seem to depend also on past compensation by green-rate awards for increased production costs in countries with high rates of inflation. This, of course, is not very logical because it suggests that what happened in the past must continue in the future. I have to say, in fairness, that there has been a certain minimal realignment of the currencies in recent times which has slightly improved the position. But the fact cannot be ignored that the possibility of devaluation, Mr President, is not realistically open to some of these countries with high inflation rates. In fact, if some of these countries devalue their currencies, there is a danger that they are conflicting with the Commis-

Maher

sion's own avowed idea of controlling inflation because devaluations tend to fuel inflation. This is a very real problem. So the possibility of green rate devaluation is not open, Mr President, to many of these countries in order to get higher price increases for their farmers.

Now, Mr President, I want to point out also that my report is not, of course, based on my own work alone, it is also based on hearings we held with experts from all the member countries to get a more precise idea of exactly how agriculture is faring in the various countries.

Could I make a comment, Mr President, in relation to just one amendment — there are about 16 or 17 amendments. The one I want to refer to comes from the Christian-Democratic Group. It proposes virtually to throw out my report and it suggests that the Commission ought to do work in the area I am dealing with and come up with proposals by 1 September. Now I must confess, Mr President, I do not understand this amendment because first of all the date is completely unrealistic — I do not see how the Commission can do all this detailed work by 1 September. But not only that, neither can the Parliament do further work because this is merely an interim report; it does not seek to cover all the problems. A lot more work must be done...

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

... I would hope this amendment would not be supported because it effectively says that the Parliament should not do any more work in this area and leave it completely to the Commission. I could not accept that. I think the Parliament has a right to do more work. I am sorry if it offends some people, particularly from one member country, but certainly the farmers from my country will not appreciate the opposition, particularly of the Germans, in relation to this particular document.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, I am sorry you did not let me in before because it was relevant to the last debate. I do think that our function as the European Parliament is to keep control of the Commission to monitor what it is doing and what it is planning to do and, therefore, if the Commissioner does not respond to a debate, to questions asked and to points made, I think it would be in the interests of the Parliament's standing if we were permitted to press them to make those responses. Mr Dalsager did respond to one of my questions. It still leaves open-ended what price he is in fact going to aim at with his wine alcohol or other distilled products.

But the other two questions he did not answer. One was, what is happening about the French alcohol exports, which are causing grave disruption throughout the Community? And the third question was, what prospects does he see in the Council of Ministers for his alcohol proposals — ?

President. — Purvis, you have put a question to the Commissioner pursuant to Rule 64, and he has answered this question. Anyone may decide whether a Commissioner's answer is satisfactory or not. But where would we be if we now decided not to observe the Rules you Procedure! It was not for you to start a dialogue with the Commissioner. Let us now get on with our debate.

Mr Eyraud (S). — *(FR)* Ladies and gentlemen, none of us who are committed to social justice can fail to be dismayed at the anarchic pattern of agricultural incomes in the Community, anarchic both in their development over time and in the disparities from one region to another.

I shall be discussing both these matters in a moment, but should first like to comment on the complexity of the formation of agricultural income and of the indicators of agricultural income, deriving from the range and variety of the factors taken into account in their composition.

There can be quite appreciable variations depending on the indicator used: the gross income per holding, the net income per holding, the net value added per labour unit, or the net income per self-employed labour unit. My personal preference is for the last of these, since it is in fact designed to reflect the income of the farmer and his family working on the holding.

And yes, incomes from family holdings have varied considerably over these past ten years. Although, according to Eurostat, they rose by nearly 16% between 1981 and 1982, we find that they fell by over 30% between 1974 and 1981.

In deference to European solidarity, to which I am deeply committed, I shall not dwell on the variations deriving from differential rates of inflation in the Member States. However, there are also big disparities from one region to another, and even within a single region and from one farm to another. Our European Community must therefore find effective ways of eliminating these inequalities. The proposals contained in the report by our honourable colleague Mr Maher represent a first step in this direction and, as such, they have our full support.

However, these measures are far too timid and we are therefore unconvinced that they will be effective. Only if we have harmonization of production costs and a tax on imports of cereal substitutes, with price modulation according to the type of holding complementing the structural improvements, will it be possible, without bleeding the Community budget white, to reduce the scale of these disparities. Until there is a majority in Europe who support our proposals, there will be no social justice for our farmers.

Mr Diana (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, I should like first of all to reply to the rapporteur regarding what he defined as an amendment presented by the Group of the European People's Party. It is, in fact, an amend-

Diana

ment presented by individual members of this Group, and one with which other members of the Group, including myself, absolutely disagree. It is, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a way of postponing yet again a discussion that has been on the table too long: it is a way, Mr President, of 'hiding one's head in the sand' in relation to a problem that is certainly difficult to solve.

I think that the worst policy is one which does not face up to serious problems, and tries to postpone their discussion. We set things going with the decisions taken at the London Summit in November 1981, in which the Ministers and Heads of State took note of the problem of differing rates of inflation and their consequences in regard to farmers and agricultural incomes, and charged the Commission to produce its own report on the subject. In March, 1982, the Commission presented a report: it is a good one, and says some very important things. However, in the final part, the political conclusions that are drawn exclude the very things that are said in the document.

We decided, in this Parliament, to go very thoroughly into the Commission's report, and make our own appraisal of it. In February 1983 in the Committee on Agriculture, after having heard economists from all the Member States of the EEC, we approved a report by Mr Maher with a substantial majority: 21 votes in favour, 7 votes against.

We ought to have discussed this subject on the occasion of the debate on agricultural prices in March this year, except that, by a surprise stroke the discussion was postponed to another session: and today, in June, we are once again faced with this request for a postponement until September.

Well, Mr President, I think that this Parliament is aware of the limits to its powers where decision-making is concerned. I think, however, that it must be aware of one great power that it has — namely, the power to examine prickly questions very thoroughly, to endeavour to study them together, and to suggest solutions to the Commission and the Council.

If Parliament gives up this power, I think it is indeed giving up every function it has. I do not believe that Parliament wishes to abdicate its main function. Commissioner Dalsager cannot deny, as he has done in the past, that differential rates of inflation do have an impact on agricultural incomes. This year's results show that, against an average increase of 8.6% in agricultural incomes, in his country — Denmark — Agricultural incomes have risen by 24%. In Mr Maher's country, Ireland agricultural incomes have risen only by 0.5%.

The Commission cannot deny that, since 1979, the date the EMS came into operation, something has

happened. What is more, the Communication from the Commission admits it, and we must bear this in mind. The statistics unfortunately do not go back as far as 1973. We have to take them from 1979, when the EMS came into operation, and the Commission can see for itself that, from that date, agricultural incomes in the countries with a higher rate of inflation have fallen and, in the other countries, they have on the other hand increased.

I should like to end with an appeal: I would like to ask the Assembly to tackle the problem once and for all, identifying the problems and applying the appropriate solution.

(Applause)

Mr Provan (ED). — Mr President, I would like to thank Mr Maher for all the work that he has done on this very important subject. As Mr Diana said in his opening remarks, it is necessary for Parliament to face up to some of the problems discussed in this report. But Mr Maher's initiative too on having a public hearing on the matter was very important, and it was very illuminating for a lot of us to sit in on it.

Mr President, we in this group believe in the Common Agricultural Policy, although in certain circumstances we realize that it needs modification to control surpluses. Having said that, I think it is important for everybody here to realize that some of the suggestions included in Mr Maher's report would mean a return to national support systems. Now if we believe in a common policy, we cannot at the same time say that we must return some of the problems to national support systems.

We have come to the conclusion that we must control inflation in the Community and that this must be done at a Community level, but it is really urgent that policies be produced by the Commission to stop divergencies in Member States' economies overall. We cannot see that we should separate agriculture from the overall economy of the Member States.

We do recognize, however, that green currencies and MCAs have had an important part to play. There is, however, a lag and with inflation taking off, farm incomes cannot be adjusted until about one year afterwards. But when inflation comes back, agriculture incomes get a boost at that stage and if we could do something to tighten up this period of lag, I believe that that is the area that we have really got to try and look at. Of course, one does understand as well that countries, especially Mr Maher's country, Ireland, where a large percentage of the gross domestic product comes from agriculture, they are bound to have greater effects on their agricultural incomes than in some of the other Member States which have a more broadly-based economy.

Provan

Mr President, we cannot see instruments other than the MCAs and green currencies presently in use being made available. Therefore, we come to the conclusion that the way in which it is operating at present is probably the best way to try and operate. What the Commission really needs to do is to tackle the main problem, i.e. encourage economic convergence of all the Member States within the Community as quickly as possible.

Mr Maher did mention in his opening remarks that politics cannot be left out of it and that people in each Member State have really got to look after their own inflation in their own Member State. Politics are important in this. We are all in politics, and if you take a certain sector out of politics in a Member State, you are in fact saying that there is no real need to elect a government that will try and control inflation. You cannot, therefore, isolate agriculture from inflation and from politics.

To sum up, Mr President, one thing we believe we have to tackle as well: we must look at production costs within the Community. If we did so and made everybody operate from the same base, I believe we should begin to get somewhere.

Mrs Barbarella (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I should like first of all to emphasize the importance of Mr Maher's report regarding differential rates of inflation, which we consider crucial to the very future of the Common Agricultural Policy.

We very much regret, however, as do other members in this Chamber, that this report has only come up for discussion now, when in reality it would have been very much more useful to discuss it at the time farm prices were being fixed. We therefore totally disagree with anyone who, even now, would like to postpone both this discussion and a decision on the subject.

May I at all events make a few very brief observations on the content of Mr Maher's report. We share the view of the report that the Commission has devoted insufficient research to the question of differential rates of inflation. We also consider this research to have been inadequate, and that insufficient analysis has been made, in that report, of the way agricultural production costs have risen which, where inflation is concerned, is a factor of fundamental importance.

In its report the Commission takes no account of factors that were of fundamental relevance, such as labour costs and, for example, the increase in the price of land. We consider this omission to be a very serious fault, bearing in mind the way costs and land prices have risen in countries with a high rate of inflation.

Moreover, there is no reference in the Commission's Communication to the cost of money. In this context, that is a fundamental point, as I think the facts show

— both the level of indebtedness reached by some producers and some countries in the Community, and the level to which the cost of money has risen.

We are on the other hand in agreement with Mr Maher's proposals. We do not think, as Mr Provan stated, that Mr Maher's proposals are moving in the direction of 'renationalization', or a strengthening of national intervention. On the contrary, we consider that the right solution is a policy that is complementary to the prices support policy and points to new ways of keeping down production costs. For this reason we also express our approval of the important precedent set by the Council of Ministers, with its decision in regard to interest rate subsidies.

*(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)*¹

IN THE CHAIR: MR JAQUET*Vice-President**Topical and urgent debate (objections)*²

Mr Israël (DEP). — *(FR)* I refer you to the Rules of Procedure, which stipulate that the grounds for a request to challenge an interpretation must be given in writing. However, you, in common with all your predecessors, have not made arrangements for these grounds to be brought to the attention of the House. I therefore ask what purpose is served by stipulating written statements of grounds for such requests if the House is not given an opportunity to see them and form its opinion.

President. — All I can say is that we have here the explanations in writing. I think we could refer this matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petition.

Mr Israël (DEP). — *(FR)* Thank you, Mr President.

6. Question Time

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 1-389/83).

Today we are taking the questions addressed to the Commission.

Further to the decisions taken by Parliament on Monday afternoon, the first question taken this afternoon will be that of Mr Muller, taken over by Mr Kirk, concerning protectionist measures taken by Sweden. This question had been tabled as an Oral question with debate, pursuant to Rule 42 of the Rules of Procedure and it has been converted into an oral question (H/192/83):

¹ Deadline for tabling amendments: see Minutes.

² For details of voting: see Minutes.

President

Last year the Swedish Government took measures on several occasions to protect its products against free competition from Community production. It prohibited imports of Danish meat, invoking isolated cases of foot and mouth disease last year. It also prohibited imports of Danish chrysanthemums. The steel price, particularly low on the Swedish market, is contrary to the steel agreement. The Swedish Government has devalued the Swedish Kroner by 16 %. All these measures are contrary to the spirit of the trade agreement between Sweden and the EEC.

Can the Commission state what problems are raised by the adoption of these measures by Sweden and set out the steps it has taken or intends to take to prevent third countries like Sweden from being able to profit from their situation and convert a bilateral trade agreement into a one-way agreement?

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission.

— (DE) In accordance with the provisions of the free trade agreement, the Commission has had consultations with Sweden on the questions raised by the honourable Member. In collaboration with the Danish authorities, satisfactory solutions have meanwhile been found to the problem of the restrictions on meat imports and the freeze on the import of chrysanthemums. The problems that have recently occurred in connection with steel prices have been the subject of in-depth discussions between the Commission and the Swedish authorities. The Swedish authorities have called on undertakings in their country to price their products in accordance with the provisions of the agreement. From a purely practical point of view, this is undoubtedly difficult because of the constant changes in guide prices and also the change in exchange rates. The Commission can assure the House that it will continue to take a keen interest in the question of relations between Sweden and the Community in the steel sector.

I gave my opinion on the devaluation of the Swedish currency in this House in November 1982. At political level, the Commission has on several occasions expressed its regret to the Swedish Government about this step. It is the Commission's task to ensure that all the provisions of the free trade agreement are respected by the parties to the agreement, and it naturally does the same where Sweden is concerned. Very generally, I should like to say that the free trade agreements have worked very well in the last ten years. The agreements themselves and the machinery for close consultation provide a suitable framework for dealing with any problems that arise. We have taken advantage of this in the past, and we shall continue to do so whenever new problems emerge.

Mr Kirk (ED). — (DA) I should like first to thank Commissioner Haferkamp for his answer concerning

the protectionist measures which Sweden has applied against the Community. I want to ask a supplementary question: does the Commission consider it necessary, possibly by a revision of the trade agreement with Sweden, to secure better treatment for the Community? The reason I put this question is that, after the consultations to which Mr Haferkamp refers took place, the Swedes declared that they would not accept Danish chrysanthemums on the Swedish market, when they are cut, since Sweden is able to produce them.

The Swedes then also stated that Denmark was to be declared free from the American leaf-miner and that the nurseries subsequently recognized would be subject to three months' quarantine. It is a fact that Denmark has been officially free from the American leaf-miner for the past two years, and we feel that Sweden is perhaps circumventing the consultations and the declarations made as a result of consultations with the Commission. Finally we must bear in mind that it is a very important market for a Member State such as Denmark for Denmark supplies over 50 % of the Swedish market for chrysanthemums, and we have many firms today which are on the point of shutting shop and going home. We therefore ask the Commission whether it intends to renegotiate the free trade agreement so as to ensure that the Community, and hence also Denmark, gets reasonable treatment on the part of the Swedish authorities, when we export to the Swedish market.

Mr Haferkamp. — (DE) I have already said that the free trade agreements we have with the EFTA countries, including Sweden, have worked very well in the last ten years. There is no reason why these agreements should be revised or lengthy renegotiations begun. The machinery of the agreements provides sufficient opportunity for the settlement of any difficulties that occur. We may not yet have been entirely successful in the case of the chrysanthemums, but we shall use the existing rules and procedures and undoubtedly arrive at a satisfactory solution.

Mr Purvis (ED). — The Commission gives us great assurances but I understand from my Danish colleagues that this question of chrysanthemums which may seem a relatively minor thing to the Commission or to the Community at large has not been sorted out to the extent that the people producing them in Denmark can retain their market. That, in a matter of months, can ruin the specialist producer. We have such strength on our side. After all, the Swedish market is relatively small in EEC terms but the EEC market is colossally important to Sweden. I cite, for example, the market for pulp and paper that we provide for Sweden. Could we not use a lot more of our muscle on Sweden to ensure that this victimization is not pursued in the way that it appears to be at present?

Mr Haferkamp. — (DE) I have already said that on a number of the issues that have been mentioned here, including meat — as Mr Kirk has just confirmed — we have come to an arrangement with Sweden. In principle, the chrysanthemum problem has also been settled. If reference is now made to the length at which chrysanthemums are cut, all I can say is that I am prepared to negotiate on this question again.

Mr Nyborg (DEP). — (DA) I hope I did not understand Commissioner Haferkamp correctly, for Mr Kirk has just stated quite clearly that the Swedes are making some clever moves to get round the agreements which have been concluded with the Commission. I hope I did not understand him correctly for I got the impression that the Commission did not intend to take any further steps to ensure that the agreements concluded are implemented in a proper manner.

Mr Haferkamp. — (DE) I am not aware that agreements have been circumvented. I should therefore be very grateful if the honourable Member would give specific examples. Furthermore, the arrangements we have made with Sweden with regard to meat and chrysanthemums were made in close cooperation with the competent Danish authorities and the Danish Government.

President. — Question No 22, by Mr Couste (H-644/82):

Given that the Council has agreed that a series of appropriate work programmes should be drawn up in the fields of technical standards, company law, certain services and formalities at the Community's internal frontiers, how does the Commission intend to contribute towards this strengthening of the internal market?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The gratifying willingness of the Council to make special efforts to reach decisions on long overdue proposals concerning aspects of the internal market is the outcome of unceasing pressure from the Commission, particularly since 1981, when it confronted the European Council with matters connected with the internal market on a number of occasions.

The Council's work programme, to which the honourable Member refers, is the subject of a mandate adopted by the European Council in Copenhagen in December 1982 on a proposal from the Commission. Under this mandate the Council was instructed to take decisions on measures proposed by the Commission in the following priority areas by the end of March 1983: Community certification of third-country products, an information procedure in the area of standards and technical specifications and the simplification of formalities at frontier crossing-points.

Another set of measures, relating in particular to the elimination of technical barriers to trade and the approximation of legislation and administrative provision, was to be adopted by the end of June 1983. At three special Council meetings devoted to the internal market, on 1 February, 1 March and 26 May, agreement was reached, for example, on the information procedure in the area of standards and technical specifications and on tax exemptions where means of transport are imported temporarily and where personal effects are permanently imported by private individuals from a Member State.

At its meeting of 21 and 22 March the European Council noted what progress had been made so far and also confirmed the need for decisions to be taken before June on all the areas referred to in Copenhagen. The Commission wants to see all aspects of the Copenhagen mandate fulfilled. It expects the Stuttgart summit to provide the impulse required to ensure the successful outcome of the next Council meeting to be devoted to the internal market, which will take place on 21 June, and to specify a period within which other decisions, relating in particular to the elimination and simplification of frontier checks, must be taken. The elimination of frontier checks has proved to be politically the most difficult aspect and in fact the 'poor relation' in the development of the internal market.

Mr Cousté (DEP). — (FR) I thank the Commission for the efforts that it is making and am sorry that the Council is once again failing to take decisions according to the set timetable.

My supplementary is this: what can the Commission do to accelerate a process to which it rightly reverted a little more than a year ago? This is unquestionably an urgent matter and that is why I am pressing the Commission to ensure that a concrete decision is taken in Stuttgart on this internal market matter and its finalization, and that it is not allowed to remain in the realm of theory.

Mr Narjes. — (DE) I thank the honourable Member for his support. The Commission intends to ensure that the subject of the internal market is again discussed at the Stuttgart summit and that, where possible, binding decisions are also taken.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) I should like to take this opportunity to thank the Commission on behalf of my group for the great effort it has made. However, I also have a question to ask, which is again a reference to the future and is intended to encourage the Commission to do more in this area.

My question proceeds from the assumption that various Member States make the completion of the internal market conditional on progress in trade relations with third countries and that the elimination of checks in the internal market must, of course, be

Rogalla

offset by checks at the external frontiers. Specifically, then, my question is this: what has the Commission already done to remind the Member States of the need to increase checks at the external frontiers, and what contacts does it have with the Member States' authorities with a view to achieving this goal in the medium term or, say, three years?

Mr Narjes. — (DE) In reply to the first part of the question, I can say that the Commission has some hope of something of a breakthrough being achieved on 21 June in two areas where little has been done thus far.

As regards the second part of the question, any activity at the external frontiers that goes beyond the administration of the Common Customs Tariff and of quotas should begin when appropriate legal foundations have been laid for further instruments and further checks. We are, of course, well on the way to developing this set of instruments, and if the hoped-for decision is taken in June, thought should perhaps be given to drawing up a kind of intermediate statement in the appropriate committee six to eight months later.

Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED). — Would the Commission not agree that due to continuing, differing technical standards, there is still a woeful lack of national governments either putting out to tender or placing public contracts outside of their own national borders and within the EEC?

Mr Narjes. — (DE) Public works contracts do indeed represent the least advanced sector of the internal market. We are not satisfied with the present situation and intend to take appropriate initiatives next year once we have received a progress report containing an interim statement on the nature of the obstacles that still exist and means of overcoming them. I would also point out that initiatives are now increasingly being taken in certain specific areas. Above all, the procedure mentioned here for the notification of new standards and technical specifications will help to prevent the emergence of new standards which the Community believes will result in a distortion of trade. Secondly, I would point out that our proposals on telecommunications, biotechnology and so on take account of the standardization aspect and its implications for public works contracts, thus enabling us to narrow the problem down more and more both sectorally and horizontally. I will not conceal from you, however, that transport equipment and the defence industry will form the hard core.

President. — At the request of its author, Question No 23 by Mr Hopper is held over until July.

Since the author of the question is absent, Question No 24 will be answered in writing¹

¹ See Annex II.

Question No 25, by Mr Gontikas (H-24/83):

How does the Commission review the obstructions that Greece puts in the way of free production and movement of pharmaceutical products and can it state whether the statements made by a Commission official in Greece on this subject reflect the views of the Commission?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The Commission has considered the Greek Act on the manufacture, distribution, import and export of pharmaceuticals which entered into force on 11 January of this year to see whether it is compatible with Community legislation. It has reached the conclusion that certain provisions of the Act conflict with Community legislation. The statements on this subject by a Commission official to which the honourable Member refers were to this effect and thus reflect the views of the Commission. Unfortunately, some of these statements were misquoted.

In the Commission's opinion, particular exception must be taken to the following provisions of the Greek Act:

1. In its present form, the national pharmaceutical authority, EOF, set up under the Act contravenes Article 37 of the EEC Treaty since it is both commercially active and exercises control powers on its own authority. These two functions should be separated.

2. The system for fixing the prices of pharmaceuticals is incompatible with Article 30 of the EEC Treaty since as a general rule it takes the level of production costs in Greece as the yardstick even for pharmaceuticals imported from other Member States.

3. Because they are discriminatory, various criteria used in the compilation of the list of pharmaceuticals, which restricts prescriptions and refunds to a limited number of pharmaceuticals, also contravene Article 30 of the EEC Treaty. This specifically concerns the arbitrary restriction to three products per pharmaceutical speciality and the use of the criterion of 'importance for the domestic economy'.

4. Lastly, Community legislation, and specifically Articles 30 and 37, is infringed by the special arrangement whereby the only pharmaceuticals that may be included in the list are those produced by manufacturers who have previously concluded contracts or agreements with the national pharmaceutical authority, EOF, on conditions governing the manufacture, import and marketing of these products, even though EOF is also commercially active. On 25 May the Commission therefore decided pursuant to Article 169 to bring an action against Greece on the grounds of failure to fulfil an obligation under the Treaty.

Mr Gontikas (PPE). — (GR) I would like to express my satisfaction with the Commission's answer. I think that it conforms to the framework of the Treaty and will now wait to see how the Commission intends to follow the matter up.

Gontikas

I just want to put a supplementary question: did the Greek government react to these observations by the Commission, and if so, how?

Mr Narjes. — (DE) As we did not initiate proceedings until 25 May, the process of briefing and calling on the Greek Government to comment has not yet been completed.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) We too thank the Commissioner for his answer. Up to now the Commission's interventions have taken place 'undercover' so to speak, in other words covertly. Now though, we see the Commission coming out into the open. I should like to add that I am sorry to see a Greek Member of the European Parliament placing the interest of certain European companies above those of the health of the Greek people.

I would like to ask the Commissioner whether this reaction by the Commission reflects an understanding of the particular problems relating to Greece, an understanding that is widely publicized by the Greek government, and whether it also reflects the Commission's concession in reply to the Greek Memorandum?

Mr Narjes. — (DE) The honourable Member may rest assured that the Commission is careful to examine and take account of any opinion expressed by the Member States.

Mr Gontikas (PPE) — (GR) A personal matter arises from what was said by my colleague who has just spoken. He said that I place the interests of foreign firms above those of Greece. That is quite wrong. The question is not which of the two we are promoting, but whether the provisions of the Treaty are being obeyed.

President. — We take note of your statement, Mr Gontikas.

Question No 26, by Mr Eisma (H-50/83):

Can the Commission say whether it has carried out the study requested in the above resolution (Doc. 1-287/82), adopted by the European Parliament on 18 June 1982¹, and if so, what were the findings?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) As part of its biomechanics programme, the Commission has investigated the problem of bumpers on motor vehicles, as the European Parliament requested in its resolution of 18 July 1982. Particular attention has been paid to the important aspect of the relationship between the front bumpers of passenger cars and the nature and degree of injuries suffered by pedestrians

hit head on and the nature of dents in other vehicles hit in the side.

The findings and studies were discussed at a seminar held by the Commission in March of this year to conclude its biomechanics programme. The Commission agreed with the experts from administrations, consumers' associations and industry that the existing ERGA working parties should be joined by an ad hoc working party on safety. The absence of harmonized provisions on motor vehicle bumpers has not so far resulted in any barriers to trade in the motor vehicle sector. The Commission is not aware that any provisions in the Member States on the form of bumpers, the properties of the material from which they are made or the manner in which they are attached have caused barriers to trade. Nor is it aware that any of the member governments intend to introduce such provisions.

Mr Eisma (NI). — (NL) My supplementary question is whether we can see the results of the study which has meanwhile been completed, to find out whether a study has been made of the point made by Mr von Wogau further to my motion for a resolution in the relevant report of last June. My question is: when can we see the results of that study and can the Commission consider drafting a directive on standardising car bumpers, although that does not concern a technical barrier to trade?

Mr Narjes. — (DE) The Commission can let the appropriate committee have an interim internal document showing the results achieved up until March. The special ERGA committee will probably complete its work on this subject some time in 1984. Again, we are, of course, prepared to report on its findings.

As I am not yet familiar with the results, it is difficult to say whether and to what extent they will necessitate legislative action or make it superfluous. Should it be superfluous, we would certainly be the last people to enact legislation nonetheless.

Mr Cousté (DEP). — (FR) My supplementary follows on from the interesting reply that I have heard Mr Narjes give.

It is inconceivable that any ad hoc group set up to examine safety will confine itself to harmonization of car bumpers and their effects; it must examine the whole of the vehicle, front and rear, taking in rear-view mirrors and a whole range of accessories. This is the point that I wished to raise.

Mr Narjes. — (DE) The overall ERGA programme is designed to cover all aspects having a synergistic or antagonistic effect as regards safety and other aspects. To explain the correlation: the lower the bumper, the better the aerodynamic effect and the lower the fuel consumption.

¹ OJ No C 182, 19 July 1982, p. 115.

Mr Notenboom (PPE). — *(NL)* I should like to ask the Commissioner where the results of the study in March in question are published?

Mr Narjes. — *(DE)* As I said just now, the document concerned is an internal summary, which I am quite willing to forward to the appropriate committee.

President. — At the request of the author, Question No 27 has been postponed to a later part-session.

As the authors are not present, Questions Nos 28, 29 and 30 will be answered in writing¹.

Question No 31 by Mr Adonnino (H-101/83):

Point 3.2 of the resolution of 5 December 1978 on the establishment of the European Monetary System and related matters called on the Commission to submit a proposal to introduce interest rate subsidies of 3% on loans to the less prosperous Member States effectively and fully participating in the exchange rate and intervention mechanisms, up to a ceiling of 200 m ECU per year, for a period of 5 years.

This five-year period is due to expire at the end of 1983. In the light of these considerations and in view of the need to extend these special intervention measures, which have proved extremely effective during the period of their application, can the Commission say whether, in the context of its independent power of initiative or otherwise, it has submitted, or intends to submit, a proposal to extend the interest rate subsidies for the loans concerned and, if so, on what basis and with what arrangements?

Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission — *(FR)* I can reply in a very few words. As Mr Adonnino has indicated, a special mechanism for interest rate subsidies was set up for a period of five years within the framework of the European Monetary System. The five-year period expires this year. On 1 June last the Commission proposed that the mechanism be maintained for a further period of two years, not only because it has proved efficient and undoubtedly demonstrated solidarity with the less prosperous countries, but also because it was desirable to keep to the same figures, bearing in mind the developments seen elsewhere, with a substantial increase in structural funds. We have therefore kept the mechanism. We have not proposed an increase in the amounts for a period of two years because we feel that we are approaching a stage when, after seven years, it will be possible, in the light not only of a number of developments in the Community — such as enlargement — but also seven years' experience of the European monetary machinery and its development, to make a fresh assessment and put forward different, more concrete proposals if appropriate but at all events we shall have the benefit of longer experience.

Mr Adonnino (PPE). — *(IT)* I should like to thank Commissioner Ortoli for his clear reply, and the Commission for the action they have taken.

I hope that the Commission's proposal will be accepted by the Council and that, as a result this mechanism — whose value and the need for which have been proved in the last few years, as Vice-president Ortoli has made clear — will still be in operation for the next two years.

I would also express the hope that, at the end of the seven-year period, as outlined, a full account may be drawn up showing the effectiveness of the mechanism, so as to make it a permanent part of the system, or, alternatively, to enable other measures to be provided for achieving the same aims.

Mr Simpson (ED) — Can the Commissioner comment on what steps the Commission is taking and what steps it proposes to take in order to ensure full participation by all Member States in all parts of the European Monetary System?

Mr Ortoli. — *(FR)* It is more a matter of the Commission's hopes than of any steps that it can take.

We have on numerous occasions expressed the view that the success of this machinery depends on full participation by all Member States, and we have said rather more. If we wish to go further, it is very difficult to see how we can have a system which is applicable to only eight of the Community countries. It is therefore essential for the system to come into full operation at some point, especially if further stages of development are to be undertaken.

Consequently we hope that the system can be extended to all States in the Community, since we feel not only that certain conditions have now come right, but also that this would give the system greater weight and standing in the rest of the world and that the outlook for the future would be correspondingly better.

Mr Chanterie (PPE). — *(NL)* As rapporteur for the 1984 budget of the Committee on Regional Policy I have indeed ascertained that the amount in question comes under the heading of regional policy. I have two questions to the Commissioner: firstly, is this classification under regional policy correct, and secondly, which regional policy projects were or are to be implemented with these amounts?

Mr Ortoli. — *(FR)* I have to admit that I was unaware that this came under the heading of regional policy. There is a certain logic in this, since we are dealing here with the less prosperous States. It was therefore necessary to find a nomenclature. However, we do not have any European Monetary System nomenclature. Since it is indeed the less prosperous States which are benefiting, there is a certain logic in this.

¹ See Annex II.

Ortoli

As to the results, they are relatively simple. They come down to the fact that we are able in particular to provide more help in the setting up of finance for energy and infrastructure projects in two countries, one of which in its entirety constitutes a region for the purposes of the Regional Fund and the other receives a very large proportion of the aid from this Fund and is therefore recognized as being entitled to priority for regional aid.

President. — As the authors are not present, Questions Nos 32 and 33 will be answered in writing¹.

At the request of their authors, Questions Nos 34, 35 and 36 have been held over until the July part-session. Question No 37 by Mr Davern (H-833/82):

According to EEC Directive 159 Member States are legally obliged to operate a system of selective incentives to farms suitable for development. Furthermore, Member States are obliged to provide for investment aid necessary to carry out development plans with land purchase and the purchase of pigs; poultry or calves intended for slaughter being the only items prohibited.

Does the Commission feel that under the terms of EEC Directive 159 the Irish Government is entitled in its budget provisions for 1983 to state that no new applications for farm building grants and fixed assets can be made by developing farmers until later this year and grants should be abolished for mobile equipment, farm accounts and the beef and sheep guidance premiums?

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) The Commission is aware of the changes which have recently been made in Ireland to the arrangements for the implementation of Directives 72/159, 72/160 and 72/268. The Irish Government has requested permission to waive the provisions of Directive 72/159 for the rest of this year. The Commission has sought views and is working on the preparation of a decision on the question in accordance with the usual procedures.

Mr Davern (DEP). — In the light of the Commissioner's reply I should like to ask him whether he has considered the serious consequences for structural farming in preparing that reply? I must say I am amazed at the length of time it has taken for the Commission to prepare its reply to the government at this stage. Could he inform us if the government has replied to them in full justifying the withdrawal of this scheme?

In view of the consequences for employment, particularly in rural areas, and the need of small builders for employment in those areas, would the Commission not take urgent steps to ensure that the government complies with Article 159 of the Treaty which many of us in Ireland believe it is now contravening?

¹ See Annex II.

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) It is the usual procedure in the Commission, when a government presents a request to the Commission in respect of a special problem regarding a particular piece of Community legislation, to examine the problem closely and, if possible, to meet the wishes of the government in question, as is the case with the question we are dealing with here.

President. — Question No 38 by Mr Kallias (H-148/83)¹:

It is obvious that the future of Europe and of the whole world depends on the coming generations, but the future of European unity, in particular, depends on the attitude the European younger generation adopts to the question.

Steps must, therefore, be taken to tackle the burning problem of youth unemployment, on the one hand, and on the other, the question of a psychological rapprochement with young people.

Both problems are extremely difficult to solve. Unfortunately, however, efforts are being devoted only to the first of them, a wide range of efforts which, it is to be hoped, will very shortly lead to specific measures. There is an urgent need, though, for the second problem, that of a psychological rapprochement with the European younger generation, to be confronted, so that the knowledge and experience of older people can be channelled towards the young, for them to use on their own responsibility and initiative. For these reasons, the Commission must urgently address itself to this serious problem.

Can the Commission say:

- (a) if it has attached particular importance to the dangers inherent in the generation gap, and
- (b) what action, if any, it has taken, or intends to take, to bridge the psychological gap between those at the decision-taking age and those at the age which is coming, or up-and-coming, and what the results of its actions have been?

Mr Richard, Member of the Commission. — The Commission shares the concern of the honourable Member about any development which tends to widen the distance between the young and older generations, and within the area of its competence the Commission has taken and will continue to take initiatives to combat such developments.

The focus of the Commission's efforts has been on the process of transition from childhood dependence to active participation in society and in the economy involving action in the field of education, training and employment for young people. Although it is the problems of employment — and what is worse

¹ Former oral question without debate (O-186/82), converted into a question for Question Time.

Richard

unemployment — which most preoccupy the Commission. Community initiatives have also emphasized the need to give young people a broad preparation for working life and not just a preparation for work.

The Commission would draw attention in particular to the new programme of pilot projects to assist national policy in each Member State on transition from education to adult and working life, which was agreed by the Council of Ministers of Education on 12 July 1982. This programme is now underway. It is based on the encouraging results of an earlier four-year programme of pilot projects which ended last year and which demonstrated that the effectiveness in young people's education and preparation for adult and working life can be considerably improved particularly where the whole local community can be involved in the process.

The Joint Council on Employment of Employment and Education Ministers on 3 June adopted a resolution on vocational training policies in the 1980s on the basis of a Commission proposal in which, again, particular importance was attached to the improvement of young people's educational and social integration. The centrepiece of those proposals is the Community-wide introduction of a social guarantee for young persons. The Commission has also stressed in its recent communication on the promotion of employment for young people the importance of encouraging nonvocational activities especially for the young unemployed.

Mr Kallias (PPE). — *(GR)* I have listened with care and satisfaction to the measures spoken of by the Commissioner regarding unemployment and education. However, I would like to ask him about one other huge problem that exists: about the psychological problem, the generation gap, the virtual refusal of the younger generations to communicate. Nothing has been done about this. I think it is one of the most important matters, because much will depend upon the possibility of communicating. However, for this possibility to exist I think that on the one hand the older generations should recognize the initiative and responsibility of the young, and on the other hand the young should welcome the experience and knowledge of the old as a sort of raw material.

I ask the Commissioner to tell us whether, in relation to direct communication between the Commission, or for that matter the Community as a whole and the younger generation, any steps have already been taken or, above all, whether such essential steps are being planned for the future.

Mr Richard. — I am grateful for the support that the honourable Member expressed for what the Commission has tried to do.

I think the point that he raises is of supreme importance, and I agree with a great deal of what he has to say. I am sure he will also recognize that it is

extremely difficult to see what specific measures we could take at Community level to bridge what he calls 'this psychological gap'. What I can say to him, however, is that the new programme on transition is based on the idea of creating, in selected geographical areas — there are thirty of them in the Community as a whole — active cooperation between the schools and the out-of-school, local environment. It is, in other words, aimed at trying to create an active educational dialogue between the generations within specific local communities, so we are conscious of the problem within the limits, not only of our budget, but of what we can do as a Community to try and bridge this particular gap. We are conscious of it and we are doing what we can.

Mr Chanterie (PPE). — *(NL)* The Commissioner referred in his first answer to the meetings of the Council for Social Affairs and the joint Council of Ministers for Social Affairs and Education which took place last week. Could the Commissioner please answer the following questions: was the principle of social guarantee upheld at this Council meeting? Secondly, did the Council welcome Parliament's proposal to extend the social guarantee to the age of twenty-five? And thirdly, what exactly is the state of play in the discussions on overhauling the whole of the Social Fund? Has the Council drawn up a number of guidelines, will they be followed by a definitive decision and when, and will Parliament still be able to play a role in it?

Mr Richard. — I am sure the honourable Member would be the first to recognize that the questions he asks are a lot wider than the question that has been put on the paper. But let me try and answer them. Was the principle of the social guarantee accepted by the Council last week? The answer is Yes.

Was the principle that it should be broadened up to the age of 25 accepted? The answer is: No.

What we got out of the Council last week was a firm acceptance of the principle of a social guarantee for training but a reluctance on the part of the Council to extend or expand it beyond an initial guarantee of six months and possibly a year, certainly not into a second year.

As far as the provision of the Social Fund is concerned, the Council of Social and Employment Ministers — accepted and came to a conclusion last Thursday on the revision of the Social Fund. Quite what the formalities are and the extent to which that is now a firm decision of the Council which can be implemented, or the extent to which it is a decision in principle of the Council which thereafter has got to have the legalities finally resolved, I am bound to say that I am not totally clear. My impression is that there is a decision in principle but that it will eventually have to be taken as an A point at some subsequent Council meeting so as to get the thing through finally. The basic decision on the review of the Social Fund has now been taken.

Mrs Hoff (S). — (DE) The fact that six million young people are unemployed in the European Community clearly shows that the initiatives and measures so far taken by the Commission have been inadequate. My question to Commissioner Richard is this: is the Commission prepared, for example, to put forward proposals for limiting agricultural surpluses and using the resources thus saved for programmes to fight youth unemployment? If so, can it give details of these programmes?

Mr Richard. — The honourable lady must not tempt me into areas where it would be beyond my competence at present to stray, however much I might be tempted.

May I just say this to her, however. She says the Commission has not done enough as far as youth employment is concerned. With great respect the Commission has tabled proposals and it is now up to the Council of Ministers to accept those proposals. If they are accepted, it is the Commission's view that youth unemployment can be reduced by 2 1/2 million over a period of 5 years, and this is what we have said in our communication to the Council. I think it is a little unfair to castigate the Commission for not doing enough when the responsibility for inaction at the moment does not lie with us.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr Kallias's drift in this question of psychological relationships seems to be that the young should adapt themselves to the ways of their elders, and all that Mr Richards mentioned in the way of training programmes for youth was also about young people adapting to the ways of their elders. Would it not be more exciting and dynamic for the Community if the young were encouraged to use their own initiative and the older people, we adults, were encouraged to understand them better? Perhaps they have their approach completely the wrong way round.

Mr Richard. — I am tempted to answer yes to that.

Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED). — Bearing in mind the importance of family life, would the Commissioner not agree that there is still far too big a gap between teachers and parents? If he does agree with this, has he any programme for trying to help this situation?

Mr Richard. — The answer to the question on a personal level is, yes, of course I agree with it. Does the Commission have a specific programme designed to bring teachers and parents closer together in the Member States? The answer to that at the moment is, no. Why do we not have a programme? Because, as the honourable gentlemen in Parliament will know, in the educational field in particular there are certain constitutional factors which raise difficulties and therefore I do not think it would be very sensible for the Commission to go down that particular road — at least, not to go down it frontally.

decide — Since its author is absent, Question No 39 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 40, by Mr Simmonds (H-56/83), replaced by Mr Battersby:

In view of the fact that in my experience letters to Britain from other Community countries take an average of seven days to arrive compared to four or five days when coming from the Far East, Africa and Australia, is the Commission prepared to look into ways in which postal communication within the EEC can be improved?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The delay in the delivery of letters in the United Kingdom to which the honourable Member refers is partly due to the fact that, although the United Kingdom has introduced post codes, it has not yet announced its intention of adopting the continental system with a view to harmonizing post codes. As the change from the British to the continental system will entail considerable investments, the Commission hopes, as it said in a recent debate in the House on a question put by Mr Prag, that, as soon as the earnings of the British Post Office permit, it will decide to make the necessary investments in the interests of its own efficiency and competitiveness. When the Commission feels that earnings permit such action, it will make a suggestion to this end. It can do no more than that. It is also confident that the House of Commons will take up this matter and ensure that, as soon as the conditions are right, the British system is adapted to the continental system.

Mr Battersby (ED). — Could the Commission examine the possibility of instituting a Community postmark or franking mark, possibly in sensitized ink, for inter-Community mail? I think that that could help in accelerating sorting and delivery and would also be a form of publicity for the European Community.

Mr Narjes. — (DE) I doubt whether a uniform stamp or franking mark would accelerate sorting, although I would have to ask the experts. The problem with the conversion of capital equipment is primarily whether the post code appears before or after the destination. As regards a uniform stamp, I would refer you to past debates in the House, in which it has been said that, although we can have the same picture on individual issues of stamps, we have not yet reached the stage where we can have uniform denominations, owing to other problems in this connection.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (DE) Mr Commissioner, you have just said that major difficulties exist in the United Kingdom because of the deficiencies of its post code system. I read Mr Simmonds's question with

¹ See Annex II.

Hasburg

considerable envy, because a letter from Paris to Munich takes an average of ten days, and our post code system in Germany is not so bad, as far as I can judge. Hence my question, Mr Commissioner: can you tell me what progress our postal services have made since the days of Charlemagne?

Mr Narjes. — (DE) The only progress I can cite with any certainty is the change from mail coaches and messengers to railways and cars. I am at the moment unable to quantify any other progress that may have been made.

Mr Purvis (ED). — It seems coincidental that when it is a case of domestic mail and only one PTT can be blamed for the delays, it gets there quickly. When there are two PTTs involved, i.e. across borders, then they can each blame each other and they leave that mail lying around while they get on with the domestic mail.

Could the Commission not institute some system of shaming them into doing something about it just by publishing the times it takes on average to move the mail between the different Member States? Some you will find are exorbitantly long.

Mr Narjes. — (DE) We do not have any means of coercion in the legal sense, but I am prepared to consider whether anything can be achieved psychologically by giving the postal authorities examples of the time it takes for mail to be delivered in this electronic age.

President. — At the request of its author, Question No 41 has been held over until the July part-session.

Question No 42, by Mr Kirk (H-76/83):

What does the Commission propose to do to counter the unrestricted and uncontrolled importation of, among other things, blue spruce trees from several East European countries (including Hungary and Poland), which is being carried out at dumping prices?

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DE) In application of the GATT anti-dumping code and the relevant 1979 Council regulation the opening of an anti-dumping procedure usually presupposes a specific complaint, providing sufficient evidence that dumping has taken place and that the industry concerned has suffered as a result. In the case to which the honourable Member refers the Commission has not yet received a complaint of this kind. If a complaint meeting the conditions I have mentioned is made, the Commission will of course, initiate the necessary investigations.

Mr Kirk (ED) — (DA) I thank the Commissioner for his answer, and I understand it to mean that, where

concrete situations arise in which dumping on the market has been determined, the Commission will also set in motion the procedure to stop it, and that it will not stand by and allow time to pass without securing the normalization of the German market in Christmas trees.

Mr Haferkamp. — (DE) That goes without saying. As soon as we receive a complaint giving details of the dumping and of the damage suffered, we shall look into the matter.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (DE) Mr Commissioner, the problem with dumping — of Christmas trees or any other product — is surely that we do not in fact have adequate anti-dumping legislation. It simply does not operate quickly enough. Just looking at the complaints that have been made in the transport sector prompts me to ask whether it is not time we speeded up our anti-dumping procedures where they concern the Eastern Bloc countries.

Mr Haferkamp — (DE) The time the procedures take depends on a number of factors. Firstly, we are, of course, obliged to abide by the procedures laid down in the international rules and also the Community's internal rules. Secondly, investigations have to be made, involving audits, possibly on the spot, and this is extremely complicated and sometimes time-consuming. You may rest assured that we and the services of the Commission responsible for these matters do everything we can to deal with cases of dumping as quickly as possible.

Mr Bonde (CDI). — (DA) I should like to ask the Commissioner if he will present a list of all anti-dumping procedures in progress and concluded.

Mr Haferkamp. — This can, of course, be done, and we shall report on this to the Committee on External Economic Relations, which is, I believe, the committee responsible.

Sir Jack Stewart-Clark (ED). — Will the Commissioner tell me — and I am a member of the Committee on External Economic Relations — if he is satisfied with the procedures which are currently operating in anti-dumping and whether he considers he has enough staff to deal with them?

Mr Haferkamp. — (DE) All I can say is that the officials in the appropriate departments have a very heavy workload. It has been possible under a number of budgets to increase the staff in this sector, but the workload is really extremely heavy. It might be possible to speed things up in some cases if more staff were available. We try to do this with the limited staff and budgetary resources we have.

President. — Since its author is absent Question No 43 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 44, by Mr Donnez (H-81/83):

As part of the Road-building works provided for in the Nord-Pas-de-Calais roadbuilding programme, the Commission, under the fourth tranche of aid from the ERDF (quota section) for 1982, gave approval to a project for the linking of two towns in the Nord department (surveys and construction). Can it give details of where this link will be built and the amount of aid granted by the Community?

Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission. — (IT) Road links in the Nord-Pas de Calais region of France, which have received aid from the European Regional Development Fund as part of the fourth tranche for 1982, will be on two separate routes: the section of the Douai-Valenciennes link, which is under survey, and the section of the Maubeuge-Jumont link, which is under construction. Community aid amounts exactly to 1 199 100 French francs, which corresponds to 30 % of the total for surveys and construction authorized for the 1982 programme.

Mr Donnez (L). — (FR) I should like to thank the Commissioner for the details that he has given. This is all very recent news. Hitherto we have never been able to obtain such details, quite simply because our respective Governments — and I intend no specific criticism of my Government, since it has treated this matter in exactly the same way as its predecessor — have refused to disclose any information on this subject and we have not been allowed to know what was being done and how much it was costing. We now have this information, and I give notice to the Commission now that I have at least a couple of dozen similar questions that I will gladly put to it in order to get all the information I need.

President. — Mr Giolitti, I do not think there is any call for a reply here.

Since the authors are absent, Questions Nos 45 and 46 will be answered in writing^{2,3}

Question No 47, by Mr Habsburg (H-120/83):

Does the Commission agree that, in view of the increasing suppression of the Catholic Church and the obvious anti-democratic development of the Sandinist regime in Nicaragua, it should state clearly that there can be no further discussion of aid to the country until such time as the Nicaraguan Government ceases its intimidation and victimization of the Church and gives an undertaking that it will establish pluralist democracy in the country within a specified time?

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DE) Very generally, it can be said of Nicaragua, as of other countries throughout the world with which the Community has relations, that the Community has a moral and political duty to use what influence it has to ensure the observance or restoration of democratic principles and democratic conditions. We are following developments in Nicaragua closely and with concern.

As regards the humanitarian aid granted by the Community, I would point out, reiterating what we have frequently said, that our humanitarian aid is guided by criteria of objective need. Political differences should not, in our opinion, be settled at the expense of the people who are in need. It is crucially important to ensure that the Community's aid actually reaches those in need, and then we will provide this aid. Some of it is granted through international non-governmental organizations. According to the information available to the Commission, Nicaragua, like other countries in Central America, satisfies the condition that the aid must reach the people for whom it is intended.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — (DE) Mr Commissioner, can I conclude from your statement that none of the programmes being implemented in Nicaragua at present are non-humanitarian, that they are all humanitarian programmes? As the régime in Nicaragua can be accused of a kind of racism and religious persecution, which not only affects the Catholic Church: the Jews are being persecuted just as inhumanly, and the synagogue in Managua was recently raided and is now used for another purpose, is it still right to treat a country of this kind as a civilized country?

Mr Haferkamp. — (DE) The conditions the honourable Member has mentioned are undoubtedly helping to increase the distress and suffering of the people. I believe this is all the more reason to grant the humanitarian aid which we provide through international organizations.

President. — Question No 48, by Mrs Lizin (H-133/83):

Can the Commission state whether France intends to comply with the new procedure laid down in Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty in the case of the construction of the Nuclear power station at Chooz?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The new recommendation adopted by the Commission on 3 February 1982 concerning the application of Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty provides for a dual procedure with regard to nuclear power stations and nuclear fuel reprocessing facilities: first, a provisional communication to the Commission before the national authorities issue a building permit, and second, a final communication at least six months before the entry into circulation of radioactive substances begins.

^{1,2,3} See Annex II.

Narjes

The building permit for Units B1 and B2 of the Chooz nuclear power station was issued on 22 January 1982 and thus before the new recommendation had been published and entered into force. However, representatives of the French Government and the Commission meeting on 7 June 1982 to discuss the details of the implementation of the new recommendation agreed that the new procedure should be applied to the Chooz nuclear power station since it is located near a frontier.

On 4 February of this year the Commission informed the French Government by letter that it had still not received the communication and requested that it be forwarded as soon as possible. To date the Commission has not received an answer to this letter. The French Government has so far always abided by the recommendations made pursuant to Article 37. The Commission therefore expects to receive the provisional communication regarding Units B1 and B2 shortly. The Commission also expects to receive a communication on units which are to be installed at the same site in the future and for which a building permit has not yet been issued. As this is no more than a recommendation, the French authorities are not obliged to observe it. Nonetheless, the Commission will use all the influence it has to bring about an improvement in cooperation in this difficult area.

Mrs Lizin (S). — (FR) I should like to thank the Commissioner for his detailed reply. It is worth making the point that such replies are rare. I should like to ask him whether the Commission intends to take steps to get the proposal for a regulation on a consultation procedure concerning the location of power stations in the vicinity of Member States' borders taken up again in the Permanent Representatives Committee?

Mr Narjes. — (DE) The Commission intends to take this question as a pretext for reminding the French authorities once again that they still owe us a reply. Depending on future developments, it will decide whether and in what form it would be worthwhile reconsidering the question of a regulation. We have not at any rate lost sight of this objective.

President. — Question No 49, by Mr Purvis (H-135/83):

As of this date (April 1983) the 1981 Analytical Tables of Foreign Trade have not yet been published by the Commission.

What steps are being taken to publish this important information more expeditiously in the future?

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — Because of the civil service strike which took place from March to August 1981, the United Kingdom was late in transmitting its external trade statistics. This delayed publication of the analytical tables of foreign

trade until April/May 1983. The 1982 results were transmitted by all Member States within the given period and consequently the 1982 figures have been available on line and in the monthly bulletin since mid-April of this year. The *microfiches* are currently being distributed and the statistics will be published in the near future.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Thank you, Mr Commissioner, especially for that explanation which I hope will be published widely in Britain and satisfy all those constituents who are constantly blaming me and you for not having these reports out in time. Since, I am afraid, in 10 countries we are almost certainly bound to be having civil service strikes of one sort or another — printing strikes, whatever — could the Commission perhaps find a way of getting around this by using estimating methods so that these figures and statistics can be actually useful to people? Really, two years later, it is neolithic and very unlikely to be of any great use to people assessing their trade potential when making plans in their businesses.

Mr Narjes. — (DE) The Commission also regrets the economic and political disadvantages caused by the absence of up-to-date statistics and similar material. Hearing your question, I ask myself whether the increased use of data processing would not ensure the flow of these data without our having to depend on the cooperation of striking civil servants. I would point out that the *document unique* we are now working on will be suitable for use on computers from the time of its introduction, which means that from then on it will be possible for data banks to be accessed from a central point and up-to-date statistics will be available.

President. — At the request of Mr Enright, Question No 50 will be held over until the July part-session.

Since the author is absent, Question No 51 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 52, by Mr Fruh (H-145/83):

Having read an article entitled 'Radical reform of the common agricultural policy' in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung of 4 May 1983, we should like to ask the Commission:

Is it standard practice in the Commission for a single Member of the Commission — and then not even the Commissioner with special responsibilities for agriculture — to put forward a programme for reforming the CAP, and can national interests — only thinly disguised and without the agreement of the Commission as a body or at least of the Commissioner with special responsibility for agriculture having been secured — be published as a programme for reforming the CAP?

¹ See Annex II.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) The Commission does not normally comment on its internal proceedings, nor will it comment on the documents being put forward on the subject of agriculture. As in every other field, the Commission takes its decisions in this respect too according to the rules normally applicable.

Mr Früh (PPE). — (DE) In view of the extreme brevity of your reply, Mr Commissioner, may I put a supplementary question. Is this principle not contravened when major newspapers publish articles on programmes announced by a Member of the Commission for the fundamental reform of the agricultural policy? Is it not also the case, however, that, as you heard just now, the intention is to fight unemployment at the expense of the agricultural policy? I see here that the regional policy could be financed from agricultural policy resources. Is it not the case, Mr Commissioner, that this unpleasant discussion is resulting in the gross misrepresentation of the great effort made by the Commission and its President to create a new financing facility and that many people, including the general public, believe that we could finance everything in the Community — accession and everything else — if only we could divide up this dreadful agricultural policy? Is it not then the Commission's duty to take a clear stand on this misrepresentation of the situation?

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) The supplementary question was not really very clearly worded. But I will say that the comments which have appeared in certain newspapers as far as we know do not emanate from the Commission but are based on leaks from Commission papers for which no Commissioner has taken responsibility, as far as I am aware. We have noted that there have been leaks from the Commission's internal documents in this field too, which we deplore. On the other hand, I would say that the Commission is entitled and perhaps even has a duty to discuss any question of importance to the Community, including agricultural policy. Since the Commission is a collegial body, however, each Commissioner has a responsibility for the agricultural policy, not just one Commissioner. Other Members of the Commission therefore also take this responsibility seriously and take an interest in the development of the agricultural policy. With regard to the economic consequences of this discussion, the Honourable Member is no doubt aware that many discussions of a long-term nature are in progress on the economic future of the Community, and many different elements are involved in these discussions, including of course the agricultural policy because, as you know, the CAP absorbs a considerable proportion of the Community's total budget.

I do not think I can get any closer than that in answering the questions put by Mr Früh.

President. — Question No 53, by Mr Rogalla (H-143/83):

How does the Commission assess the need to supplement the administrative committee procedure in the various sectors so that either representatives of the nations concerned or Members of the European Parliament are given the opportunity to participate in the consultations on an institutionalized basis, and what preparatory work has the Commission undertaken to date?

Mr Thorn, President of the Commission. — (FR) Community legislation makes provision for use of the 'management committee procedure' for the exercise of management responsibilities, which lie, by definition, with the executive. The role of a parliament, on the other hand, is to exercise legislative powers and, *ipso facto*, powers of control.

Granted, in the case of the European Parliament, this role — which you will say is too heavily restricted by the Treaties — has not yet developed to the extent that this high Assembly would like to see, in which aspiration it has the Commission's support. However, we do not consider that this situation warrants any attempt on the part of Parliament to involve itself in tasks which are by definition outside the terms of reference of an institution such as itself. The Commission is convinced that this position is in line with the best interests not only of Parliament itself but of the Community as a whole.

As regards participation by representatives of interested circles, the Commission, which misses no opportunity to surround itself with expert opinion whenever this seems necessary, holds the view that considerations of principle preclude such participation in the proceedings of management committees, this for practical reasons which should be all too clear. It seems out of the question that the people who are going to be bound by the decisions to be taken should have a direct hand in framing them.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) I should like to thank President Thorn for the clear way in which he has broken down his answer: first, participation by Parliament, second, participation by the public. The aim is to make the Commission responsible for more of the tasks now incumbent on administrations and governments. My question, which follows on from the answer just given, is based on the assumption that the activities of these administrative committees are confined to contacts and discussions among the officials concerned in each case, the specialists in other words, and that the idea of involving either the representatives of the public or the representatives of the sectors with an interest is designed to bring about European cooperation more quickly. I therefore want to ask the President of the Commission whether

Rogalla

further thought might not be given to supplementing this administrative committee procedure so that the sectors concerned can give appropriate advice and, in addition to the experience and knowledge of the specialists, appropriate pressure can be brought to bear.

Mr Thorn. — (*FR*) The Commission has already had the opportunity — I believe that it was on 20 May last, during the debate on the Collins report on measures to be taken against atmospheric pollution by motor vehicles — to inform the House why it is not in favour of bringing Parliament into the procedures laid down for adjustment to technical progress.

I therefore refer you to the statement made on this matter by my colleague Mr Narjes, but I should like to assure Mr Rogalla that the Commission intends to take all necessary steps to keep Parliament informed on this subject and to maintain the closest possible contact with Honourable Members.

Mr Purvis (ED). — The Commission has a good point when it says that Parliament should not be involved in the management of these programmes. But in fact what they are doing is bringing in representatives of the Member States, so effectively permitting the Council of Ministers or the Member States to have a major say in the management of research projects and all the various other things that are involved.

Surely the President of the Commission would agree that it is the Commission that is wholly responsible for implementing these projects and cannot in any way abdicate its responsibility to these management committees alias the Council of Ministers?

Mr Thorn. — (*FR*) I accept that the Honourable Member is right. However, the Commission is prepared to assume this responsibility to this extent, on the basis of powers delegated by the Council.

President. — In the absence of its author Question No 54 will be answered in writing¹.

Question No 55, by Mrs Nielsen (H-145/83):

What does the Commission intend to do to bring pigmeat prices into line with the basic price laid down by the Council, and will it confirm that the grain price policy, which entails lower price increases for grain than for animal products, benefits large-scale farming to the detriment of family farms?

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (*DA*) The Commission has undertaken, as an element in the management of the pigmeat market, to ensure that the effective market prices follow the rise in the

basis price. Since the development in the market price for pigmeat depends on a number of factors, which the Commission is only partially able to influence, no guarantee can be given that the market price will be closely in line with the basis price every time. At present the situation on the market in pigmeat is strongly influenced by seasonal, cyclical and general economic factors, which have resulted in a surplus and in unsatisfactory producer prices. The Commission has applied special measures to support the market by pigmeat market regulations providing support for private storage and higher refunds, and these measures have had a certain stabilizing effect on the Community market in pigmeat. It will be remembered that the basis price is fixed with reference to the sluice-gate price and the levy on pigmeat, based on the threshold prices for grain. The supply situation in cereals, however, has resulted in a price level on Community markets which is substantially lower than the threshold level, especially where barley is concerned, and this situation is due to the development of cereal growing in the Community. These circumstances may also explain why grain prices have risen less sharply than pigmeat prices.

The Commission does not however agree that the price policy in the cereals sector, with lower price rises than those for animal products, has given the large undertakings an advantage over the family holdings, which are usually geared to stock rearing and not to large-scale grain cultivation. I might add, Mr President, that in a single Member State, which is normally a large exporter of pigmeat from the Community, there have been two outbreaks of foot and mouth disease, which have seriously affected these exports and have thus contributed to a surplus of pigmeat on Community markets. This has also contributed to the unsatisfactory situation which certainly exists at the present time.

Mrs Tove Nielsen (L). — (*DA*) I should like to thank the Commissioner for his answer and to agree with him that it has of course been extremely unfortunate for us that we have actually had two outbreaks of foot and mouth disease in Denmark, and these occurrences have had deplorable consequences. But I do not now believe that this is the sole cause of the situation we are in, and I also do not agree that we are not favouring the large undertakings at the expense of the family holdings. I should like to ask the Commissioner if it would not be an idea — with the knowledge he has of Denmark — to try and examine the conditions to which an efficient family holding is subject in these times. I am sure that the Commission will find that in point of fact there are a few things to straighten out. And — something which exacerbates things even further — is it really fair that farmers in Denmark should only get 70 % of the agreed basis price? Is it any wonder that the Danish farmers say: if the Council has adopted a basis price, why should we only get 70 %? We cannot accept it!

¹ See Annex II.

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) I am not sure that 70 % is the correct figure. I think it is a little higher, but I have not got the details to hand. I must say however that, if it is low in Denmark, it is even lower at present in other Member States, and I certainly did not say in my answer that foot and mouth disease alone was responsible for the unsatisfactory situation. It was actually a subsidiary element in my answer. It has contributed to the unsatisfactory situation along with other factors which are currently making their influence felt. With regard to the economic situation facing agriculture in Denmark, the latest information we have been able to supply to Parliament and the Council is that Danish farmers in 1982 had far and away the highest rise in incomes of all farmers in the Community, and that is of course highly satisfactory for Denmark. We have had a few years of very great difficulty, both for Denmark and for all the other Member States but, fortunately and thank heaven, it looks as though the turning point was reached in 1982. That's what we all hope.

Mr Beazley (ED). — I heard the Commissioner say that he had no intention of changing the grain price policy. I would like to ask why. Certainly in my country and my constituency pigmeat is the cheapest of all meats. One of the major reasons for the problem is the price of grain. Here we are importing foreign foodstuffs and we are having to get rid of our surplus grain at very low prices to Third World countries. Why does he intend not to change the grain price policy in order to help the pig farmers?

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) I am not absolutely sure what part of the Community the Honourable Member comes from, but we have put forward a policy to change the cereals situation. It is the Commission's intention to propose in the coming years that the Community cereals price should be more closely in line with the price our competitors get on the world market. Also in the price settlement concluded this year, we provided for a much lower increase in the price of grain than in that of, for example, animal products.

Mr Maher (L). — It would be extremely useful if the Commission could give precise information about the actual farmgate price received by farmers as distinct from the general level of price. These are not necessarily the same thing. When will it be possible for the Commission to provide such information, which would, I think, be useful but also revealing?

Mr Dalsager. — (DA) These details are fully accessible to every Member of Parliament, since they are regularly supplied to Parliament. If Mr Maher is in any doubt as to the current percentage of the basis price, for example for pigmeat, I can phone Brussels and inquire, for we collect these data at regular intervals, and we pass them on. Thus there are no secrets here. Anyone can find out what the price level is.

President. — Question time is closed.¹

I thank Mr Dalsager and all the Members of the Commission for the answers they have given.

7. *Agricultural incomes (continuation)*

President. — The next item is the continuation of a debate on a report by Mr Maher (Doc. 1-1327/82).

Mr Davern (DEP). — Mr President, first of all I would like to congratulate Mr Maher on his interim report and agree with his conclusions that farm incomes and inflation go hand in hand, the one rising as the other falls.

In all of this we are tempted to question whether the CAP needs restoring. Indeed, we only have to look at the very central issue of farmers' earnings. Many in my own country, who are outside agriculture, still seem mesmerized by the undoubted increase in farm incomes that came immediately after we joined the European Community. Those increases were real and very large. Just as real is the fact that in 1982 farm incomes did rise at a rate that was higher than inflation for that year. However, these are, of course, isolated facts and they take on a very different complexion when we see the whole picture. The whole picture includes the fact that last season was the first time in three years that farm incomes did keep pace with inflation. It includes the fact that, even allowing for last year's improvement, farm incomes are now more than a third lower in real money than they were five years ago. But the most revealing fact of all is that farm incomes are now more than a fifth lower, after inflation, than when the country joined the European Community.

This fall in farm incomes is a serious matter for every country in the Community. For Ireland it is nothing short of catastrophic. Right across this Community we find one farmer leaving the land every minute. How then can we say, that inflation has nothing to do with farmers' incomes? Surely those farming in isolation, farming in separate units, as is so often the case, are harder hit by inflation than many other collective bodies who can benefit by bulk buying and so on. Because agriculture is such a large part of our economy, larger than in the case of any of our partners with the exception of Greece, the fortunes of agriculture effectively decide the fortunes of the country as a whole. That is something that seems to be largely forgotten in the present economic recession. Even more important, it is something that is not reflected in present government policy. The withdrawal of the farm modernization scheme, which I raised with the Commissioner, was part of that policy. If someone is to do the work, the rate of inflation has to be taken into account. This is unfortunately not the case as far as Irish farmers are concerned, because of the policy being pursued by academics and others working in that area.

¹ See Annex II.

Davern

I would urge support for Mr Provan's amendment. Mr Provan is customarily not very favourably inclined towards the farming communities of smaller countries and towards smaller farming units. However, even he has tabled an amendment to the effect that farm incomes should be geared to those of smaller countries that have higher inflation and do not have the economic wealth of the industrial nations but are largely influenced by the circumstances in which the nation was built up. Anything else would mean the death of many rural areas throughout this Community, a great cultural loss, the loss of a great tradition and, I believe, the loss of a great basis on which this Community could build its future.

IN THE CHAIR : MR LALOR

Vice-President

Mr Pasmazoglou (NI). — (GR) Mr President, I warmly support the report by our colleague Mr Maher, and stress its importance for a number of countries including my own.

The basic fact is that inflation undermines agricultural incomes, and I do not think that the information issued from time to time by the Commission is accurate. Not only does it fail to reflect the time situation, but it creates problems of particular severity for certain products. In stressing the importance of the report we are debating, I would therefore like to make the following comments :

Firstly, there has to be special treatment for those countries in which the problem of agricultural incomes is particularly acute, and these certainly include Ireland, Southern Italy, certain parts of France and my own country.

Secondly, the Commission should look into the inequality of agricultural incomes within each country. Otherwise, generalizations can lead to misleading conclusions.

Thirdly Mr President, it is essential to institute some special system for small producers. We have proposed this repeatedly. Mr President, I would say that the Community should work out and as soon as possible put into operation a system of minimum agricultural incomes. It is hardly necessary to stress that such a system of minimum agricultural incomes is of tremendous economic and socio-political importance for our countries and for the image of the European Community as an entity committed to a just social balance.

Mr Gautier (S). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to make a few comments on Mr Maher's report, because I do not agree with all the conclusions it draws.

If we are going to talk about inflation and farm incomes, the first thing we must surely do is agree on how we are to measure inflation and how this affects incomes in agriculture. The indicators used in the Member States of the Community and by the Community itself are based on a hypothetical shopping basket. The increase in the prices of the items in this shopping basket is taken to be the rate of inflation in the Community. In general, this is undoubtedly the right way to do it, but this concept of inflation need not necessarily apply to agriculture, since inflation may well have a positive effect on agricultural producer prices here and there, while input costs in agriculture do not correlate closely with the general rate of inflation.

We have had some experience of this in recent years. While we in the European Community, for example, have had inflation averaging 10 %, the rise in the prices of energy and fertilizers, major cost factors in agriculture, has been far less steep. Farmers are therefore less interested, I believe, in the general rate of inflation than in the relationship between input costs and producer prices and thus in incomes.

Secondly, I agree with the report that the indicators the Community uses at present are not satisfactory. The sectoral incomes index now used certainly does not comply with the desire of the members of the Committee on Agriculture and of Parliament for detailed information on incomes in the many sectors of agriculture. I therefore strongly endorse the call for the systematic extension of the agricultural accounting information network within the Community and for its application in all the Member States. The member States should then logically be prepared to meet the costs involved. Only then will we have reasonable data on actual incomes in agriculture, broken down by size of holdings and by the manner in which they are managed.

The third point I should like to raise concerns monetary policy. Mr Maher calls for the immediate abolition of the monetary compensatory amounts. In principle, we very much sympathize with this demand, but the foundations must first be laid to permit the abolition of monetary compensatory amounts. It certainly cannot be done by forcing the Member States together with the aid of the European Monetary System while they are all pursuing different economic policies and so have different rates of inflation. In this situation there must logically be monetary compensatory amounts if we are to have an agricultural policy which guarantees incomes by means of the prices charged. I am opposed to price-based incomes. In my opinion, prices should have a market function, but as you, Mr Maher, and your side of the House are always in favour of price policy to support incomes, you must, I feel, accept that this logically entails monetary compensatory amounts.

Gautier

The last point I should like to raise concerns the various subsidies referred to here. I am opposed to farm subsidies on principle. They will be a drain on our resources, especially if we leave paragraph 9 (d) as it is. I believe that, if we want to create something positive, we should tackle the sector systematically with our own structural policy by improving the structural foundations in such a way that the operating costs of agricultural holdings are reduced, thus improving the incomes situation and eventually bringing down inflation. Certain interest programmes are also involved here.

Mr Clinton (PPE). — I personally regret very much that there seems to be a deliberate attempt on the part of some people to try and detract from the value of this report by describing it merely as an interim report on a subject that needs much greater research, much greater depth of study and discussion. This report, in my view, cannot be pushed aside or dismissed in this manner. It is a serious attempt to describe the very great hardships being suffered by farmers in high-inflation regions of the Community. It is clearly saying to the Commission and Council that there is a serious problem here that will not go away unless the necessary measures are taken to deal with it. This Parliament and the Community institutions generally are now seen by the people of Europe as places where we all talk too much and at the end of the talking take too little action to overcome problems. We cannot go on like this. Rome is burning all the time; people are suffering all the time and this position is progressively getting worse.

I am not attempting to lay all the blame on the Community and totally exonerate the Member States concerned. This would be wrong and very foolish indeed. But we pride ourselves on having a common agricultural policy which implies similar opportunities and rewards for farmers throughout the Community. It is now abundantly clear that the system as it is now operating does not give this result and every effort should be made to change this. It is now generally accepted that the Commission's first effort to report and make recommendations has been inadequate, to say the least. The methodology used is regarded as being inappropriate for the assessment of farm incomes in all regions for all lines of production and in very varied circumstances.

It has been pointed out by economists that their assessments only cover the period up to 1981. But a very different picture has since emerged which provides evidence to show that a much more serious problem now exists. This is particularly so since the establishment of the EMS. The Commission's own figures giving real per capita net value added at factor cost in agriculture taking 1978 equals 100 showed Denmark in 1982 increased to 118,2, the Netherlands and Belgium 113,2 and 113,7 respectively, Greece at

110,1 the UK at 101,2 and Ireland back at 65,9. These are the Commission's own figures. This obviously demonstrates the divergent trend in farm incomes since the advent of the EMS and, of course, it is particularly so in the case of Ireland because such a large percentage of our total exports go to the UK and the UK has not joined the EMS.

Some high-inflation countries have tried to overcome their problems by frequent devaluations of their currencies. But this, of course, defeats the main purpose of the EMS, which is intended to give stability.

Prior to the EMS it was possible by green-rate adjustments to overcome at least the worst effects. But that has now gone and other measures are now clearly necessary. I disagree with those who say that the situation needs much more probing. In my view, we have all the information we need. These areas need help and they deserve help, particularly if they are prepared to accept the condition of following an economic programme designed to reduce inflation to acceptable levels. If we are prepared to do nothing, we should give up talking about convergence. This help can be given in many ways well known to the Commission. These special measures should in no way be regarded as even a partial substitute for the present price and market policies which are the main guarantors of farm incomes.

Mr Fernandez (COM). — (*FR*) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the impact of inflation may be felt differently from one sector of production or type of holding to another, but it certainly depresses agricultural incomes severely. Moreover, it is acknowledged that farmers are the main victims. The Council's recent decisions on agricultural prices justify these comments. Even though it has been possible to make some improvements on the original proposals, the increases granted are likely to be insufficient to cover the rises in production costs and the cost of living during 1983. The Commission could have gone some way towards remedying the situation by compensating milk producers and sheep and cattle farmers in particular for the losses that they have suffered as a result of the seven-week delay in the fixing of prices.

The Maher report discusses the important problem of monetary compensatory amounts, which are directly related to inflation and the different rates prevailing in the various countries. There is an urgent need for a thorough overhaul of the system of monetary compensatory amounts if our agriculture is to be cured of this cancer which is gradually destroying it by perpetuating intolerable distortions of competition. The Commission should lose no time in bringing before this House proposals for reform of compensatory amounts with a view to preventing their creation and phasing out those in existence. In the immediate term

Fernandez

it could remedy the most flagrant injustices by correcting the negative compensatory amounts, which are still substantial, whose effects will continue to penalize wine growers and farmers in France until the beginning of the next crop year.

I am in favour of the Maher report's proposal for greater differentiation in EAGGF financing. We support this and we shall not fail, during the debate on the future financing of the EEC, to press our demand for an adjustment of the balance in the EAGGF in favour of small and medium-sized farmers, by means in particular of a special levy on milk processing plants, improvement of the arrangements concerning Mediterranean products, and restrictions on derogations from Community preference. We are broadly in agreement with Mr Maher's analysis and the approach that he has adopted, Mr President, and we shall therefore be voting in favour of his report.

Mrs Spaak (NI). — *(FR)* Mr President, I congratulate Mr Maher on his report and particularly approve his insistence that the Commission should henceforth avoid relying on excessively general measures which fail to take account of regional disparities.

Instead of considering all the agricultural land in a country as a homogeneous area, the Commission should gather in all the relevant data and ensure that programmes are applied on a regional basis. The Commission should no longer allow certain Governments to continue to consider the whole of their national territory as the geographical area for application of EAGGF programmes, so that they can distribute funding as they see fit.

In Belgium, for instance, although the average income in certain rural areas has risen, the relative level has remained low and the gap between the Flemish and Walloon regions is continuing to widen. Wallonia's dependence on Flanders is in fact such that, taking the common agricultural policy as a whole, the surplus generated by Walloon agricultural production is collected by Flanders. Wallonia now contributes only 24 % of Belgium's total agricultural production, although it has 55 % of the farming land.

These figures say a great deal, more than any speech could. This situation arises not only because Wallonia uses extensive farming methods, but mainly because Wallonia's raw materials are processed and marketed in Flanders, where three-quarters of the agri-foodstuffs industry is located.

This specific structural defect therefore calls for a specific approach on the part of the Community and national authorities.

Flanders receives over 85 % of the Community support for investment programmes and sector programmes. It receives 80 % of the finance from the Guarantee Section of the EAGGF. Similarly, Flemish agri-foodstuffs companies have so far taken 72 % of

the funding from the Guidance Section of the EAGGF.

I am therefore arguing for a more strictly regional approach according to which the necessary technical and financial structures could be set up in all Europe's regions.

I am also arguing that Community aid should be directed to the farmers themselves, who at present receive only 20 %. The main beneficiaries of the agricultural policy currently are the intermediaries. If the EAGGF financing in 1979, for instance, had gone direct to the farmer, each farmer in Wallonia would have benefited by almost 400 000 Belgian francs, since the products which receive substantial support are typically Walloon. But 80 % of the intermediaries are established in the Flemish region.

Another set of figures provides further illustration of this disparity between Flanders and Wallonia: 14 men working 100 hectares of farm land in Flanders make a higher average income than 6 men working 100 hectares in Wallonia.

The whole policy on income support therefore needs to be reviewed if we are to manage one day to meet our obligations under Article 2 of the Treaty.

Mr Vgenopoulos (S). — *(GR)* Mr President, it is evident that in its study of agricultural incomes, and using the average sectorial index of incomes, the Commission is trying to measure incommensurables while taking no account of the different structures of the agricultural economies in the various Member States. Thus, using a single index which is cumulative, in other words which includes both large and small enterprises, full and partial employment, intensive and extensible cultivation, it is trying to survey the changes occurring in the incomes of all the enterprises in all the Member States.

It is quite certain that the result emerging from this analysis does not reflect the harsh reality faced by the Community's farmers in countries where inflation is high. Thus, I cannot accept the Commission's conclusion that high inflation rates — i.e. those above the average, as for example in Greece, Ireland and Italy — do not entail low, i.e. below-average rates of increase in real agricultural incomes.

What is mainly of interest to us is not the income of the agricultural sector, but that of the farmer himself. A graphical representation of the development of agricultural incomes in relation to that of the overall income, for each Member State, again yields inadequate conclusions since it is not supported by absolute values. More information must become available concerning inequalities of income at a regional level, both within each State itself and between one Member State and the next, and what must be quoted is the absolute magnitudes of the agricultural incomes and not just their developments.

Vgenopoulos

Thus, to maintain that in the case of Greece the gap between agricultural and other incomes is narrowing is to say nothing since the agricultural income continues to fluctuate at around 50 % of the country's average income and around 45 to 50 % of the average agricultural income for the Community.

In Greece the marked inequality in the distribution of incomes to the disfavour of the agricultural sector has been condemned as unacceptable at a political level and the political will has been expressed for a redistribution in favour of the farmers.

The main problem is centred around certain specific organizational inequalities which impede the dynamic development of the agricultural sector and which, because of the high annual rate of inflation, reduce its competitiveness. The report by our colleague Mr Maher highlights the fallacies in the Commission's analysis and finds us entirely in agreement with the measures proposed for combating the increasing inequality between the incomes of farmers in various countries in the Community.

The special organizational interventions proposed to help smaller producers to improve their productivity, for example the adoption of support for incomes as a permanent measure, direct subsidy of contributions in relation to the level of inflation, reduction of the cost of borrowing for investment purposes etc., are in our view essential measures for securing their incomes and, moreover, do not conflict with the basic principles of the CAP, in other words the principles of a common market and a common price.

Mr Helms (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the debate shows how important the question we are discussing is. I also believe that we must act, even though this is not primarily the responsibility of the Community's institutions at present. Like the rapporteur, Mr Maher, and many of the previous speakers, I feel, however, that Parliament should give priority to this question. I believe there must be a serious discussion of the various rates of inflation and the effect they have on incomes in agriculture and that, after the appropriate committees have considered the matter carefully, we must formulate and adopt conclusions and propositions which enable the situation to be remedied and make it clear that it is the absence of convergence of economic and monetary policies in the Community and the fact that, despite the many vows and constant declarations of intent in the Council, there is no common economic and monetary policy, that are a threat to the common agricultural policy.

My esteemed colleague Mr Lücker, who has been a Member of the Parliamentary Assembly and of Parliament from the very beginnings in 1953, has said within our group that the European Parliament has hitherto always refused to discuss this question because the national governments bear sole responsi-

bility for this area and only they are able to influence currencies and thus inflation through the budgetary, financial and economic policies they pursue. The European Parliament has strongly urged the Council to take action on several occasions and appealed to it to do something. Nothing has been done.

This interim report by Mr Maher was to have been considered together with the Mouchel report on the 1983/84 price decisions in March. It was discussed by the committee in a considerable hurry in February. No account at all was taken of the findings of a hearing of experts held on 16 February. At this hearing the Commission's statistical calculations and methods were described by many of the experts present as completely inadequate. Without any further discussion in the Committee on Agriculture, without any evaluation of the many useful pieces of information emerging from the hearing of experts, the report was then adopted on 25 February because time was short. The report consequently has its inconsistencies and defects. No mention at all is made of important aspects of this complex and difficult process, and I am grateful to the rapporteur, Mr Maher, for saying so here in the House.

The documents submitted by the Commission similarly fail to mention the various investigations made in this matter. I have therefore tabled an amendment...

(The President requested the speaker to conclude.)

Mr President, I must ask you to allow me to comment on this, because it changes the background to the debate. I believe that progress can only be made if there is a serious, in-depth debate on this question which enables us to submit credible propositions and proposals and resolutions in a final report in the autumn. I do not want to hold things up. On the contrary, I simply want a thorough debate.

I have made my objections known. I therefore propose that you delete the last sentence of paragraph 10. You agreed to this. I would appreciate an explanation. I am then prepared to withdraw my amendment, which seeks to replace the whole of the motion for a resolution. I believe that would be a magnificent compromise. I would regard the motion for a resolution thus amended as a basis for our debate in the autumn. I call on the members of the Committee on Agriculture to ensure that we are able to consider and adopt this report in committee in a correct and reasonable manner.

Mr Treacy (S). — Mr President, this is a profoundly important report. It exposes the fallacy that the common agricultural policy brings benefits to all farmers. It does not. It is surely elementary that a price increase common to all producers must have a varying impact throughout the Community because of different inflation rates in the Member States. A common price system only makes economic sense if

Treacy

there is a common rate of inflation. However, we all know that some countries have suffered for some years now from high inflation. Consequently, their farmers have seen relatively generous price increases eaten up by spiralling costs of their inputs. In fact, in the case of Ireland farmers have suffered a severe drop in real incomes, simply because the CAP is not designed to take account of the special problems of high inflation countries.

This is the central point of the Maher report, which I support and commend. In doing so I greatly regret that the Commission in its document of March 1982 on this problem chose to deny that countries like Ireland were actually losing income because of high domestic inflation. This is a fallacy. I trust that Parliament will redress this injustice by supporting this report and, in particular, the special compensation measures set out in paragraph 9. But I would go further. I would ask for a substantial increase in the EAGGF grants to help low-income farmers, structural aids in certain sectors such as milk, relief from the co-responsibility levy especially in the disadvantaged areas and increases in the calf premium scheme. If these and other measures are not immediately taken, then Irish agriculture will continue to lose income, the Irish economy will slump deeper into depression and this Community will have failed to show real solidarity with my country.

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE). — (GR) Mr President, Colleagues, I support the excellent report by Mr Maher because he has given detailed consideration to a complex problem of direct interest to millions of farmers in the European Community who depend for their living on agricultural and livestock production.

The European Parliament, which as a rule applies itself with great interest and goodwill to matters that concern farmers, must once again help to eliminate the grave inequalities observed between the incomes of farmers in different Member States due to increased production costs and the results of inflation, whose rate differs from one Member State to another. As an example I shall refer to my own country, Greece, which unfortunately has the highest annual inflation index within the Community. According to the Commission's estimate, this will fluctuate around the 23 % mark this year.

The real improvement of agricultural incomes is a matter of principle that cannot be ignored in any long-term, correct and fair economic policy. In Greece and in other countries that suffer from high inflation there is an inequality in the distribution of incomes, to the disfavour of the agricultural population. Besides, the agricultural sector is almost the only productive sector that remains labour-intensive, and is a factor that retains the workforce in agricultural occupations, at

least in the short term. For this reason it is of capital importance for a policy of full employment and discourages any thought of reducing agricultural incomes.

I would also like to remind you that according to a statement by the Prime Minister of Greece, unemployment in our country has risen above 10 %, i.e. it has almost trebled within two years. As soon as there is no doubt that the support and further improvement of agricultural incomes must be a prime target of any long term economic policy, the question arises: which measures would be likely to lead to the achievement of such a goal? The most convenient way of supporting agricultural incomes is to ensure a level of agricultural prices sufficiently high to cover the increased costs for each product, including inflation as well, and to leave a sensible margin of profit. This demand is advanced quite reasonably by the farmers themselves, who toil just as hard as, if not harder than other productive categories. However, their incomes are being eroded through no fault of their own.

Consequently, to help the farmers who face serious special problems because of the results of high inflation in countries such as Greece, Italy, Ireland, etc., I have the honour to propose:

Firstly, subsidies by the EEC for low interest rates for loans to farmers.

Secondly, subsidies for the means of production, such as fertilizers, machinery, plant medications, animal feeds and olive-gathering nets.

Thirdly, economic participation of the EAGGF in works of land improvement, storage and transport, etc., and

Fourthly, special measures for the support and improvement of the incomes of the smaller and more out-of-the-way agricultural enterprises.

Finally, Mr President, I hope that Parliament will adopt Mr Maher's excellent report because this would be a practical demonstration of their concern for farmers in the economically weakest countries.

Mr Tolman (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, I wish to underline the fact that Mr Maher's report is an interim report. I want in particular to take up the committee's conclusion that inflation has no effect on farmers' incomes. Mr President, I cannot yet go along with that. That is going too far for me.

I think that the hearing was a valuable part of the preparation for this debate, but we see, as often happens when leading experts from the various countries discuss such a difficult subject, that at the end of the hearing many questions still remain unanswered. We did widen our knowledge of the problems concerned and I would describe the talks as useful, but I would like to make this point to the rapporteur.

Tolman

I think he would agree with me that this question of the effect of inflation on farmers' incomes is on closer examination more complicated than we all had thought. I feel there are no clear-cut guidelines yet and I could well imagine us winding up this debate without a vote because it is an interim report; but that is not customary in this House, so we shall have to vote one way or the other.

A second point I would like to make, Mr President, is to issue a word of warning. Apart from the obvious fact that there are big differences in the inflation rates between the Member States, there are also major regional differences within the Member States themselves. But I stress that we do not intend to make inflation the primary and major scapegoat. And if we, looking at this report, ask for a series of measures, then I think it ought to be more in the framework of structural policy rather than from the point of view of inflation. And finally, Mr President, I do admit that there is a special problem with Ireland and the United Kingdom, which I fully understand, linked to the fact that Ireland is part of the EMS and the United Kingdom is not, which gives rise to problems of a special nature.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, Mr Maher's report on inflation and farm incomes is an interesting document. It deals with some very important questions which are all too often forgotten in our debates on agricultural policy. The central element in our policy is not how many cows there are in the fields or how much corn there is in public storage, but of course the standard of living afforded to the farming population. I should therefore like to thank the rapporteur for the work before us today. I should also like to express my sympathy to him, for two reasons: first I am sorry that the report was not debated during Parliament's March part-session in conjunction with agricultural prices. It would have been the right forum of debate. To discuss it now in June after the price decisions have been taken is a little late. I would remind Parliament that the detailed study to which Mr Maher refers was published by the Commission 15 months ago, and we might have wished that Parliament had reacted earlier than it has. Secondly, I should like to express my sympathy to Mr Maher because the question of inflation and incomes is not a particularly simple one to deal with. It is in fact extremely complex and technical. I think that the rapporteur realized this when he organized a public hearing with the participation of 20 economists from a number of countries. Many of them were in disagreement. It is quite common among economists, Mr President. Some of them even share the Commission's view, and that was perhaps not exactly what Mr Maher had expected.

I shall briefly set out the Commission's comments on Mr Maher's report. I hope Mr Maher will excuse me

when I say that he does the Commission's document of last year an injustice when he says that our main conclusion is that inflation has no effect on incomes. That would have been an absurd assertion, and nor is it the Commission's view. Our view is that farm incomes are ultimately a product of many factors, including input and output prices, productivity improvements and farm structures, and of course common prices and green exchange rates which are fixed under the common agricultural policy. Inflation plays a crucial role, but it is far from being the only factor. We do of course realize that difficulties can arise in the short and medium term, if a country has a high rate of inflation, does not devalue its currency and therefore becomes unable to achieve a further increase in farm prices. That is what we concluded last year in chapter 7 of the document on inflation and the common agricultural policy. In my opinion those were cautious and carefully thought-out conclusions, which we still stand by. What has happened since then? Yes, as Parliament knows, farm incomes rose sharply in 1982. There was an average increase of 9% at constant prices, which compensated for the drop in incomes in previous years. It was of course good news, and the farmers are now a little more confident. Let us hope that the bad weather we have been having in recent weeks does not set back the progress we have achieved.

If we look at the Community average however, we see that not all Member States have done as well. This applies especially to Ireland, where incomes only increased by 2,6% at constant prices, and to Italy where the increase was 1,4% at constant prices. It was not enough to offset the drop suffered in the preceding years by these countries, which are members of the European Monetary System.

But where inflation is above the average, it is clear that farm incomes have fallen at constant prices over the past three years. On the other hand, I would add that for Greece a 5,8% increase in farm incomes was noted last year and that the increase over the past three years has been approx. 20% at constant prices. I know that the level of incomes in Greece is low, but it is now increasing rapidly thanks to the common agricultural policy. Those are the facts.

What then is the Commission's answer to the problem of inflation and farm incomes? Once again I would remind Mr Maher that one of the most important things we did last year was to set about controlling inflation and reducing the differences between rates of inflation. This is not an easy task. It must be accomplished by the Member States and the Community together. It is the only way we can achieve a lasting improvement in economic conditions not only in agriculture but also in all the other sectors.

Dalsager

In the meantime the agricultural policy can help in three ways: Firstly, we can graduate the annual price decisions by means of adjustments to the green exchange rates. We did that in conjunction with the latest price decisions, in which the green rates were devalued for Italy, Ireland, Greece and France. And that of course means that the price increases in those countries are higher than the common price increases.

Secondly, we can apply special medium-term measures in favour of the countries concerned. We also did that in the recent price settlement, when special arrangements totalling 10 million ECU were applied to the Irish Republic and Northern Ireland, 60 million ECU to Italy and 12 million ECU to Greece. And let me finally draw Mr Maher's attention to the fact that this is of special concern to his country: there are many forms of special subsidy or special support for farmers in Ireland, from suckler beef and calving premiums, which are 100 % Community financed, to interest subsidies, which are financed partly by the Community and partly by the Irish Government. We could give quite an impressive list of measures.

Thirdly and most importantly, we can intensify our structural measures so as to help farmers in the disadvantaged areas. Here I should mention the proposed integrated programmes for the development of the Mediterranean regions, which were recently announced by the Commission. These constitute an ambitious endeavour to raise the entire infrastructure of the Mediterranean regions to a higher level. Then come the renewed and revised structural measures for agriculture, which we shall shortly be proposing, and I am convinced that these are the best means of assisting agriculture in the long term.

Mr President, I will conclude by once again thanking Mr Maher for his report. The Commission does not intend to revise the document it published last year, but we shall continue to improve the flow of information on farm incomes and to make use of the network for agricultural accounting information. Already this year, we have been able to make the information more detailed by introducing more income indicators, and the more detailed information thus obtained will be passed on to Parliament's Committee on Agriculture. Next year we shall take further steps. May I say, Mr President, that it was Mr Maher himself who said in the introduction to his report that the farmers are not to be blamed for the rate of inflation in the various countries, and that is of course correct in part. Mr Clinton also touched on the same question when he said that we have a common agricultural policy which does not solve these problems. It is true that the common agricultural policy cannot solve the problem of different inflation rates in the various countries for, while we have a common agricultural policy, we do not have a common economic policy under which a particular economic policy can be imposed on different countries which are Member States of the

Community. That is decided by the countries concerned themselves, and it is therefore the national governments and parliaments which have responsibility for the economic policy which is applied in the various Member States. This economic policy thus also affects the farmers through high inflation. But at the same time I must say that I do not regard the common agricultural policy as a suitable instrument for evening out the differences in economic trends and policies pursued in the various Member States. But we can of course endeavour by way of the common agricultural policy to give some special help to those areas which are particularly hard hit by inflation and, as you know and as I have already reported, we have done this over a number of years and again in conjunction with the last price settlement.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-224/83) by Mr Colleselli, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-65/83 — COM (83) 91 final) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72 on the common organization of the market in fruit and vegetables.

Also included in the debate is the Oral Question with debate (Doc. 1-187/83) by Mr Kyrkos and others to the Commission:

Subject: The problem of Greek dried grapes

On the accession of Greece to the Community, the Commission issued a regulation providing for the COM to be applied to Greek dried grapes. Although the Commission's action was seen as a considerable success for Greece, accession proved catastrophic for the Greek economy in this respect, because:

1. It was not accompanied by specific measures on the part of the Commission to mark Community preference in the dried grape market; as a result the European market is now flooded with dried grapes from Turkey, America and South Africa.
2. It was not accompanied by parallel measures to improve the conditions of production so as progressively to reduce production costs and to make Greek dried grapes competitive internationally.
3. No provision was made to subsidize the cost of transporting dried grapes from the southernmost corner of the Community to markets located in the centre of Europe — i.e. marketing premiums — and consequently last year's production, amounting to 100 000 tonnes, is now in storage and is likely to go for distillation. To this will probably be added this year's production, amounting to

President

between 70 and 80 thousand tonnes. Despite the Commission's view that it safeguards agricultural incomes, this state of affairs has had a catastrophic effect on the dried grape processing sector. Failure to market and process last year's production means that one thousand million drachmas worth of income has not been realized and thousands of workers in dried grape processing plants in the agricultural districts of Greece have remained without employment.

In view of the fact that, unless the Community takes prompt action, the same conditions are expected to prevail this year too in the dried grape sector, what measures does the Commission intend taking to put an end to these negative consequences of its non-integrated intervention in the Greek dried grape sector?

Mr Colleselli (PPE), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, with this motion for a resolution the Committee on Agriculture approves the amendments proposed by the Commission to the present system for calculating the reference price applied to fruit and vegetables, as laid down in Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72. The very date of this Regulation itself confirms the reason and the need for its amendment.

I will say straight away that the proposal is supported by the favourable opinion of the Committee on Budgets, which is attached to the report. I will simply give here a very brief summary of the reasons that induced our Committee to approve the proposal, by a large majority. As we know, fruit and vegetables cannot be imported into the EEC at a price lower than the reference price, otherwise countervailing charges are levied.

Under the new system now proposed, the annual adjustments to the reference price will take due account of increases in production costs in the Community, less a percentage corresponding to the growth in productivity, which is calculated by means of the table attached to this report. The amendment will not only improve, if only in part, Community preference for the products in question, but, in the interests of fairness and equality, it will tend to reduce the difference between the degree of protection accorded to production from the north of the Community and that given to Mediterranean products. The proposal is an improvement on the present system, especially as regards control of the application of countervailing charges and the blocking of imported produce, in cases where the reference price is not duly observed.

I cannot let pass the fact, Mr President, that many Members of the Commission or the Parliament have received a letter from the importers' confederation CIMO, addressed to me but given wide publicity,

which complains that this measure is critical of the importers — in particular where the explanatory statement is concerned — and stating — and this is not for me to judge — that Parliament's method of proceeding in this way is intolerable and scandalous. I don't believe a word of any of this! We should instead have welcomed a meeting at the proper time, before it was too late. And secondly, there is nothing offensive to anyone — individual importers or companies — in the report, even though it does make a reference to stricter, more up-to-date monitoring. I therefore think that this letter, which I have just briefly mentioned, was very out of place.

Two amendments have been made to my report: one, put forward by the rapporteur and approved by the Committee, asking for the date of application of the Regulation to be brought forward to the third day following its publication in the Official Journal of the European Communities, instead of waiting till 1 June 85, the expected date of admission of Spain and Portugal.

A second amendment proposed by Mr Provan emphasizes the need to establish commercial relations with third countries. We have already discussed that in committee, and no-one denies the desirability of continuing these relations, subject to the application of a few corrective measures. This in fact seems to me implicit in the motion for a resolution as a whole, and in the text of the Regulation itself. But if Mr Provan will permit me, I should like in this connection to express my concern as to the interpretation which that might give rise to since, if it were restrictive, it would seriously compromise the text and the very reasons for the proposed amendment.

I therefore consider that Mr Provan's amendment is by no means superfluous but might be dangerous, because of how it might subsequently be interpreted. I took the liberty of putting these considerations to Mr Provan, who received them courteously and objectively as always.

We know that the question of the market in fruit and vegetables neither starts nor ends here: it is debated very widely indeed, and is on the agenda for early discussion. The fact remains, however, that these amendments put forward by the Commission come at the right moment for improving the present system, on the basis of experience to date.

It should in fact be remembered that, in December 1982, the European Council instructed the Council of Agriculture Ministers to revise the rules on fruit and vegetables, by the end of March 1983. That is the reason why the proposal must be considered as soon as possible.

I hope I have summarized the essential points and reasons contained in this motion for a resolution, which I ask Parliament to adopt.

(Applause)

Mr Vgenopoulos (S) — (GR). Mr President, the protection of fruit and vegetable products in the Community is part of the problem of a more general safeguarding of Mediterranean products within the framework of the CAP. As has been said many times in this House, there is unequal treatment for Mediterranean and northern products. According to a statement by the Commission the total expenditure of the EAGGF — Guarantee Section in 1983 will be divided 22,5 % in favour of Mediterranean, and 75,5 % in favour of northern products. The latter are protected by the support price, which secures for them a minimum price level for each trading period. In contrast, Mediterranean products are dealt with by the complicated mechanism of reference prices, which also has to take account of the competition of imports of third countries. The Commission, with its proposal for the amendment of the basic Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72, is making an attempt to protect the Community's production against illegitimate competition from imports taking place even at dumping prices. We hope that the amendment of criteria proposed by the Commission in relation to the annual review of the reference prices will have a favourable impact on the application of the principle of Community preference, which is vitally important for Mediterranean products.

With this opportunity — I should like to refer to the oral question concerning the problem of Greek dried grapes, to which I am a cosignatory and which, wrongly, has been included in this debate. A large part of Greece's dried grape production remains in storage in Greece because the principle of Community preference was not respected. The Commission acted far too late, and after imports of Turkish and American dried grapes had taken place in various ways, and that, indeed, at dumping prices, with the result that the market is flooded. But this subject is to be debated on Friday and I shall not, therefore, go further into it at this time.

In conclusion, I would like to stress how important it is for the Community's fruit and vegetable products that the amended Regulation should be implemented as soon as it has been published, and not from 1 January 1985. This is because the problem already exists today as opposed to being about to arise following the forthcoming accession of Spain and Portugal. For this reason we are entirely in agreement with Mr Colleselli's motion for a resolution.

Mr Kalloyannis (PPE) — (GR). Mr President, the report by our colleague Mr Colleselli is particularly satisfactory, as indeed are all Mr Colleselli's reports on related matters. For this reason the European People's Party, and I personally, will support it.

Matters relating to the common organization of the market in the fruit and vegetables sector have repeatedly occupied the Community's organs and the European Parliament. This sector accounts for approximately 2 m agricultural workers within the European

Community, while these products are particularly sensitive from the standpoint of preservation and transport, especially from the Mediterranean regions where most of them are produced. Thus, everything that is done both to improve the incomes of the producers and to serve the interests of the consumers is welcome in principle and should be applauded. With these general thoughts, for a start I approve of the Commission's proposal and the relevant report on the amendment of Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72 to improve the existing system of reference prices that constitutes a protective measure applied to fruit and vegetables, as to other Mediterranean products.

Of course, I concur with the rapporteur's view that the Commission's proposal does not solve the problems connected with the mechanism governing the reference prices. It is of course well known that this price can be altered by certain clever importers who issue inaccurate invoices. Moreover, lack of flexibility in the procedure results in the fact that protective measures such as the application of compensatory duty or cessation of importing in cases when the reference price has not been conformed to, are instituted far too late, at a stage when imports from third countries at low prices have already created serious difficulties for the Community's producers.

A positive point in the proposed amendment of the Regulation is the provision that the reference price is to be automatically reviewed each year, being increased by a proportion related to the average increase in production costs after first subtracting a proportion corresponding to the increase in productivity.

Mr President, I also wish to point out that the case of Greek dried grapes is indeed, a good one and should have a greater influence on the Community's policy. There must be some intervention by the Community to protect this product, which is nowadays subject to special problems owing to the large surpluses and the admittedly poor implementation of the common policy by the Commission.

Mr Kyrkos (COM) — (GR). — Mr President, we shall support the Colleselli report and I am sorry that the very little time available to me does not allow me to comment further on it. I would like to refer more particularly to the problem of dried grapes, granted that the debate has included a question on this subject that we signed together with other colleagues. The dried grape producers in our country had expected, with our accession to the Community, to be relieved of the anxiety of how to dispose of their production. This was because dried grapes are not produced by any other European country and because they should have been covered by the principle of Community preference. This did not happen, and last year large quantities remained undisposed of, with disastrous consequences, while there were imports from third countries. The Commission is only now preparing to introduce the application of that principle.

Kyrkos

However, the proposed measure will only be effective if it is accompanied by strict control of the minimum prices of products from third countries, because we all recognize the unbelievable circumventions that are taking place by means of over-invoicing. At the same time, the determination of the reference price should take account of the real average costs as well as the burdens arising out of transport costs. And while we are on the subject of the new Regulation, I would propose that it should be extended to include apricots. Just a few days ago in fact, an acute problem arose in Greece in that sector. We oppose fixing the limit of production at 80 thousand tonnes. Statistics show that this limit cannot be an average yearly limit for a period of ten years, owing to the fluctuations caused by chance factors etc. Consequently, the imposition of a limit would reduce incomes in good years without increasing them in bad ones. It would also have bad psychological effects. Moreover, the new Regulation should not do away with the mechanism of interventions, at least during a transitional stage, until the other proposed mechanisms have been tried out.

Mr President, Greek dried grapes represent wealth not only for Greece but for the whole Community, a wealth that is peculiar in its uniqueness. The new Regulation will be an example of how we face the problems associated with Mediterranean products and I hope that the Commission will take note of the comments I have had the honour of addressing to you.

Mrs Pauwelyn (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, one of the cornerstones of the common agricultural policy is the protection of the Community production, which involves levying compensatory duties when products from third countries could normally be sold at lower prices than our own European products. It is indeed impossible to guarantee a reasonable income without protecting against such imports.

Protectionism is not a liberal option, but in order to safeguard our farmers' interests and to guarantee the fundamental principles of the common agricultural policy we support such a system of reference prices. It is necessary, of course, to ensure that the reference price is properly adjusted to the national annual rate of inflation and the development of production and corresponding costs; if it is not, the system of reference prices becomes indicative only, not protective and therefore superfluous. It is clear too that the market situation changes according to the product and that that must be taken into consideration when setting the reference prices. It is not surprising that it is particularly products from the southern EEC countries that benefit from the system of reference prices. The Mediterranean farmers suffer most from competition and inflation. The reference system must therefore be adjusted and brought up to date.

A second controversial point is undoubtedly the time at which the new formula should be put into force. The Commission proposes 1985, after the accession of Spain and Portugal. This proposal is unacceptable for the following reasons: firstly, any change in the present reference system must be a corrective mechanism of immediate benefit to European farmers.

Secondly, after the accession of Spain and Portugal this system should also apply to their production; so it will be dealt with on accession, but not beforehand. A protective system of updated reference prices would be pointless unless some benefit could be gained now over our greatest competitors from this procedure. Let us not forget that Spain and Portugal are the biggest exporters of many of these products. It is equally important to remember that the existing price reference system has no serious budgetary implications. This is an important point in view of the criticism of expenditure of the common agricultural policy.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the rapporteur was brief, to the point and correct in his analysis of the problem and proposed solution. We congratulate him. The Liberal group will also vote in favour of this report.

Mr Pasmazoglou (NI). — *(GR)* Mr President, the Commission's proposal for the amendment of the Regulation concerning the protection of fruit and vegetable products is a step in the right direction, and the European Parliament should approve it.

I should like to make three comments on this subject:

My first comment is that the number of fruit and vegetable products covered by the Community's protection should be increased, and the market organized accordingly. Many Mediterranean fruit and vegetable products and many other Greek products do not enjoy this protection, and I need hardly stress how important it is that they should acquire it.

My second comment concerns the calculation of the reference price. The changes proposed are in the right direction. However, I wish to stress that for a particular category of products the estimates made so far have not been accurate. Specifically, I refer to citrus products, whose reference price did not cover the cost of production, particularly in a country with high inflation like Greece.

My third comment is that for Greece there exists a special problem: as many colleagues are aware, the period of transition for two categories of products, peaches and tomatoes, lasts seven years. Consequently, we should take care that the new system and its immediate application will not restrict the Community's protection for these two categories, which are of especial importance for Greece.

Pesmazoglou

Mr. President, I would now like to refer to the matter of dried grapes: as my compatriot colleagues have also stressed, the dried grapes problem is very severe. However, I should like to emphasize the origin of this anomaly. Mr President, the anomaly arises because the importers contract for returns at the invoice price. However, with this system, as also by means of inaccurate invoices, the entire system of Community protection is undermined and in effect abolished. I would like to ask the Commissioner here present whether, as I hope, a sufficiently effective mechanism is envisaged for dealing with these circumventions that have occurred in recent years and that result in the elimination of Community protection for dried grapes.

Mr. President, I hope that the new system will secure Community protection for fruit and vegetable products, which are of particular importance to Mediterranean countries, including of course Greece, my own country.

Mrs Pery (S). — (FR) Mr President, my dear colleagues, the proposal before us represents a step forward, aiming as it does to safeguard production of 14 types of fruit and vegetables grown in Community countries more effectively against imports from third countries, thereby avoiding the gradual erosion of Community preference. The fact nevertheless remains that this market organization is a less satisfactory system than the level of protection afforded to Scandinavian crops. The European Parliament has repeatedly voted in favour of measures to afford better protection for crops produced in the southern regions of the Community, but various of these, notably the measures to strengthen the role of producers' organizations and extension of the rules to include sectors which have no organization, have not been adopted by the Council. I have to acknowledge that the executive Commission has made proposals along these lines, particularly when it proposed the extension of reference prices to eight new products, to which strawberries, garlic and early carrots should be added.

It is urgent that this new regulation be finalized and applied as soon as it is adopted by the Council, before the accession of Spain and Portugal to the EEC, so that its full effects can be felt. In the Community of Twelve, Spain will be producing 9 % of the potato crops, 12 % of the peaches, 15 % of the table grapes and 42 % of the citrus fruits. Hence the need to set up efficient organization of markets in the fruit and vegetable sector which, by avoiding a collapse in prices, will benefit all producers in the EEC and the enlarged Community when it comes.

But will these measures be sufficient to protect our fruit and vegetables? At its recent general meeting in Basle, the European Union for the Fruit and Vegetable Wholesale Trade expressed concern at the stagnation in consumption of these products and called upon the EEC to consider how best consumption of

them could be encouraged. A recent study has actually found that per capita consumption fell by 20 % in the ten years from 1970 to 1980, in the case of fruit from 40 kg to 32 kg per head a year. There is no lack of factors which may account for this. Some people would blame the austerity measures but, as a consumer, I have a different explanation to offer. For the past twenty years the common belief has been that the housewife buys with her eyes. The fruit produced has looked good and felt sturdy, but the quality of taste has definitely declined. If consumers are offered tasty fruit, their appetite for it will return, and this will be all to the good for producers and traders.

Mr Müller-Hermann (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the rapporteur, Mr Colleselli, has referred to action taken by the fruit and vegetable importers. It is true that there can be no objection to the resolution, but point 4 of the explanatory statement says that importers can easily bypass the reference price mechanism with incorrect invoicing. It seems difficult to me to know where this claim begins and where it ends. I therefore recommend the rapporteur to delete this sentence in the explanatory statement, because we should surely not start using insinuations, since no one knows what that would lead to.

Mr Adamou (COM) — (GR) Mr President, though the Commission's proposal for the amendment of the method of calculating the reference price, with the aim of protecting fruit and vegetables, may be regarded by the rapporteur as a positive step, we shall vote against it because we harbour many doubts about this system in itself. The reference price can be distorted by inaccurate invoices and thus all the protective measures may be taken far too late, when imports from third countries have already blown the common market sky high, as in fact happened with Greek dried grapes.

Specifically so far as Greece is concerned the reference prices do not secure the incomes, nor protect the interests of our farmers, who are threatened by similar products imported not only from third countries but from the Member States of the Community. The proof is that in the 2½ years since our accession, Greece has had to bury 500 000 tonnes of fruit and vegetables, a thing that had never occurred in the past. Furthermore, the balance of Greece's trade with the EEC in the agricultural sector was in the red by 10.6 thousand million drachmas in 1981 and by 17.9 thousand million drachmas in 1982, whereas before accession it was in the black by 7 thousand million drachmas each year. These figures show how voluminous imports of agricultural products into our country have been, and by how much our exports have fallen. Moreover, owing to the high production costs in our country, the high rate of inflation and the low prices fixed by the Community, agricultural incomes were reduced by 7.1 % in 1981 and by 5 % in 1982. The consequence of this was that during those two years the agricultural

Adamou

population was reduced and unemployment increased. Thus, for as long as Greece still remains a member of the EEC the only way to protect Greek agricultural products is to apply a safeguarding clause, namely the prohibition of any imports of fruit and vegetable products into the Greek market when the latter is abundantly supplied with Greek fruit and vegetables.

As for Greek dried grapes, particularly sultanas which are facing an extremely acute problem, I would like to stress certain related matters :

First, the danger of doing away with the guarantee prices.

Second, the danger of doing away with national intervention.

Third the limiting of sultana production to 80,000 tonnes in each, marketing year, while Greece is the only country in the Community that produces dried grapes.

For all these reasons we shall vote against the report and the Colleselli resolution.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, I want first of all to thank Parliament for what I believe is unanimous support for the Commission's proposal for a regulation on new calculation methods for reference prices. The intention of the proposal is to secure better management of Community preference against third countries. The Commission does feel however that 1 January 1985 — the expected date for the accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community — should be retained as the date of entry into force of the regulation, as some Member States can only proceed with the proposed change as part of an enlargement of the Community by the admission of new Member States. I do not therefore think that there is a possibility of a date of entry into force prior to accession.

Regarding Mr Kyrkos' question on Greek raisins, I would point out that stocks at the close of the 1981/82 production year amounted to approx. 55 000 tonnes of sultanas and that Greece prior to accession exported 50-60 % of its production to the Community market, which obtained 30 % of its imports from Greece. Normal protection of dried grapes against imports from third countries is laid down in the Common Customs Tariff, which is applied to all third countries, apart from Turkey because a reduced tariff is applicable to that country. Because of the distortions of the Community market due to imports from third countries, the Commission introduced protective measures for the 1982/83 production year in the form of a minimum import price of 1067 ECU per tonne for dried grapes other than currants. In addition, in order to promote sales of Community products, the selling price of dried grapes was reduced to a level competitive with that resulting from the minimum price with all sale factors included, transport costs as

well. Sales of Greek dried grapes in the 1983/84 production year have thus been progressing satisfactorily. The quantities of sultanas remaining in storage only amount to some ten thousand tonnes, and that at a time when the production year still has three months to run. I would stress that the Greek producers receive a minimum price, which has been increased considerably since accession, and that in these circumstances they enjoy considerable advantages under the present arrangements.

I want to say that the Commission has presented proposals to the Council, which Parliament will be discussing on Friday, concerning the sale of these grapes, which are still in storage, for purposes other than normal sale.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

IN THE CHAIR : MR KLEPSCH

*Vice-President*9. Votes¹

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I should like to point out first that as agreed group meetings are cancelled this evening since voting today will be going on until past 7 p.m., given the number of amendments tabled.

We have first to decide on the request by Mr Purvis on the referral back to committee of the Second Report by Mr Dalsass on Ethyl alcohol.

Mr Hord (ED). — Mr President, on the assumption that you are now going to put this to the vote, I would like to ask for a quorum under Rule 71 (3).

President. — Mr Hord, we have an arrangement that no requests are allowed to establish the presence of a quorum on points of order. I would ask you, if you will, to make your request when we have started on the vote.

(Parliament rejected the request for referral)

Mr Hord (ED) — Mr President, I asked for a quorum under Rule 71(3). You took the vote without acknowledging my request.

President. — Perhaps you did not follow what I said a moment ago. I expressly asked if you had any objections. I pointed out that in accordance with the deliberations of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions an arrangement exists whereby there can be no call to establish the existence of a quorum on points of order. However, you can make your request later when we come to vote on the Dalsass report.

¹ See Annex I.

VAN HEMELDONCK REPORT (DOC. 1-370/83
'TRANSFER OF DANGEROUS WASTES')

Proposal for a directive

The directive as whole — Amendments Nos 1 and 2

Mr Schleicher (PPE). — (DE) Amendment No 2 was of a general nature, and we now have a number of amendments all concerning the same point. I request that this fundamental decision also apply to the following amendments.

3rd recital — After the rejection of Amendment No 3

Mr Sherlock (ED). — We have now voted under Amendment No 1 that the Commission should proceed by way of regulation. Through a total misunderstanding we have now taken away Article 235, which gives them the power so to act. Can you not use your ingenuity, Mr President, to find some way of resolving this dilemma?

President. — Mr Sherlock, Amendment No 1 is not identical to Amendment No 3. Amendment No 1 is concerned solely with inserting the word 'Regulation' whereas the object of Amendment No 3 is to retain the text of the third recital 'shipments of hazardous wastes and dangerous substances' — I think, however, that what we are concerned with now is dangerous substances.

5th recital — Amendment No 5

Mr Schleicher (PPE). — (DE) Here again we have the problem of a reference to 'dangerous substances'. We voted against this in the case of amendment No 2. In all the amendments that follow I simply want to know whether the decision on dangerous substances stands. If it does not, the voting will be very complicated. In our opinion, the adoption of amendment No 2 means that the majority of Parliament have taken the basic decision that dangerous substances should not be covered by this resolution.

President. — I see that Mrs Van Hemeldonck shares your view.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, it is clear that amendments nos. 1 and 2 are matters of principle. Amendment no 1 assumes that during the whole voting procedure we are speaking of a regulation and not a directive. Amendment no 2 presumes that the expression 'hazardous substances' is deleted everywhere.

President. — We can therefore take it, I think, that dangerous substances are excluded by the Basic Decision.

Article 2 — After the voting on Amendments Nos 13, 52, 49 and 14.

Mr Simpson (ED). — Mr President, Mrs Van Hemeldonck of course is the rapporteur on behalf of the

Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. Is it strictly necessary to ask her whether she is in favour of the amendments which are put forward by the Committee on the Environment? I would have thought that that is not necessary.

President. — Mr Simpson, you are quite right. It is indeed superfluous, but I have no objection to her saying so specifically.

Article 8 — Amendments Nos 25 and 58

Mr Donnez (L). — (FR) Are you going to take a vote on amendment 58 before 25? For my part, Mr President, I should prefer it if you took amendment 58 before the other. It is merely a linguistic amendment designed to make the text more legal in tone.

President. — My feeling is that the basic decision which the Plenary has taken to substitute 'Regulation' each time also applies where the word 'directive' features in the amendments.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S), rapporteur. — (NL) Amendment no 58 from Mr Donnez and amendment no 25 can be taken together. So amendment no 58 can be put to the vote first and amendment no 25 afterwards.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President, in the English language either word is equally acceptable.

After Article 11, paragraph 3 — Amendments Nos 29 and 68

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S), rapporteur. — (NL) In my Dutch text amendment no. 68 is identical to amendment no 29. I am therefore in favour of both, as they are identical.

Mr Sherlock (ED). — Mr President, they are very close in the English version, but I would prefer slightly No 68 and since I think it is a little further from the original, I would like you to take it first, if you would be so kind.

Mrs Weber (S). — (DE) Mr President, I believe this is all due to a mistake in translation. In the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection we discussed the name of the UN code, our view being that one code should apply to the substances transported, the risks involved and the measures to be taken in the Community. The problem was then to decide which code we should take. The committee felt that it must be comparable to the Hazchem and Kemler codes. I have already discussed the matter with the Conservative author of the amendment, who is not here today. He shares this view. I therefore believe an inconsistency is unlikely here.

President. — Mrs Weber, the only question facing me is on which amendment we vote first.

Mrs Weber (S). — *(DE)* I have seen the English text, and there really is a difference here. This has given rise to some of the amendments that have been tabled. The English text says that the Kemler or the Hazchem code will be used, and in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection we said that the code used must be comparable to the Kemler and Hazchem codes. That is the only difference.

10. Statement by the President

President. — At its meeting earlier today, the enlarged Bureau, pursuant to Rule 9 (4) of the Rules of Procedure, decided after thorough consultations with the Federal Government to hold an additional session on 29 and 30 June 1983 in order to assess the record of the German Presidency and the results of the European Council meeting of 17/19 June. The meeting on Wednesday will be from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m., the Thursday meeting from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. Federal Foreign Minister Dietrich Genscher will be attending the Wednesday meeting and Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl the Thursday meeting.

Mr Israël (DEP). — *(FR)* A procedural motion, Mr President. You do not intend to seek the view of the House on such a decision? I have the impression that this is absolutely contrary to the decisions.

(Applause from various quarters)

I wonder which of the Rules of Procedure, Mr President, you are taking as your authority for imposing on this democratically elected House a meeting at which it has nothing to decide. It is inconceivable!

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — Mr Israël, I must ask you to refer to the Rules of Procedure. I pointed out that the enlarged Bureau had reached a decision under Rule 9 (4). If anyone has anything else to put forward he can do so by means of a motion for a resolution under the urgency procedure. Under the Rules everything has been done correctly. I do not think we should now be holding a long debate. To make things clearer I shall read out Rule 9 (4):

‘The enlarged Bureau may alter the duration of adjournments decided pursuant to Paragraph 2 by a reasoned decision of a majority of its members taken at least two weeks before the date previously fixed by Parliament for resuming this session; the date of resumption shall not, however, be postponed for more than two weeks’.

That is the situation we now have.

Mr Cottrell (ED). — Once again, Mr President, this is an example of the Bureau acting as a parliament within a parliament and I suspect it is the way in which you have delivered your remarks to this House *(Applause)* which has angered, as you can see, a large number of Members. It is not right for you to come to the House in an unexpected way and deliver the news from Mount Olympus that there is to be another part-session. It is true that there have been rumours circulating in Strasbourg this week that there was to be another part-session. I think it is totally wrong, no matter what the rule book says, for you to bring the news to the House in this way. I therefore request, Mr President, a vote as to whether this special part-session shall take place.

(Applause from various quarters)

Mr Davern (DEP). — Mr President, I would like to second Mr Cottrell’s proposal and to say that the serious effects of the Bureau’s making this decision are once again bringing the whole Parliament into disrepute: the enormous cost just a week before the Parliament meets again is bringing us into serious disrepute. I question the ruling about the reasonable effort of the reasonable majority. Is there reason within the Bureau if they can carry on with this sort of nonsense?

(Applause from various quarters)

Mr Bangemann (L). — *(DE)* Mr President, I believe it will be appreciated that this announcement has taken the Members of this House who have not been informed of the motives rather by surprise...

(Interjection by Mr Cottrell ‘Nobody ever tells us...’)

... That is the reason why I rose my dear friend. It can be appreciated that this announcement which had to be made without any prior information, is now causing some anger. But I rose on a point of order to tell you at least something that you can discuss in your groups afterwards.

We faced a situation in which the Greek Presidency categorically refuses to allow the German Presidency to make a statement after 1 July. I do not mean this as a criticism of the Greek Presidency. In fact, I can see their point of view in some ways. We faced a situation in which we would not have been able either — and this was the less important factor — to discuss the statement made at the end of the German Presidency or — the decisive point — to react to the positive or, more importantly, the negative outcome of the Stuttgart summit sufficiently long after it had taken place.

The whole of the committee has been sitting there trying to formulate a joint position in case Stuttgart is a disaster, which, as you all know, is a possibility that cannot be excluded. I therefore ask you to realize that we are not to blame for the political situation we find

Bangemann

ourselves in — and I would also ask the Irish Member to remember that various events in certain Member States, the elections in the United Kingdom, for example, forced us to postpone the summit. The Bureau has very reluctantly agreed to this special part-session, not to annoy the House or to cause additional costs but to enable Parliament's voice to be heard at a critical time and, if possible, to save what can be saved. I ask you to bear this in mind when you make your decision.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, before we spend any more time on points of order, I should like to suggest that the House vote on this decision, after the morning Group meetings.

Mr Cottrell (ED). — Well, of course, the only success we have had so far, Mr President, is that we have actually forced the House to discuss this issue. Now perhaps many people will be able to accept what Mr Bangemann has said. It is very kind of him to come to the House and tell us these things this evening. No doubt they will illuminate the honourable Members as to why it is we will be brought back to Strasbourg. Thank you very much indeed. None of us would have known otherwise.

In the meantime, of course, the President having brought his tablets down from the mount, now proposes to take them back up again and then bring them all the way down again tomorrow morning.

Now, Mr President, I submit it to you in this way. This is a House composed of presumably intelligent people who are able to judge the issues that are placed before them. Complex and amazing as they are, it is not too much to ask this House to vote now as to whether it requires a special session. I submit to the House that an overnight opportunity, a pause, to think about it is not particularly necessary. Let us vote now.

Mr von der Vring (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, I wish to comment on the procedure rather than on the actual issue. I consider your proposal very reasonable, and I should like to express my disapproval of the Bureau's attempt to use a provision of the Rules of Procedure as it has never been used before. It has now become traditional for us to vote on special part-sessions. We are proud of this achievement and want to retain it. If the Bureau had abided by the traditional method, we would not have had this annoying situation, but I realize that a vote cannot be taken after a brief announcement that does not tell the whole story, which would certainly have taken a quarter of an hour or half an hour longer. My suggestion is that we vote on this tomorrow morning or tomorrow evening at 6 o'clock, thus giving the political groups time to collect the information they need. There may be arguments for and against, but the procedure you have proposed complies with past custom in this House.

(Applause)

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* I agree with Mr von der Vring: after all, we have not yet heard our Vice-Presidents, who form the Bureau. We should hear what they have to say first. If Mr Cottrell is not interested in the more detailed information his Vice-President can give him, that is his concern, but we simply have to have the information from our Vice-Presidents.

President. — I would also mention that it is not only the Vice-Presidents who are concerned here but also the Group Chairmen since this was a decision of the enlarged Bureau.

Mr Nord (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, in your statement just now you referred to Rule 9, para. 4 of the Rules of Procedure. On reading it I conclude that the enlarged Bureau was ill advised to refer to this rule and I shall explain why. It is an important point because it refers to any future special part-session that this House may decide to hold.

Rule 9, para. 4 states :

'The enlarged Bureau may alter the duration of adjournments decided on pursuant to paragraph 2 by a reasoned decision of a majority of its members taken at least two weeks before the date previously fixed by Parliament for resuming the session; the date of resumption — and this is the important part — the date of resumption shall not, however, be postponed for more than two weeks'.

These last words show that the whole paragraph only refers to altering the date already decided on for part-session, stipulating that any postponement may not be for longer than two weeks. It is quite different from slotting in a new unplanned part-session. I therefore contest with all due respect to the members of the enlarged Bureau, their interpretation of this rule. And although I wish to thank the President for the wisdom he was showing in taking up the apparently eager desire to have a vote in the House on it, I would point out that it is not only his wisdom but his duty, as our Rules of Procedure say that adding a further part-session is not the same as postponing the date of a part-session already decided on. I think therefore that the Bureau should now propose to us that this additional part-session be held and leave it to the wisdom of the Members of this House to decide whether they must sleep on it for a whole night and then have a group meeting on the subject, or whether they are adult enough to vote on it immediately.

President. — Mr Nord, I would just put in a word here to make it clear I have not accepted your legal interpretation. Rule 9 is quite clear. It implies that the Plenary actually meets continuously and the part-sessions are adjourned each time until the next session is convened. This is also dealt with by paragraph 4. I have not found any other rule we can refer to ...

President

(Exclamation: 'Paragraph 5! — Laughter)

Paragraph 5 only applies where — read paragraph 5! — a request has been made by the majority of Parliament ...

(Exclamation: 'Or by the Council')

But this is not at all the case. We should, though, properly consider what Mr Nord has just said and ask the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to resolve this question once and for all. But we should not now be discussing that Committee's interpretation. Right now we have Mr Cottrell's request to vote on, and we also have my proposal, which Mr von der Vring supported, to take a decision tomorrow morning at 10 a.m.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — I would just like to make it absolutely clear to colleagues that our group was consulted about this; we did take a vote on it; we decided to go along with the session. However, we think that it ought to be ratified here by everyone and so I am in favour of the vote. We also consider we should decide where we have it.

Mr Barbi (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, the enlarged Bureau has never been in any doubt about the fact that the decision should be taken by Parliament in plenary session. We have never thought it should be done differently. But I support your proposal, Mr President, that a decision should be taken tomorrow morning. Since I am a man of only modest intelligence, much below what Mr Cottrell credits me with, I need a little time in order to pass on my overmodest enlightenment to the remainder of my Group, and I therefore need to take advantage of the Group's meeting tomorrow morning, and to vote later on.

(Applause from the Centre benches.)

Mr. Alavanos (COM) — *(GR)* Mr President I shall ask you not to interrupt me, as is your habit. My intervention is directly relevant to the matter under discussion and the matter raised by Mr. Bangemann. The Presidency's proposal is not merely procedural. Mr. Bangemann has shown that there is a serious political basis for it. According to Mr. Bangemann, either the Greek Presidency will have to agree to be represented by the German Presidency, even though the latter will have expired since 1 July, or we will have to proceed with an extra part-session during June. Consequently, there is a clear doubt concerning the abilities and rights of the Greek Presidency. If the German Presidency has the right to review the achievements of Stuttgart the Greek Presidency has a much more important obligation according to the logic of the Community: to continue the work of Stuttgart.

Why, then, do you come and cast doubt on the ability and right of the Greek Presidency to develop the

theme of Stuttgart? Our positions are well known, but I think that while we are here our rights should be respected. From this standpoint I think that this political notion will have to be very seriously taken into account.

Mr Simpson (ED). — In order to help the Parliament take its decision tomorrow morning, can you confirm that the only reason for bringing us back to Strasbourg for an extra session was the refusal of the Greek presidency to allow the German presidency to make its statement on the Monday of the July session, as indeed it had asked to do? Can you not ask our Greek colleagues overnight to use their influence to get their presidency to change their mind thereby saving Members and officials additional travel and strain and the European taxpayer the cost of an extra session?

(Applause)

President. — I do not want this discussion to go on any longer.

Let us now vote whether we comply with Mr Cottrell's wish and vote immediately or take up my proposal and vote tomorrow morning at 10 a.m.

(Parliament decided not to vote immediately)

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, I am getting a little confused. May I ask what we shall be voting on tomorrow. Simply on a part-session to be held in Strasbourg or on a part-session to be held elsewhere? When and above all where does the Bureau propose this part-session should take place?

President. — I should like you all to think about it this evening at the Group meetings. As decided by this House all sessions of Parliament are held in Strasbourg, unless specifically decided otherwise — see Rule 10 (2).

(Protests)

Sir Fred, if you wish to make a request to influence this decision, you can do this tomorrow morning but there is no point in carrying on with this discussion. The House has just decided that we take our decision tomorrow at 10 a.m.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — I dispute your interpretation. I formally asked on behalf of my group that we should also vote on where it should be. That can be a decision of the House which we are perfectly entitled to make and I propose that we vote on that tomorrow morning. I do not accept that we cannot vote on that tomorrow morning.

President. — You can make the request tomorrow, but we have now finished with this point.

Mr Cottrell (ED). — Mr President, you know I will not waste the time of the House. I merely want to propose that this session be held in Brussels. I would like a vote on that tomorrow as well.

President. — How come then you are saying exactly what Sir Fred has just proposed and telling us you did not want to waste our time?

Mr Israël (DEP). — (*FR*) Mr President, I would ask if you could cast light on tomorrow's proceedings by telling us this evening whether or not you intend to consult the Greek presidency and giving us a clear answer tomorrow on whether or not the Greeks agree to allow the Germans to speak on the Monday of the next part-session?

(*Applause from various quarters*)

President. — Mr Israël, this really has no place here. I might mention, however, that the Bureau has received firm information from the Council as to what will be done and this will be adhered to.

11. *Votes (continuation)*¹

DALSASS REPORT

(Doc. 1-240/83 'ETHYL ALCOHOL')

Proposal for a regulation

Title — After the vote on Amendment No 51

Mr Sherlock (ED). — My agenda says I can go home at 7.30 p.m. The House finishes at 7.30 p.m.

President. — Mr Sherlock, you were obviously not here at the beginning of the sitting when I announced that the Group chairmen had agreed that the sitting would go on until 8 p.m.

Article 1, paragraph 2 — Amendment. Nos 28 and 78

Mr Prout. — Mr President, I would like to ask you to check the quorum for the next vote. I ask this as a matter of right under Rule 71(3).

(*Ten Members rose. The President noted that a quorum was present.*)

After the approval of the Commission proposal

Mr Prout (ED). — Mr President, we have come to the moment in the procedure when it is normal for the rapporteur to turn to the Commission and ask the Commissioner whether he accepts all Parliaments'

amendments to the regulation. I would like therefore, through you, to invite the rapporteur to ask the Commission to react to Parliament's amendments in order to make our consultation procedure work properly. I assure you that this is not an underhand move on behalf of my group. It is a genuine concern to know exactly how Mr Dalsager is going to react.

President. — Thank you, Mr Prout, for your observations. I did not put the question to the rapporteur specifically because one of the other rapporteurs, who did not speak, had earlier told me in answer to my question that he did not wish that. I assumed that Mr Dalsass did not wish to make a statement.

Mr Dalsass (PPE), rapporteur. — (*DE*) Mr President, the Commission has already agreed so I will not ask any more.

(*Laughter*)

President. — I took it that you would not be asking any more

(*Laughter*)

We said at the start this morning that we would be finishing at 8 p.m. However, if we took another 15 minutes we could get through everything. Are you agreed, now that we have been here so long already?

(*Mixed reactions*)

Mr Purvis (ED). — (*EN*) Mr President, it says in the footnote to Rule 36(2) that the rapporteur 'has not only a right but also a duty to advise Parliament after gauging the Commission's attitude'. As it is very important to me and my constituency to know, do I take it from Mr Dalsass that the Commission has accepted all the amendments that we have adopted and that Mr Dalsass now recommends that we allow the report to go forward? Is he giving his solemn undertaking that that is the case?

President. — Quite so, Mr Dalsass has just said as much. I see that the House is agreeable to taking the motion for a resolution now.

12. *Agenda for next sitting*

President. — I would inform the House that, in connection with the decision to be taken tomorrow morning at 10 a.m., I have received two amendments on the additional session. They will be presented at the Group meetings. They are both from Mr Cottrell.

(*The President read out the agenda for the next sitting*)¹

¹ See Annex I.

¹ See Minutes.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I request that the Bureau take the continuation of today's agenda first at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. There is no reason why the remaining items on today's agenda should be taken after tomorrow afternoon's agenda. Furthermore, if we have not completed the debate on my report by 6 p.m. tomorrow, we shall not be able to vote on it, even though the Council and Commission have requested urgency.

President. — Mr Blumenfeld, unfortunately I cannot help you because precisely what was to have been

decided at 3 p.m. tomorrow has been expressly changed by the Plenary.

Mr Maher (L). It was announced from the chair today that the vote would take place on all the reports on which the debate had been concluded. There are still three to go. I want to know when exactly those votes will be taken — tomorrow or Friday or when.

President. — The Maher and Colleselli reports will be taken in first place in the voting at 6 p.m.

(The sitting was closed at 8.20 p.m.)

ANNEX I

Votes

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

VAN DEN HEUVEL REPORT (Doc. 1-368/83 — Malta): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke :

— AGAINST Amendment No 1.

Explanations of vote

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — (GR) We have serious reservations about this resolution despite the evident effort that has gone into producing the most diplomatic formulation possible of the document in question, with a view to assisting both sides, both within Malta and as regards Malta's relations with the Common Market.

Our reservations relate mainly to certain points in the explanatory report but also to the terms of the resolution, where a tendency is revealed to interfere in the internal affairs of Malta in violation of her national and sovereign rights, and where, without mincing words, the elected system in force in that country is criticized and a polarization is detected between the political and the social forces. I wonder however, Mr President, who can claim that in his own country all the political...

President. — I am sorry, but under the rules of Procedure you have only got 10 seconds.

Mrs Baduel Glorioso (COM). — (IT) We welcome the van den Heuvel report as a just reparation to the Valletta government, which rectifies the position adopted by the European Parliament on 10 March. It was a mistake, as events have immediately shown, for this Parliament to interfere in the internal political situation of a democratic, friendly country. We therefore consider that the reactions of the Government of Malta were entirely justified.

Whilst recognising this meritorious aspect of the van den Heuvel resolution, however, our Group cannot overlook the fact that, even in this text, opinions are expressed on the Maltese political situation, and we do not agree with this method. Whilst, therefore, we are in agreement with those parts of the resolution that refer to better cooperation between the EEC and Malta, in mutual respect, and which indicate how to proceed on these lines, I have to state that our Group will abstain.

VAN HEMELDONCK REPORT (Doc. 1-370/83 — Shipment of hazardous wastes): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke :

— IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 60, 62 (1st part), 63, 65, 66, 68, 70, 71, 73, 75 and 76 ;

— AGAINST Amendments Nos. 47, 48, 53, 55 and 59.

Explanations of vote

Mr Ephremidis (COM). — *(GR)* We support the resolution because it makes a start in taking measures that will prevent the sort of crime against life and the environment that took place in Seveso. We will also vote for it because during the debate and the voting a number of amendments were accepted that strengthen its preventive and suppressive nature. However, we wish to stress that our own amendments were not accepted — this does not prevent us from voting in favour — precisely because they promoted the preventive and suppressive measures even more strongly, and in particular they drew attention to the main perpetrators of these crimes, namely the multinational complexes which, for the sake of profits, are apathetic towards taking the preventive measures necessary during the production, processing and transport of these dangerous substances.

Mrs van Hemeldonck (S), rapporteur. — *(NL)* There have been other occasions when I have seen how right-wing this House can be and especially how unbelievably conservative and influenced by the big lobbies from right-wing industry, especially the Christian Democrats. They have refused to make a regulation out of the problem of hazardous substances. Let the people of Europe take note of that! After the big Seveso scandal and the poison we have seen being transported through Europe, they still have the temerity to vote against a European regulation here. I have also noted that despite the Commission's recommendation, they do not want prison sentences passed on those responsible for such dangerous situations. And finally I have noted they have no intention of informing the workers about the hazardous substances they must work with. Well, we have understood. I hope that the electorate and the people of Europe have followed this vote carefully.

Mr Bombard (S). — *(FR)* I shall be voting in favour of Mrs Van Hemeldonck's motion for a resolution despite the exclusion of hazardous substances. However, there is one type of frontier which needs to be patrolled, and that is the coastline; as Mrs Weber pointed out in her speech, the drums that are still in Seveso could be dumped at sea without crossing any frontiers.

I hope that the present motion for a resolution, for which I shall be voting, will be followed up by an urgently drafted and adopted directive or resolution to impose an absolute ban on the dumping at sea of all toxic wastes or substances in containers which, after a greater or lesser lapse of time, will disintegrate, discharging their poison into the sea. In voting for this motion, I look forward to the vote on a further proposal for a regulation which will protect that frontier which is impossible to patrol and provides opportunities for the dispersal of the most harmful wastes and substances: I refer to the maritime frontier.

(Applause)

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (S). — *(DE)* I shall vote for the motion. I would have been far more willing to do so if I thought that this regulation would actually achieve something. Unfortunately, the vote has already made it useless by taking out any reference to dangerous substances. This means that in future waste must be declared as something that can be reused. That will rule out what we wanted to achieve with this regulation.

I deeply regret the decision of the House to vote against the requirement that the best possible method of disposal must be selected. The best possible method of disposal is the one that gives the public the greatest protection. I also regret that we will not be given the list of undertakings. This has unfortunately been rejected by a coalition which has conspired against the public. The fact that we are not to be given any information on intermediate storage will result in precisely what I feared from the outset: we have approved a regulation designed to pacify the man in the street, but I regret to say that otherwise nothing will be done.

Mrs Weber (S). — *(DE)* Sad though I am at the removal of any reference to dangerous substances from this regulation, I should like to point out that Parliament and the Commission are obviously far more sensible than the Member States. The Member States have obviously been incapable of finding a sensible arrangement for the transfrontier transport of hazardous wastes. I therefore very much welcome the fact that Parliament has called for a regulation. I believe that this is the right way to prevent a recurrence of incidents like that involving the Seveso waste.

I would nevertheless ask those of my colleagues who were opposed to the inclusion of dangerous substances to give some thought to how they intend to explain to the public that a dangerous product is considered in terms of its intended use when an accident happens. If there is a road accident involving dioxin, what difference does it make whether it is to be reused or stored as waste? So far I have not been given an answer to this question, either in the committee or in Parliament, and I hope to receive one in the forthcoming public debate.

Mr Cottrell (ED). — A brief observation, Mr President. Would you consider requesting Members who read explanations of vote to this House to submit them in writing so that the House is not subjected to the tiresome chore of listening to this unattractive way of presenting one's remarks?

President. — Mr Cottrell, we have taken note of your observation, but every Member of the House is free to give his explanation of vote orally or in writing.

Mr Chanterie (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, I object to the rapporteur's attack on my group. I think such speech is unworthy of a rapporteur.

Mr De Gucht (L), in writing. — *(NL)* Community legislation shows some shortcomings in the transport of dangerous wastes. Recent events have shown the kind of incredible situations that can lead to.

It is obvious that measures must be taken and with that in mind I support the report.

In the debate on whether it is best done by a directive or a regulation, I opt for a regulation.

A directive has always to be incorporated into the national legislation. Purely from the Community angle a directive may seem to be drawn up more quickly, but afterwards it is much more difficult to check the various Member States in their compliance with it.

A regulation is directly applicable. Any objection that a regulation is more laborious to draw up can be met by the Commission being constantly urged to speed up its work here.

The regulation should not contain too many points. For practical considerations it is advisable to settle the crucial issues and leave the details to be worked out later, possibly by means of directives.

Mr Skovmand (CDI), in writing. — *(DA)* The 41 drums of dioxin waste from Seveso have generated both understandable and justified concern over the toxic waste which is moved from one country to another. It is in this light that the present proposal on trans-frontier movements of waste should be seen.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck's proposal seems at first sight to be a reasonable one. Nevertheless we in the Folkebevægelse mod EF (People's movement against the EEC) cannot vote for it. Because the entire activity of the European Community moves in the diametrically opposed direction.

If a country wants to protect itself against toxic hazards, it must be able to prevent toxic waste from entering it from other countries. This requires effective inspection at the frontiers. But the EEC tries time and again to weaken such inspections. In addition a country must seek to prevent the import of goods which contain toxic substances or are produced with the aid of toxic substances. The EEC also tries to prevent this on the grounds that it is a technical barrier to trade.

In short: here, as in other connections, we may conclude that the Community is hostile to a better environment.

SECOND DALSASS REPORT (Doc. 1-240/83 — Ethyl alcohol) : ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke :

- IN FAVOUR OF amendments Nos. 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119 ;
- AGAINST amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14/rev., 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42 and 43.

Explanations of vote

Mr. Adamou (COM). — (GR) The Dalsass report on ethyl alcohol of agricultural origin demonstrates the confusion that exists in that sector. In essence, it is a frantic attempt by the Community to find an outlet for a whole range of agricultural products. However, the situation is further complicated by the intrusion of synthetic alcohol, which competes against ethyl alcohol and threatens to eliminate it. Nevertheless, the measures proposed by the Commission, and with which the Dalsass report and resolution are in agreement, will if implemented have serious negative consequences for countries such as Greece. Vini-culture, which occupies some 400 000 agricultural families, will become really problematic as also will the production of alcohol that uses Greek agricultural products as raw materials.

However, we believe that if Greek viniculture and its products are to survive in a community which is 120 % in surplus in this sector, the Greek government will have to institute protective measures at a national level. Only this will solve the problems of 'agricultural products, agricultural alcohol, alcoholic drinks'.

For this reason, as we did on the Committee on Agriculture, we shall vote against the Dalsass report and resolution.

Mr Hord (ED). — I think that this House has just witnessed something of a charade where we have been concerning ourselves, if that is the right word, with an important new proposal for an ethyl alcohol regulation. It is not something that we do every month, and it seems to me that the charade that we have just witnessed matches the shambles of the Commission's proposals and the contradictory and complicated amendments that we have seen — some 70 of them — from Parliament's Committee on Agriculture. Those who were in the debate earlier will be aware of the substantial reservations about the legality of the Commission's proposals insofar as Parliament has already indicated through its Legal Affairs Committee that they do not conform to the Treaty.

The Commission's proposals are irrelevant and they are expensive. We see increasingly that the solution to the substantial surplus is to distil it and I believe the Parliament will rue the day when they waded through this absurd set of complicated and amended proposals which are totally irrelevant to the Community.

I submit that the Members of this House, if they were not obsessed with agriculture but concerned themselves with the 88 % of the people of Europe who are not directly involved in agriculture but secure their living from non-agricultural means, would get a better reception when they go outside. In a year's time we shall be facing the electorate : 88 % of them want to see agricultural expenditure reduced, and I believe that until such time as there is a degree of responsibility in this House towards all the people of Europe, we shall not get any respect whatsoever.

For all these reasons, my group utterly rejects, not only the Commission's proposals, but also the Dalsass report. We shall vote against.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — Mr President, I would simply like to say to colleagues with whom we agree so much that we are sorry that this normally agreeable and helpful group has been rather difficult tonight. But we did ask that this vote not be taken on the eve of our General Election. It was taken on the eve of our General Election and perhaps if there had been more of us here we would not have been quite so awkward or difficult.

So we hope that when somebody else has an election, like the Italians, we will not have a vote on wine just before the Italian election when none of the Italians are here.

I think that the main point that we would like to make is the point that was made by Mr Hord and that is, at a time when the Community are about to run out of money ; at a time when we have open-ended commitments on agriculture, that is not the time to introduce an expensive regime like this. It could have been that if it had been more reasonable, as it at one time seemed it was going to be, we could have gone along with it. But it was made unreasonable ; it was made unduly heavy and, therefore, we will certainly vote against it.

*ANNEX II**I. Questions to the Council**Question No 2, by Mr Marshall (H-836/82)*

Subject : Spanish accession to the Community and Spanish recognition of Israel

In view of the Association Agreement between the Community and Israel does the Council not agree that full diplomatic recognition of Israel by Spain should be a precondition of Spanish accession to the Community ?

Answer

The basic principle underlying the accession negotiations is complete acceptance by the applicant State of the 'acquis communautaire' as it stands at the time of accession.

This means that problems arising for either the applicant State or the Community during accession negotiations should be solved not by amending Community rules but only by interim measures or temporary derogations, while preserving an overall balance of mutual advantages.

It is in accordance with these principles that Spain, in acceding to the Community, will be required to accept the Mediterranean Agreement, including the Agreement with Israel, as these form part of the 'acquis communautaire'.

The recognition of a third country by a Member State comes within the competence not of the Council but of the State concerned.

* * *

Question No 8 by Mrs Lizin (H-134/83)

Subject : Installation of a nuclear reactor at the frontiers of a Member State

Can the Council state what progress has been made with regard to the proposal for a regulation on setting up a compulsory consultation procedure in the event of the installation of a nuclear power station at the frontiers of a Member State ?

Answer

The proposal for a regulation to which the Honourable Member refers is still being considered by the Council.

* * *

Question No 10 by Mr Martin (H-140/83)

Subject : Mediterranean fisheries

Has the Council decided to supplement the common fisheries policy with a chapter on 'Mediterranean fishing' as requested by the European Parliament ?

Answer

The need for Community measures has already been acknowledged by the Council at its meeting of 25 January 1983.

In furtherance of the resolution adopted that same day by the Council on the adjustment of capacities and the stepping up of productivity in the fisheries sector, the Commission has submitted proposals on fishing structures and the development of aquaculture in the Mediterranean. These are to be considered by the Council at its next meeting on 20/21 June 1983.

The Council has noted with interest the resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 10 February 1983 on fisheries policy in the Mediterranean.

It will consider all the proposals made to it by the Commission on this subject and aimed at the adoption of such Community measures as may appear necessary in this sector.

* * *

Question No 14, by Mr O'Mahony (H-167/83)

Subject: Integrated operations in favour of Dublin

In view of the adoption by Parliament of the von der Vring Resolution⁽¹⁾ on Integrated Development Operations, will the Council call on the Commission to draft proposals immediately for the implementation of the policies called for, particularly in relation to Dublin, as proposed in the Cluskey Resolution⁽²⁾ on Community aid for Dublin, and will Council adopt these proposals as rapidly as possible?

Answer

Within the context of the reform of the Regulation establishing the European Development Fund, the Commission has proposed inserting an Article 29 in the revised Regulation to cover integrated operations making concerted use of the Community's various financial instruments, with a preferential rate being granted to measures under the ERDF. Examination of this proposal is currently under way within the Council.

Should the Council adopt Article 29, it would be for the Commission as the body responsible for managing the various Community funds to examine whether proposals should be submitted to the Council within the framework of the integrated operations or whether the existing instruments offer an adequate basis for the action to which the honourable Member refers.

* * *

Question No 15, by Mr Provan (H-169/83)

Subject: The Carajas project in Brazil

It would appear that the £ 35 billion industrial and mining development Carajas project in Brazil is running into a certain local difficulty. The local indigenous people, who are the occupiers of the land, the 'posseiros', are being driven off their land often with the backing of the special military government in the region. What is special about the Carajas project in Goias is that it is financially backed by the European Community.

Will the Council, therefore, give a statement regarding the use of the European Community funds in this project and the consequences for the local people, who are obviously violently opposed to the project and demonstrated this in the recent elections in Brazil where the Goias region elected a Governor from the parties in opposition to the military government?

Answer

Before granting the assent requested by the Commission to the co-financing of the iron ore mine project in Carajas, the Council insisted on obtaining detailed information from the Commission not only on the general financial and economic aspects of the project but also on the social and environmental protection aspects.

¹ Doc. 1-104/83

² Doc. 1-953/82.

The Commission examined these various aspects in collaboration with financial institutions, particularly the World Bank, and was then in a position to state that the concern expressed in this connection was not justified. It was able to establish that the work which had by then been carried out showed that the developer had laid particular emphasis on environmental protection and the human implications of the project and was prepared to accept a corresponding obligation under the loan agreement.

The agreement should indeed enable the Commission to ensure that proper account is taken of these aspects and to take the necessary control and supervision measures in co-operation with the other financial institutions.

* * *

Question No 16 by Mr Pintat (H-172/83)

Subject : Dumping of copper sulphate by the East European countries

Is the Council of Ministers aware of the problems faced by European firms in the copper sulphate sector as a result of steadily increasing imports of copper sulphate from the East European countries at very low prices ; this is creating a particularly serious situation in France where imports in January and February accounted for 90 % of the amount imported annually ; in view of the anti-dumping complaints lodged with the EEC, what steps does the Council intend to take to put an end to this anomalous situation ?

Answer

The Council is aware of the difficulties faced by Community producers of copper sulphate owing to imports from third countries. Consequently, at the end of February on a proposal from the Commission, it adopted a regulation introducing an anti-dumping levy on imports of copper sulphate from Yugoslavia.

Further, in December 1982, the Commission initiated anti-dumping proceedings against copper sulphate imports from Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. These have now been concluded and the Commission will very shortly take the decision it deems appropriate. It is recalled that the Council is required to intervene only when a decision has to be taken on a Commission proposal intended to extend a provisional anti-dumping levy, either for a further period or indefinitely.

* * *

II. Questions to the Commission

Question No 24, by Mr Marshall (H-835/82)

Subject : The Arab Boycott

In view of the fact that the Arab strikes at two Community principles, non-discrimination in trade and religious freedom, what proposals has the Commission to counteract this policy which has been counteracted so effectively by the United States ?

Answer

The Arab boycott problem has been raised at Community level, particularly during the negotiation of agreements reached with Maghreb and Mashrek countries which contain a clause prohibiting discrimination. The Commission has already had more than one opportunity to emphasize before Parliament¹ that it considers the boycott measures to be against the spirit and principles of the cooperation that the Community wishes to pursue with Arab countries. It stated that it was ready to study any specific cases submitted to it to determine whether they involved any discrimination within the meaning of the agreement.

* * *

¹ See Debates of the European Parliament, sitting of 15 May 1975, Annex 1, page 111.

Question No 28 by Mrs De March (H-84/83)

Subject : 1970 trade agreement between the EEC and Spain

The 1970 trade agreement between the EEC and Spain has been of much greater benefit to Spain than to the EEC because of the high customs duties levied by Spain.

Does the Commission not consider it necessary to renegotiate the agreement in order to remedy the fiscal discrimination which currently exists and restore normal conditions of competition ?

Answer

The 1970 agreement between the EEC and Spain laid down provisions designed to reduce the barriers to trade between the Community and Spain. Consequently it led to a mutual cutback in trade protection.

In view of Spain's economic situation in the 60s, the agreement, for a first phase covering a period of six years, provided in principle for tariff reductions that were more substantial on the part of the Community than those decided on in the case of Spain. During the 70s various efforts were made to draw up a free trade agreement along the lines of those concluded with the EFTA countries.

In 1979, following the opening of the negotiations on accession, the Community and Spain both discovered independently of each other that they were faced with a *de facto* situation, that is to say, that at some time in the future these problems in trade relations would all be solved within the Customs Union. In view of the accession negotiations still in progress, it seems difficult, if not well nigh impossible, to have any renegotiation of the 1970 agreement.

In order to tackle the present problems of tariff imbalances between the Community and Spain and to find a fair solution to the Customs Union problem within the framework of Spain's accession to the Community, the Commission has submitted to the Council its proposal for a comprehensive solution linking tariff questions in the pre-accession period with the transitional measures for the post-accession period.

In recent years the effects of the Spanish system of progressively diminishing tariffs have been examined on several occasions in conjunction with the Spanish authorities, and the Commission has left no stone unturned in its efforts to gradually put the whole situation back on a proper footing. Following the budgetary measures adopted by the Spanish Government which resulted in an increase in internal taxes without any repercussions at the frontiers, the Commission has gone into the whole problem once again with the Spanish authorities. It feels that these measures have had the effect of considerably obviating, if not indeed completely nullifying, the effects noted from export subsidies in the past.

In this connection it may be pointed out that Spain will be applying VAT by the date of accession at the latest in line with Community provisions on competition.

* * *

Question No. 29 by Mr Pranchere (H-85/83)

Subject : Imports of New Zealand Butter

In its resolution on farm prices for 1983/1984 the European Parliament opposed the extension of preferential arrangements for the import of New Zealand butter and requested that they be terminated by 1984.

Does the Commission intend to submit proposals to the Council in accordance with the wishes of the European Parliament ?

Answer

The Commission has noted the diversity of views expressed by the European Parliament on the import of New Zealand butter. On 9 May 1979, the Parliament recognized the Community's ties with New Zealand and its responsibilities to that country and stressed the need to avoid policies which would run counter to the New Zealand efforts to diversify. The Parliament equally espoused the sentiment of the Dublin Summit Declaration that New Zealand should not lose any markets fundamentally important to its economy; and in this context the vital importance to the New Zealand economy of its butter exports to the Community is self-evident.

In 1980 (21/11/80) the Parliament, when approving the proposal concerning Community imports of butter from New Zealand from 1980 onwards, similarly recalled the links which unite New Zealand and the Community, and the importance of cooperation in the dairy sector, as well as the continued dependence of New Zealand on its dairy butter sales to the Community.

In its resolution of 10 March 1983 however, the Parliament expressed its opposition to a continuation of the preferential system and has asked for its suppression as from 1984.

The situation on the Community market and on the world market for dairy products has indeed changed drastically over the last year.

Public stocks of butter have reached 337 071 tonnes (29.4.1983), which is the highest level ever. 87 000 t of butter imports from New Zealand in 1983 represent 4 % of Community production.

According to Article 2 (4) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 858/81 'the Council shall, before 1 August 1983, on the basis of a report and a proposal from the Commission, review the functioning of the arrangements relating to the import of New Zealand butter into the United Kingdom on special terms, with a view to a decision on arrangements for the import of New Zealand butter after 1 January 1984'.

The Commission is currently compiling the necessary material for this report and will, in making proposals to the Council, take due account of all the relevant political and economic factors, in particular the butter market both in the Community and in the world.

* * *

Question No. 30 by Mrs Le Roux (H-95/83) (x)

Subject: Common Fisheries Policy

During Question Time for questions to the Council on Wednesday, 13 April, Mr Maffre-Baugé asked whether the Council intended adding social provisions to the Common Fisheries Policy. Mr Genscher replied that no proposal of this kind had so far been submitted to the Council.

Will the Commission take rapid action to remedy this situation and submit to the Council proposals aimed at bringing about the upward harmonization of social conditions for fishermen, as provided for in Article 117 of the Treaty of Rome?

Answer

1) The Commission submitted to the Council a Communication in November 1980 on the social aspects in the Community sea-fishing sector to complement proposals for a common fisheries policy. The European Parliament delivered its Opinion on the Communication a year later. The Council agreed to suspend further examination of the Communication in 1981 as no agreement could be reached on a common fisheries policy. However, following the agreement in Council in January 1983 on a common fisheries policy, there would appear to be no reason why the Council should not now reopen discussions on the Commission proposals regarding social aspects.

2) Mention should also be made of the structural policy proposals put forward by the Commission in 1980, which included social measures aimed at sea-fishermen affected by reductions in the Community fishing fleet. The Council, however, has not yet adopted these measures.

* * *

Question No 32, by Mrs Ewing (H-108/83)

Subject: Reduction of refunds on mackerel exports to third countries

Is the Commission aware that the reduction in refunds on exports of mackerel is imposing heavy losses on Scottish processors and exporters who bought mackerel for export on forward contracts on the basis that the refunds obtaining before 15 January 1983 would be maintained; if the original refunds will be restored and, if not, if arrangements will be made at least to ensure that processors who have committed themselves to purchase mackerel for export on forward contracts will benefit from the original level of refunds on the quantities specified in those contracts?

Answer

The Commission would like to inform the Honourable Member that the decision to reduce refunds on exports by 10 % on 15 February 1983 and another 10 % on 15 May 1983 is part and parcel of the general agreement on the fishing sector reached by the Council on 25 January 1983.

Furthermore, Council Regulation 110/76 (EEC) of 19 January 1976 states that the amounts of refunds shall be fixed at least once every 3 months (Article 5) on the basis of the main market conditions (Article 3). There is therefore no guarantee that the amounts of refunds will remain unchanged over several successive periods.

* * *

Question No. 33 by Mr Pedini (H-112/83) (x)

Subject: Aid and assistance to Latin America

Information provided in the Latin American countries concerning the often substantial aid and assistance promoted locally by the EEC is frequently inadequate, and worthwhile initiatives by EEC officials are sometimes insufficiently coordinated.

How does the Commission plan to improve coordination in this area between its Directorate-General for External Relations (DG I) and its Directorate-General for Development (DG VIII); and

how does the Commission plan to ensure that the official EEC representatives in Latin America are informed of all initiatives in good time to enable them to publicize them fully?

Answer

1. The Commission shares the view that the coordination of its activities in Latin America is of great importance, particularly as the Community's scope of activities is in any case subject to serious limitations of an objective and material character.

The Commission assures the honourable Member that precautions have been taken to ensure an optimal exchange of information between the various services concerned.

2. As regards public relations, the Commission has press offices at its disposal in Caracas and Santiago and, of course, in Brussels. The Commission appreciates the especial importance of intensifying our work on public relations, particularly with regard to our relations with Latin America. For example, in connection with the Sixth Inter-Parliamentary Conference due to take place next week, the Commission has, in consultation with the competent authorities in this Parliament, applied all the resources at its disposal in order to provide public opinion with the broadest possible coverage.

* * *

Question No 39, by Mr Adam (H-19/83)

Subject : U.K. Lamb Exports to France

Further to my oral question H-551/82 ⁽¹⁾, have the Commission sought an assurance from the French authorities that the border health check will not be reimposed, and if so with what results ?

Answer

As a result of the representations it had made, the Commission was assured by French authorities that they had stopped checking mutton imports from the UK to France and taking samples for laboratory tests.

Article 36 of the Treaty empowers the Member States in perpetuity to take import restriction measures if and when they are deemed necessary for the protection of public health. Consequently, it is not possible for the Commission to ask a Member State to renounce such measures, whatever the circumstances may be.

Similarly, a Member State cannot give any assurance in this respect.

* * *

Question No 43, by Mr Prag (H-77/83)

Subject : Award of public supply contracts

Will the Commission consider instituting a system whereby public supply contracts are awarded on the basis that a percentage of the contract should be sub-contracted to small and medium-sized enterprises ?

Answer

The Commission attaches as much importance as the honourable Member does to taking due account of small and medium-sized enterprises when public orders are being placed, more particularly when public supply contracts are being awarded. Small and medium-sized enterprises already enjoy a certain share of such public orders.

The conclusion of contracts with such undertakings is being encouraged, although the Member States have as yet no relevant legal provisions. Only in the Federal Republic of Germany do the Directives of 1 July 1976 lay down administrative procedures designed to facilitate in a general way the participation of small and medium-sized undertakings in the award of public orders.

The Commission is nevertheless continuing its consultations with the Member States with the object of facilitating the access of these undertakings to public contracts, particularly public supply contracts.

¹ Debates of the European Parliament No 293.

The Commission points out in this connection that, within the framework of the 'Year of Handicrafts and Small and Medium-sized Undertakings', a conference on the problems of supply undertakings is to take place in Athens, at which the possibility of participation by small and medium-sized undertakings in the award of public contracts will be examined.

* * *

Question No 45, by Ms Quin (H-93/83)

Subject: Obligation of the Commission to respond to European Parliament Resolutions tabled under Rule 49 of the Parliament's Rules of Procedure

Does the Commission consider that it has no obligation to respond to resolutions addressed to it and sent to it by the European Parliament, resolutions which were tabled under rule 49 of the Parliament's rules of procedure and which received the support of an absolute majority of MEPs?

Answer

The Commission considers resolution adopted in accordance with Rule 49 of the Rules of Procedure, as well as any other resolutions, as a manifestation of the political will of Parliament.

The information to be given to Parliament on the action taken on these resolutions, which are own-initiative resolutions, is now governed by the procedural provisions agreed upon by the Commission, the President of Parliament and the chairmen of the parliamentary committees at their meeting of 11 April 1983.

The provisions stipulate that members of the Commission shall be heard by the parliamentary committees concerned and that, on a trial basis, a political and selective report on action taken shall be drawn up every 6 months.

* * *

Question No 46, by Mr. Hume (H-100/83)

Subject: Less favoured areas in Northern Ireland

Has the Commission received a request from the UK government for the extension of the boundaries of the less favoured areas in Northern Ireland and if so, is the Commission yet in a position to respond?

Answer

The honorable Member of the Parliament has last March put to the Commission a similar written question and the reply given was the following:

'In December last year the British Government submitted to the Commission an application concerning the extension of the less favoured areas within the meaning of Directive 75/268 on mountain and hill farming in certain less favoured areas.

Because the data presented in this submission were not sufficiently explicit to decide whether the extended regions conform to the criteria for defining less favoured areas as laid down by the Directive, the Commission has requested the British Government for additional information.

As soon as the Commission receives the additional information required and completes its examination, it will immediately proceed to a submission to the Council of the appropriate proposals.'

The new element, which could be added to the above reply is that since then the U.K. Government forwarded to the Commission all requested information and that the latter, having already completed the necessary examination, prepares its appropriate proposal which will shortly be presented to the Council.

* * *

Question No 51 by Mr Verges (H-139/83)

Subject : FOD cane sugar

Although FOD cane sugar production is modest compared with Community beet sugar production it is nevertheless vital to the economy of the FOD.

Does the Commission not feel it should take greater account of the differences between the two types of products and is it not prepared to make special arrangements for sugar cane by introducing separate regulations ?

Answer

The Commission has always endeavoured to make as much allowance as possible for the specific situation of sugar cane growing and sugar production in French overseas departments, although they are an integral part of the common organization of the market in this sector. In this connection, one of the aims of the new organization set up on 1 July 1981 was to accord sugar cane growers in French overseas departments specific treatment compatible with this common organization. The production scheme set up under this organization runs for 5 marketing years, i.e. up to 30 June 1986. Under these conditions, the Commission does not intend before then to propose to the Council and Parliament a modification of the scheme for the sugar sector that involves only the French overseas departments. Any such modification, especially on the lines suggested by the honourable Member, would be bound to have a substantial impact on the other regions of the Community.

* * *

Question No 54, by Mr Balfe (H-144/83)

Subject : European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

At the April part-session, I asked the Council about the position regarding accession of the Communities to the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms⁽¹⁾.

In its reply, the Council said that it preferred to wait until the Commission responded to the request from the European Parliament to submit as soon as possible to the Council a formal proposal for accession.

When does the Commission expect to be in a position to submit this proposal ?

Answer

As the Commission has already explained before the House, it is of the opinion that a discussion of the principle of accession of the Communities to the European Convention on Human Rights should take place in the Council before the Commission submits formal proposals for accession.

¹ Verbatim report of proceedings on 13. 4. 83, p. 204.

The Commission has been given to understand that the Council authorities are at present considering the most appropriate way of examining the questions raised by the Commission memorandum of 3 May 1979. An informal group is meeting today, 8 June 1983, at the Council's headquarters.

* * *

Question No 56, by Mr Moorhouse (H-146/83)

Subject: Cheap Air Flights from Berlin

In its answer to written questions 1546/80¹ and 1543/82² the Commission stated that it could take no action against cheap East German air flights from Berlin.

Why has the Commission taken two years to answer written question 1546/80 and what information has the Commission sought and collected, as it originally promised to do?

Answer

Following contacts with the author of the question, the Commission's understanding was that no further response on its part was necessary.

* * *

Question No 57 by Mr Galland (H-151/83)

Subject: Observer status for the USSR in GATT

In January 1983 the Soviet Union approached GATT with a request to be granted observer status and is continuing to press the matter despite the generally unfavourable reaction of the West.

In view of this, what position does the Community intend to adopt in response to this request?

Answer

1. To date the USSR has made no official representations to secure observer status for the Soviet Union at GATT. Consequently the problem raised by the Honourable Member does not arise at present.

2. Should the situation change, the Commission will naturally hold all the appropriate consultations both with our partners in GATT and within the Community, before adopting a position on this question. (Due note will have to be taken of the fact that observer status in GATT constitutes a preliminary to full membership. Here the question of the compatibility of the economic principles on which GATT is founded with the special features of the Soviet economic system is of fundamental importance.)

* * *

Question No 60, by Mr Beazley (H-159/83)

Subject: Cigarette taxation in France

In reply to Question number 1920/82³ by myself and others on the above subject, the Commission indicated that it was examining the French law imposing a new tax on cigarettes. The law in question will now come into force on 1 July 1983 under Ordinance Number 83/856 dated 30 April 1983; does the Commission believe the French law introducing the new cigarette tax to be compatible with EEC law?

¹ OJ No C 345 of 31. 12. 1980, p. 32.

² OJ No C 118 of 3. 5. 1983, p. 1.

³ OJ No C 129 of 16. 5. 1983, p. 10.

Answer

The Commission takes the view that the French Law in question is contrary to the provisions of Articles 2 and 4 of the Council Directive of 19 December 1972 relating to the taxation of manufactured tobacco¹ and to the provisions of Article 11A2(a) of the Sixth Council Directive of 17 May 1977 on the harmonization of the value added tax : uniform basis of assessment².

The decision to apply the provisions of Article 169 of the Treaty against France was taken by the Commission at its meeting of 25 May 1983.

* * *

Question No 62, by Mr Pearce (H-170/83)

Subject : German and Greek restrictions on beer imports

Will the Commission say what procedures and consultations it has taken under article 169 since it declared (in answer to written question 1464/81³), that German and Greek restrictions on imports of beer constituted an infringement of article 30 and since it declared itself obliged to take such procedures (Questions 1239/82 and 1267/82)⁴; and what was the result of these procedures and consultations?

Answer

On the present position of the Treaty infringements procedures against Germany and Greece for trade restriction measures imposed by national legislation, in breach of Article 30 of the EEC Treaty, on the production and marketing of beer, the Commission can give the following information :

1. With reference to the German provision the Commission in February 1982 initiated the procedure against the Federal Republic of Germany under Article 169 of the EEC Treaty. In its response to the date fixed by the Commission the Federal Government emphatically disputed the Commission's legal opinion by reference to the requirements of health and consumer protection. In the meantime intensive talks have been held with the competent German authorities but to my regret these have not led to a convergence of views. For this reason the Commission decided (in December 1982) to introduce the Treaty-infringement procedure.

However, in April 1983 the Federal Government submitted to the Commission two scientific opinions with the aim of underpinning its earlier health and consumer arguments. These opinions are now being carefully examined.

In the case of the Greek legislation the Commission, again in February 1982, opened the Treaty-infringement procedure. Admittedly the Greek Government has submitted no written opinion. Nevertheless talks have in the meantime been held with its authorities on the termination of the infringement. The representatives of the Greek Government expressed their readiness to bring their national legislation on the importation and marketing of beer into line with the requirements of Article 30 of the EEC Treaty.

Unhappily there are no serious indications of any movement in this direction, and therefore the Commission saw no alternative but to reopen the infringement procedure against Greece as well.

¹ OJ No L 303 of 31. 12. 1972.

² OJ No L 145 of 13. 6. 1977.

³ OJ No C 82 of 1. 4. 1982, p. 25.

⁴ OJ No C 3 of 5. 1. 1983, p. 11 and 15.

3. The lengthy duration of these procedures derives from the crucial need to protect the consumer from possibly dangerous additives in beer. This aspect requires careful consideration. As you know, the Commission itself attaches the greatest importance to health protection ; this applies to its efforts at harmonization in food legislation, but also to other areas including norms to be laid down in the free movement of goods.

* * *

Question No 64, by Mr Pattison (H-174/83)

Subject : Community aid for development of cut-away bogs

Will the Commission outline the policies in favour of the development of cut-away bogs and the financial and other aids available ; and state what kind of projects have been aided in the Member States in the past, in particular in Ireland, and does it have any proposals for future development in this area ?

Answer

The Community does not offer aid for the development of cut-over peatbogs. Under the 'Polluter pays' principle it is considered that the responsibility for the restoration of these lands lies with the developing agency.

* * *

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 9 JUNE 1983

Contents

1. <i>Approval of minutes</i>		<i>beiron; Mr Hänsch; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Hänsch; Lord Douro</i>	199
<i>Mr Kallias; Mr Lalor</i>	184	<i>EEC and Israel — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-403/83) by Mr Barbi and others</i>	
2. <i>Special part-session (decision)</i>		<i>Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Schmid; Mrs Tove Nielsen; Mr Israël; Mr Haferkamp (Commission)</i>	200
<i>Mr Arndt; Mr Lagakos; Mr Cottrell; Mr Barbi; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Alexiadis; Mr Spinelli; Mrs Veil; Mr Cottrell; Mr de la Malène; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr Wurtz</i>	184	<i>Conference on the law of the sea — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-417/83) by Mr Seeler and Mr Glinne</i>	
3. <i>Topical and urgent debate</i>		<i>Mr Seeler; Mr Janssen van Ray; Mr Helms; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	203
<i>European Council — Motions for resolutions by Mr Irmer and others (Doc. 1-397/83), Mr Barbi and others (Doc. 1-407/83/corr.), Mr Barbi and others (Doc. 1-410/83) and Mr von Wogau and others (Doc. 1-405/83)</i>		<i>Blocking of the appropriations — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-394/83) by Mr Delatte and others</i>	
<i>Mr Irmer; Mr Habsburg; Mr von Wogau; Lord Douro; Mr Segré; Mr Galland; Mr Bonde; Mr Jakobsen; Mr Hänsch; Mr Martin; Mr Alavanos; Mr Giolitti (Commission); Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Jakobsen</i>	186	<i>Mr Delatte; Mr Saby; Mrs Boserup; Mr Dalsager (Commission)</i>	205
<i>ERDF — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-401/83) by Mr De Pasquale and others</i>		<i>Mr Cottrell; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Nord; Mr Chanterie; Mr Klepsch</i>	207
<i>Mr Alavanos; Mr De Pasquale; Mr von der Vring; Mrs Boot; Mr Purvis; Mr Damette; Mr Cecovini; Mr Flanagan; Mrs Fuillet; Mr Giolitti (Commission); Mr von der Vring; Mr Giolitti</i>	193	4. <i>Community's internal frontiers — Report (Doc. 1-160/83/rev.) by Mr Schieler</i>	
<i>Commerce and craft industries — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-399/83) by Mr Deleau and Mr Remilly</i>		<i>Mr Schieler; Mr Nyborg; Mrs Scamaroni; Mr Rogalla; Mr Klepsch; Mr Purvis; Mr De Gucht; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Janssen van Raay; Mr von Wogau; Mrs Boot; Mr Estgen; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	208
<i>Mr Remilly; Mr Notenboom; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Narjes (Commission)</i>	197	5. <i>Family policy — Report (Doc. 1-1196/82) by Mrs Cassamagnago Cerretti</i>	
<i>Aid for the Palestinian refugees — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-402/83) by Mr Barbi and others</i>		<i>Mrs Cassamagnago Cerretti; Mrs Duport; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mrs Veil; Mrs Spaak; Mr Estgen; Mr Eisma; Mrs Pblix; Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Moreland; Mr Contogeorgis (Commission); Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Contogeorgis</i>	218
<i>Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Schmid; Mr Nordmann; Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Lord Douro; Mr Schmid; Mr Cham-</i>		6. <i>Seeds — Report (Doc. 1-223/83) by Mr Diana</i>	
		<i>Mr Stella; Mr Dalsager (Commission) . . .</i>	227

7. *Milk and milk products — Report (Doc. 1-225/83) by Mr Curry and oral question with debate (Doc. 1-190/83) to the Commission by Mr Seligman*
 Mr Battersby; Mr Woltjer; Mr Bocklet; Mr Dalsager (Commission) 228
8. *Horses intended for slaughter — Report (Doc. 1-229/83) by Mrs Herklotz*
 Mrs Herklotz; Mrs Veil 230
9. *Application of the Rules of Procedure*
 Mr von Hassel; Mr Herman; Mr Luster; Mr Nyborg; Mr Gontikas; Mr Estgen . . . 231
10. *Votes*
 Mr Maher; Mr Helms; Mr Maher; Mr Früh 233
11. *Horses intended for slaughter (Doc. 1-229/83) (continuation)*
 Mr Eisma; Mrs Seibel-Emmerling; Mr Mertens; Mr Eisma; Mr Moreland; Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Eisma; Mr Dalsager 234
12. *Common commercial policy — Report (Doc. 1-376/83) by Mr Blumenfeld and oral question with debate (Doc. 1-352/83) to the Commission by Mr Israël and Mr Cousté*
 Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Rieger; Mr van Aerssen; Mr Prout; Mr Fernandez; Mr Israël; Mr van Aerssen; Mr Seeler; Mr Alavanos; Mr Gérard Fuchs; Mr Haferkamp (Commission) . . . 237
13. *Transport infrastructure — Financing of a Channel tunnel — Report (Doc. 1-85/83) by Mr Martin, interim report (Doc. 1-372/83) by Mr Vandewiele and oral question with debate (Doc. 1-39/83) to the Commission by Mr Berkhouwer*
 Mr Martin; Mr Veronesi; Mr Martin; Mr Vandewiele; Mr Protopapadakis; Mr Gabert; Mr Baudis; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Moreland; Mr Lagakos; Mr O'Donnell; Mr Berkhouwer; Mr Wedekind; Mr Contogeorgis (Commission) 244
14. *EAGGF appropriations — Report (Doc. 1-271/83) by Mr Gabert*
 Mr Gabert; Mr Martin; Mr von der Vring; Mr Marck; Mr Gérard Fuchs; Mrs Nikolaou; Mr Haferkamp (Commission) . . . 252
15. *Automobile industry — Report (Doc. 1-235/83) by Mr Veronesi*
 Mr Van Rompuy; Mr Purvis; Mr Pininfarina; Mr Veronesi; Mr Davignon (Commission) 256
16. *FAST — Report (Doc. 1-379/83) by Mr Normanton*
 Mrs Walz; Mr Petersen; Mr Rinsche; Mr Purvis; Mr Veronesi; Mr Davignon (Commission); Mr Beazley 258
17. *European scientific and technical strategy — Report (Doc. 1-382/83) by Mr Sälzer*
 Mr Sälzer; Mr Gautier 261
- Annex*
 Mr Adamou; Mr Maher; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Stella; Mr Kyrkos; Mr Maffre-Baugé; Mrs Théobald-Paoli; Mr Ephremedis; Mr Petersen; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mrs van Hemeldonck; Mrs Dury; Mr Adamou; Mr Kyrkos . . . 263

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

President

(The sitting was opened at 10.15 a. m.)

1. Approval of minutes

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

Are there any comments ?

Mr Kallias (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, I should like to make the following statement under Rule 67 of the Rules of Procedure.

The Member who spoke after me yesterday in the discussion on my question about the problems of young people implied that I felt that young people should follow their elders, whereas I in fact stressed the opposite — that we should come closer to young people and recognize that the initiative and responsibility for their future lies with them, but that they would benefit greatly from using as their raw material our experience and knowledge.

President. — We take note of your statement, Mr Kallias.

Mr Lalor (DEP). — On the minutes, Mr President, of Tuesday, on the communication from the President about the Bureau decision Mr Nord indicated in reply to Mr Klepsch that Rule 9 (4) did not apply in this particular case. The President said he would refer the matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. I know how difficult it is to do that overnight. But in view of the fact that the decision of the Bureau did not apply and that Rule 9 (4) was not the applicable rule, what has been the decision arising from the query put to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure ?

President. — I think we will have to come back to that question later on.

(Parliament approved the minutes)⁽¹⁾

2. Special part-session (decision)

President. — In accordance with what was decided yesterday we are now required to vote on the decision to hold an additional part-session on the afternoon of 29 June and the morning of 30 June to consider the six months of the German Presidency of the Council and the outcome of the European Council meeting in Stuttgart.

I have received five amendments to this motion. Unfortunately, on account of the very short time available, it has been impossible to have these amendments translated and distributed in all the languages. However, I feel that the urgency and importance of this matter are such that we may accept them.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* May I, on behalf of the Socialist Group, say how we stand on this issue. In principle we will be voting in favour of a special part-session sometime during June. However, we would like to make it absolutely clear that this development cannot be blamed on the Greek Government and for that matter, on the Greek Presidency, as some people did yesterday.

(Applause)

All the statements made yesterday to this effect bear the stamp of an antagonism which we in the Socialist Group repudiate. We hope that Greece, as a new Member State, will be successful in its term of presidency, not only in our interests but in its own as well.

(Sustained applause)

Secondly : we regret the fact that the normal procedure has not been followed, i.e. that the Council did not itself call for the special part-session as it could have done. We regret that very much. Normally, the statement should have been made on 8 June, and for the past six months we have been reckoning with that date.

We understand that there is a difference between the Presidency and the summit, and that the summit report can only be submitted at a later date. The report on the Presidency could, however, have come out on 8 June. It is, therefore, not the fault of Parliament that we now find ourselves in this situation ; the fault lies clearly with the Council of Ministers, or rather with the Presidency.

Thirdly : we believe that Parliament must try to ensure that a part-session is held as soon as possible after the summit conference. There is a feeling in my Group that it would have been much better if we had held a special part-session of Parliament immediately after the summit meeting. One suggestion, which was not adopted but which nevertheless got a very good reception, was to hold a special meeting of Parliament in Stuttgart immediately after the summit meeting, in order to draw attention to the importance of the situation. We were aware how difficult this would have been, but normally this would have been the proper reaction to the current situation in Europe.

It is our opinion that this should not be used to make the question of the seat a central issue again ; the Socialist Group is therefore, in favour of the special part-session being held here in Strasbourg. We have not yet come to a decision on the question put by Mr de la Malène as to whether it should be held on 29 and 30 of June.

⁽¹⁾ Documents received : see Minutes.

Arndt

We would welcome the opportunity, if it were given to us — at least I would myself, but I do not have any final agreement with my Group on this point — to hold the group meetings on the afternoon of 29 June and then to deal with the two points on the agenda on 30 June. My Group, however, has a free vote on this issue, as no final decision has yet been made. I personally would be in favour of this, so that the groups can be properly prepared.

(Applause)

President. — *(DE)* As to the points which you have made about the Presidency, I believe, that we are all agreed that a President is only President for the six months he is in office. That would solve the problem.

Mr Lagakos (S). — *(GR)* Mr President, I shall not take up much of the House's time. I agree completely with what Mr Arndt has said.

Mr Cottrell (ED). — Mr President, I would agree with the comments of Mr Arndt and Mr Lagakos. I do not think it is necessary for the House to have a discussion this morning on the reasons why the session became necessary or whether it was or was not the fault of the incoming Greek Presidency.

My complaint as a backbencher of this House is on the way in which we received this information last evening. It was presented to us, once again, as a Bureau *fait accompli*, and no matter how many protestations I have heard to the contrary, I do not believe that the Bureau intended to put this to the House for a vote. So I would like to think that what we have achieved at least is a democratic debate in this House as to what the purpose of this session is, what dates it should be held on and, indeed, where it should be held.

Mr President, you know I am always keen to help this House in its work. Therefore, I withdraw my amendment proposing that the special session should be held in Brussels. That, I think, will aid our work this morning. But I maintain my amendment that I do not believe this session should be held in any case.

Once again, may I urge you, Mr President, to note that it is a mistake to misjudge the backbenchers of this House. It is a mistake to come to us with decisions which the group leaders, the Bureau, the Vice-Presidents and the President have made in secret conclave. We do not wish to see white smoke going up the chimney when you decide whether to have a special session or not. Just come and ask us and we will give you our opinion on every occasion.

(Applause)

President. — Mr Cottrell, I do not quite understand. The enlarged Bureau informs the House of the proposals it makes concerning an extraordinary session. If there is no objection, we do not need to vote on it. If the House wants to vote on it, it can always do so. I

do not think a more democratic procedure than that is possible.

Mr Barbi (PPE). — *(IT)* Mr President, the Group of the European People's Party endorses what was just said by Mr Arndt on behalf of the Socialist Group concerning the rights and the responsibilities of the Greek Presidency. Be that as it may, we feel that it is a good idea to have an additional part-session and we shall be voting in favour of the additional part-session on 29 and 30 June.

Sir Fred Catherwood (ED). — Mr President, I am simply speaking on behalf of my group since it was a member of my group that raised the complaint. I entirely forgive this member of my group for raising the complaint; he was not present at the group meeting on Monday when we had an extensive discussion on it because he was in Bristol fighting for Britain's right to remain in the Community. Therefore we forgive him.

However, we did have a discussion on it when you first raised it in the Bureau. As the acting unpaid temporary chairman I consult my group about absolutely everything to be certain that I have their support. Therefore, we took a vote. We did support it, and the reason we support it is primarily that we appreciate the helpfulness of the German Presidency in changing the date of the Stuttgart Summit so that it did not coincide with our election campaign. Having changed it, it was impossible for us to hear from them before the Greek Presidency and therefore we entirely accept that we have inconvenienced them and they have inconvenienced us in this way. We are sorry to have caused this difficulty.

We are also quite clear that when the Greeks take over the presidency, they are entirely responsible and that it is quite inappropriate for some other country to come and make a statement during the Greek Presidency. We would like, together with our Socialist friends and everyone else, to wish the Greek Presidency all the best.

We are also extremely grateful to the Socialist group for agreeing to come back all the way from Madrid or some other happy place in order to have it at this particular time so that we can accommodate the Italians. Therefore the Italians are also accommodated. I think this is the correct time for the part-session and we entirely support it.

Mr Alexiadis (NI). — *(GR)* Mr President, I accept the extraordinary part-session if it is considered necessary for the report by the German Presidency. I reject it, however, if it represents an expression of no-confidence in the Greek Presidency.

Mr Spinelli (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, on behalf of the Italian Members of the Communist and Allies Group I wish to say that we are against convening this special part-session.

Spinelli

It is our view in fact that in spite of the British and Italian elections it was still possible in this June part-session to have a summing-up of the German Presidency and to discuss the Stuttgart summit, which is going to be held after this part-session and on which the Greek Presidency can easily report.

To avoid any misunderstandings, however, let me ask Mr Cottrell to withdraw the second part of his request, so that there is simply a request that the part-session not be held. I feel that there is no point in putting such a suggestion to the Greek Presidency. Also, we should like to have a split vote, on the understanding that we shall be voting against this part-session and we shall be voting against this request to the Greek Presidency about allowing the Presidency and so on, in view of the fact that the German Presidency has already intimated that it can give a summing-up in writing on its Presidency and as for Stuttgart — as I said — that is a job for the Greek Presidency.

Mrs Veil (L). — (FR) I am speaking on behalf of the Liberal Group, although with some reservations since our group is not unanimous on where we stand on this issue. We regret that there has been no opportunity to discuss the report on the German Presidency during this part-session. However, since we are hoping for a report on the European Council, some Members of our group will be voting for the holding of a special part-session, whereas others will be voting against since they believe that this is not the right time for it. I must add, however, that this must not create a precedent for the future, i.e. if the dates do not allow a report on the European Council during the Presidency in progress, it will be up to the new Presidency to draw it up.

(Applause)

Vote⁽¹⁾

Amendment No 1

Mr Cottrell (ED). — I am happy to accept Mr Spinelli's proposal that we simplify that amendment by terminating it at the point *that part-session should not be held*.

After the vote on the amendments

President. — The special part-session will therefore begin at 5 p.m. on Wednesday, 29 June. The groups can meet beforehand to work out their written proposals. The plenary sitting will be held from five o'clock until eight o'clock and will resume the following morning at ten o'clock.

Mr de la Malène (DEP). — (FR) In view of the votes which have just been expressed, I should like it to be quite clear that the Bureau will draw the right conclusions on behalf of the groups which because of

this decision are in a tricky position as regards their commitments. It must be quite clear, given the fact that the groups have commitments for the week in question, that the Bureau will have to bear in mind the repercussions of the vote which has been expressed.

President. — It goes without saying, Mr de la Malène, that we shall do everything we can to mitigate any inconvenience caused by this decision.

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — (FR) Just one question, Mr President. I should like to know when we shall have the statement by the President of the Council. Will it be on 29 or 30 June?

President. — I cannot say for certain yet but it stands to reason that the debate will begin with a statement by the President-in-Office of the Council. I have been told only that the President of the Council will speak on 30 June.

We shall have to set a deadline for the motions which will be tabled after the group meetings on the Wednesday. Shall we say 6 p.m.?⁽²⁾

Mr Wurtz (COM). — (FR) I am sorry for interrupting, Mr President, but I do not think we can let pass without a word the triple crime that was committed in South Africa at dawn this morning, with the hanging of three patriots which went ahead in spite of many appeals including some from the Council of Ministers of the Ten. I really feel, Mr President, that we need to make a solemn protest, especially as the prisons in Pretoria still contain many anti-apartheid fighters who could well meet the same fate as the three men who were murdered this morning.

President. — Thank you, Mr Wurtz. I was going to say something along the same lines myself. I feel that after the appeals by the Security Council and by the governments of the Ten the European Parliament should continue with its policy in this area.⁽³⁾

(Applause)

3. Topical and urgent debate

European Council

President. — The next item is the joint debate on four motions for resolutions:

— motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-397/83), tabled by Mr Irmer and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the deliberations of the European Council on the draft European Act;

⁽²⁾ Membership of committees: see Minutes.

⁽³⁾ Transfer of appropriations: see Minutes.

⁽¹⁾ See Annex.

President

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-407/83/corr.), tabled by Mr Barbi and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on the European Act;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-410/83), tabled by Mr Barbi and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr von Alemann and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Miss Hooper and Lord Douro on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Galluzzi and Mr Gouthier, to the European Council meeting in Stuttgart on the accession of Portugal and Spain to the EEC;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-405/83), tabled by Mr von Wogau and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on the European Council's mandate on the realization of the internal market.

Mr Irmer (L). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I ask for your support for Amendment No 2 to the motion for a resolution in Doc. 1-407/83/corr. and Amendment No 1 to Doc. 1-397/83. The wording of these two amendments is identical, and they have been tabled by Mr Hänsch on behalf of the Socialist Group, by Mr Barbi and Mr Croux on behalf of the PPE Group, and by myself on behalf of my own group.

It was unclear whether we would be discussing the question of the European Act once more before the Stuttgart summit conference. We are somewhat in danger of repeating ourselves here. We have in actual fact already stated what we are hoping for from this summit meeting. A large majority of us supported the Croux report on the European Act. We took a vote on that and adopted our respective positions. In the course of our work in the Committee on Institutional Affairs we made it clear what we, as the European Parliament, expect from the Council of Ministers and from the governments of the Member States.

There was, therefore, also the danger that by repeating this we would perhaps weaken Parliament's position.

In spite of this we have decided to table these motions for resolutions once again, because we believe that the summit meeting in Stuttgart will be one of the last chances for the Member States to show whether they take the constant appeals of this House seriously. We really do believe that time is fast running out.

What use is there in continually paying lip service to the European Community when, on the other hand, Member States and governments believe that they can divert attention from all the problems we are faced with — the economic crisis, the problem of unemployment and, in particular, youth unemployment — while looking for scapegoats and saying that the Community is to blame for all of this. On the one hand it does nothing. On the other hand it costs too much, and at home we do what we like without

finding the political will to tackle problems jointly — problems which can only be solved together. We believe that the time has really come, one year before the next direct elections, when all governments, all Member States, must say to themselves: let's finally do what needs to be done. Let us tackle together the problems which require a joint solution, and let us stop once and for all searching for alibis, running away from the real problems and doing nothing. What we need is some new impetus on the European scene. We must take a new effort. This is the appeal that we make to the governments of all Member States. It is not the fault of this Parliament if no more progress is being made in Europe. It is not even the responsibility of the Commission, although there is many a thing it can be criticized for; it is due to the lack of political will, to the lack of political force on the part of the Member States. The fault lies with the Council of Ministers.

I therefore, now, make one further urgent appeal: please decide once and for all in Stuttgart to implement what we have been putting to you for years in the European Parliament. Do not let us down, we who have always called for joint European action! Do something in Stuttgart! Decide on the proposals which we have been putting forward to you for so long.

If this does not happen, ladies and gentlemen, we will have to find more radical solutions. We simply cannot accept the Stuttgart summit conference ending in failure. If we then have this special part-session and if it should become clear to us that nothing has happened in Stuttgart, then we, the Parliament and Commission, must join forces to form a radical pact. Then we must look for ways to force the governments to finally take the action so indispensable to European unity, represents the only solution to our problems. We must then become much more radical and look for radical solutions, because in next year's elections we have to answer to our constituents. We cannot possibly stand there empty-handed. Proposals must come from here as to how we — Parliament and Commission — can exert joint pressure on the governments of the Member States to bring about the long-awaited breakthrough which is so urgently required.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, the question of the enlargement of the Community to the south has also much to do with how we see ourselves as Europeans. Are we only an association of grocers and book-keepers or are we a continent with a great tradition which includes a duty to the future of our people.

Habsburg

The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, one of the most prominent personalities in Europe, announced that her country had not joined the Community primarily for economic reasons but for reasons of external security. She is right, because politics and its aim of guaranteeing the security of our citizens is the justification for all that our electors have entrusted us with. Looking at it from this point of view only a blind man could fail to see that the Iberian Peninsula is vital to our security. What happens in the Mediterranean depends on their affiliation to one or other side. That is also the case for northern Europe. Some of the basic inspiration for our culture and political system originated in Spain and Portugal. They created present-day South America, as well as giving us great names in the fields of philosophy, literature, art and science. Our civilization would be considerably poorer without them. A European Community worthy of its name is unthinkable without Spain or Portugal.

For this reason we must not let purely material considerations, however important they may be, stand in the way of our security. There is a lot of truth in what the French say: 'Plaie d'argent n'est jamais mortelle'. It is, therefore, a question of political will according to the principle: where there is a will there is a way. Building Europe is a question of will, and the enlargement of the Community to the south will demonstrate whether we possess this will or whether we are just simply resigned to things.

That is the message of our appeal to the European Council in Stuttgart. The Council has the chance next week to show whether it is in fact still capable of doing something for Europe. On the same theme I would like to thank Mr Irmer for his strong words, which were long overdue. We are dealing here with a question of paramount importance — namely justice, European solidarity and, last but not least, the security of our people. I, therefore, urge that the request for urgent motion on the enlargement of the Community to the south be adopted by as large a majority as possible.

Mr von Wogau (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, we have very high expectations indeed of the Stuttgart summit. There is the Genscher-Colombo initiative, the questions of the Community's finances and the accession of Spain and Portugal, and the destruction of our forests. It is doubtful whether the level of expectation which has been set here, could ever be met by a summit of this kind. We urge that the Stuttgart summit should not be a time for solemn declarations; we want to see practical and tangible results for the peoples of the European Community.

I would like to draw attention to the fact — and this is also the reason behind our motion for a resolution — that the European Council in Copenhagen entrusted the Council of Ministers with very specific

tasks which should be adopted as a package by the end of June at the latest. Contained in it are practical proposals as to how the internal frontiers of the Community can be opened up, since it is simply unacceptable that we should be introducing the European passport in 1984 and then making border checks at the internal frontiers of the Community just as before; whilst 30-36 thousand millions are levied at these frontiers per year, despite the fact that we are a customs union whose frontiers are supposed to be open to persons, capital goods, and services.

If we take a good look at the task set by the European Council in December of last year and see what has been achieved, we find that exactly one-third of the proposals have been adopted, but two-thirds are still waiting for a decision. For this very reason we are hoping that the European summit in Stuttgart will set a definite target for adopting the decisions still on the table by the end of June; secondly, there should be another package of practical proposals next year dealing with the opening up of the Community's internal frontiers, so that we, as Members of the European Parliament can show the voters on the day of the European elections in 1984 that some real progress has been made in this area.

Lord Douro (ED). — Mr President, we are this morning discussing a number of very important issues prior to the summit meeting next week in Stuttgart.

The first resolution which we are considering, which was introduced by Mr Irmer, is signed by the Liberal Group, the EPP Group and the Socialist Group. I should perhaps explain why it was not signed by the European Democratic Group. We entirely support the thrust of the resolution and we support all the clauses in it, except that we have some reservations about Amendment No 2 which refers to the Croux report passed earlier this year.

As you know, the question of majority voting in the Council is a sensitive matter in the United Kingdom and many members of my group have serious reservations about doing away with the Luxembourg Compromise and the right of a particular Member State to use its veto in the Council. Because there are so few of my group present today, for obvious reasons, we unfortunately will feel compelled to abstain on this amendment. But I do wish to assure the House that in every other respect, other than the question of majority voting in the Council we entirely accept the thrust and the points made in that resolution.

Today, Mr President, there is a general election in the United Kingdom. At the start of the election campaign the British Labour Party made one of their main policies the withdrawal by the United Kingdom from the European Community if they were elected as the government. Both the Conservative Party and the Social Democratic/Liberal Alliance are committed to continued membership of the Community. The

Lord Douro

results of the general election, which we will know by tomorrow morning, are widely predicted to show an overwhelming victory for the Conservative Party. This will, at least for another five years, and I hope forever, remove any doubt about Britain's continued membership of the European Community.

(Applause)

The United Kingdom rightly remains concerned about the present structure of the Community budget and the unfair net contribution which we have to make on account of our small agricultural sector. We are hopeful that next week at the Stuttgart Summit there will be a commitment to further special measures to help Britain and also, and very importantly, a commitment to restructure the Community's finances so as to avoid the recurring British problem. Once that is behind us, and I hope it soon will be, it is clearly necessary for the Community to move forward again. That is why we so very much welcome the initiative taken by Mr Colombo and Mr Genscher. There is no doubt that a structure as complicated as the European Economic Community cannot make progress without the drive, determination and foresight of people like the present Foreign Ministers of Italy and of the Federal Republic of Germany.

We, therefore, do hope that next week in Stuttgart there will be a declaration on the European Act. As part of this initiative, it is essential that the European Parliament should play a greater role in the decision-making process. The people whom we represent expect us to have greater responsibilities; they expect us to have more control of the Commission; they expect us to have greater budgetary powers and they expect us to have to ratify all agreements between the Community and third countries. None of these advances in Parliament's powers step on the sovereignty of Member States: they are simply increases in democratic control of the way the European Community works.

Now, Mr President, I pass to the other subject introduced by Mr Habsburg, namely that of enlargement. It is now six years since the Republic of Portugal and the Kingdom of Spain applied for membership of the European Community. Serious negotiations have been going on for four years. Many chapters of the negotiations are completed and agreed. However, the most contentious of these still remain. It is true that many of the difficulties of the next enlargement arise because of the internal problems within the Community itself. Nevertheless, these internal difficulties are not a reason to delay any further the political decision to welcome these two applicant countries. There is a new socialist government in Spain and a new socialist coalition government in Portugal. Both these governments are as committed as their predecessors in wishing to join the Community. The Commission has said that the difficulties created by the next enlarge-

ment are not as great as many alarmists would have us believe. Therefore, my group joins with other groups in imploring the European Council in Stuttgart to instruct the Council of Foreign Ministers to conclude the negotiations speedily.

The German Presidency of the Council is about to end, the Greek Presidency will begin in July. Greece was brought into the Community comparatively quickly. I hope that during their period in the presidency they will do everything they can to carry forward the negotiations with Portugal and Spain.

Finally, Mr President, I would not like to sit down without referring to the resolution tabled by Mr von Wogau. Unfortunately, Mr de Ferranti, who normally is a colleague with Mr von Wogau in pushing for the improving of the internal market, is not here today. But I would like to say that my group entirely supports all that is contained in Mr von Wogau's resolution.

Mr Segre (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, after the sad spectacle we had with the failure of the Brussels summit the crisis and the paralysis in the Community have just got worse in the last few weeks. More than ever before Europe needs to make bold and sweeping decisions and the risk in this situation is that the work of European construction may go by the board and individual and national desires may triumph.

Of course we are not looking to Stuttgart for miracles. We are viewing the event with what might be called considered pessimism. We are well aware of what resistance there is to the enlargement of the Community and to the European Act. And we are also worried by what I could call the fallout from Williamsburg, by which I mean the further blow, with the uncontrolled rise of the dollar, to the hope for a Europe which can speak for itself and really combat unemployment and inflation.

We really feel it is necessary — as Mr Irmer was saying just now — for the European Parliament to remind the European Council in no uncertain terms of its responsibilities and of the tremendous blame — of momentous import one might say — it would have to bear if Stuttgart actually failed to provide some positive sign.

For these reasons the Italian Members of the Communist and Allies Group will vote in favour of both the motion for a resolution to the Council on the enlargement of the Community and the motion for a resolution by Mr Hänsch, Mr Barbi and Mr Irmer on the European Act.

Mr Galland (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, two minutes is not much, but it must suffice for me to say that my Group will vote in favour of the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Barbi, because honouring our commitments and the requirement — which is also an ideal — to encourage and

Galland

strengthen the new democracies is of the utmost importance to us. Of course this resolve does not make us unrealistic. We are aware that the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal poses problems to the member countries as well as the applicant countries. We are, in particular, aware of the fact that these are serious problems for the Mediterranean regions and crops of the Community.

Enlargement is a hope for all those who trust in democracy and an opportunity for the applicant countries. It should not, therefore, bring suffering on whole regions of the Community. But we maintain that, if the political will exists, solutions to economic problems can and will be found. Everyone knows these solutions, in particular the adoption of transitional periods, which is absolutely essential for the sensitive sectors. Moreover, if the Community spirit disappears to give way to selfishness, if every country wants to receive from the Community budget as much as it contributes to it, the increase in the Community's own resources is rejected, then the enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal could be jeopardized again.

Ladies and gentlemen, what is needed in Stuttgart, where we are inviting our governments to make a firm commitment to achieving this enlargement by 1 January 1985, at the latest, is political will, an acceptance of the political realities, positive moves on the budget question and a return to the real European spirit, for which generosity and solidarity are not empty words.

Mr Bonde (CDI). — (DA) Mr President, I should be grateful to the representatives of the Commission and Council if they could explain the difference between what they refer to on the one hand as the political and economic aspects of security policy and, on the other hand, any other aspects of security they might have in mind. In particular, I would be grateful for an assurance to the effect that the economic aspects of security which are now to be incorporated into the Stuttgart Declaration will not include the following nine specific points, and I would ask the representative of the Commission and Council to make some written notes so that we can receive an answer during this debate. Do the economic aspects include arms production? Do the economic aspects include trade in arms? Will the Stuttgart Declaration open up the possibility of establishing an arms agency proper? Can we now start discussing NATO questions? Can we now discuss issues in which Ireland's neutrality is called into question? Will it be possible in the future to grant appropriations for studies of defence problems, for example? Can we now discuss, for example, the deployment of nuclear missiles? Are questions of civil defence and, ninthly, and finally, coastal defence now matters which can be discussed by the Commission and the Foreign Ministers

meeting in the context of European Political Cooperation?

I should also like to raise a few questions regarding the role of the Commission. Will the Stuttgart Declaration mean that the Commission of the European Communities will be fully involved in all questions of foreign affairs and security policy and will hence be able, for example, to earmark funds for questions of this kind?

Finally, I should like to address a few questions to the Danish Conservatives, the representatives of the Left and the Central Democrats. Have you such confidence in your own ideas on the question of union as to dare to put the question before the Danish voters in the form of a referendum, before letting your Prime Minister and Foreign Minister go to Stuttgart and sign a declaration of union within the European Community? Dare you let the question get so far as a referendum or are you little sneaks who would not dare ask the opinion of the Danish electorate.

Tomorrow, the newspaper of the Danish People's Movement against the Community is publishing a report on a new opinion poll regarding Denmark's membership of the European Community and the attitude of the Danish voters to the idea of turning membership of the Community into a European Union proper with its own joint foreign and security policy. According to this opinion poll, a mere 10% of all the Danish voters — I repeat, 10% of the Danish voters — I repeat one in 10 of the Danish voters — are in favour of the declaration to be signed in Stuttgart two weeks hence. 10% of the voters are in favour of turning membership of the European Community into a Union proper with a joint foreign and security policy, and in the Danish Prime Minister's own party, i.e. the *Konservative Folkeparti* (Conservative People's Party), the party which can boast the most supporters for such a union in the whole of Denmark, — only 11,5% of the voters are in favour of turning Community cooperation into a union proper. Thus a mere one in eight of the Conservative voters in Denmark is in favour of the Union, and that is the party which has made most progress in gaining support for the plans for union, and I should therefore like to ask whether things have really gone so far as regards the protection of minorities in Denmark that no account whatsoever is being taken of the wishes of 90% of the population, which constitutes the vast majority of our electorate, when the Genscher-Colombo plan is involved, i.e. the proposal to turn Community cooperation into European Union proper?

Mr Jakobsen (PPE). — (DA) I should like to make a personal statement in connection with the questions which have just been raised and which were, after all, addressed directly to Danish Members, since I am sure I am the only member of my Government who is able to answer them. May I be permitted, Mr President, to make a very brief personal statement at this point?

President. — At the end of the debate, Mr Jakobsen.

Mr Hänsch (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group's support for the motions before us today represents one last urgent appeal to the governments gathered together at the European Council in Stuttgart, with special attention to two points: firstly to take a decisive step forward on the question of Portugal and Spain's accession to the European Community. It is unthinkable for this Community, which sees itself as furthering the cause of democracy in Europe, to keep these countries which have opted for democracy waiting at the door like beggars looking for alms. Now is the time to make some progress on this outstanding issue.

The second thing we would like to see is that this European Act or Solemn Declaration, or whatever one wants to call it, earns the respect and attention it is due. For this to be achieved it must contain a lot more than what we have heard up till now. If the Declaration or 'Act' was lacking in punch from the very beginning, then from what we have heard it has been gradually weakened even further, particularly as regards the role of our directly-elected Parliament.

We will not allow ourselves to be fobbed off with crumbs as far as our rights to a greater say are concerned. We would rather say no than vote for a declaration which means nothing more than a freezing of the present unsatisfactory situation for years. We demand that the solemn declaration should contain at least those points which were supported by a large majority in the vote on Mr Croux's report. Let us all, i.e. all the groups, make sure that at least those find expression in the European Act. We will not be able to vote for it, either, unless there is at least one hopeful passage with a clear indication that talks will continue in future amongst the Heads of Government and State and amongst the Governments of the Community on increasing Parliament's powers. Ladies and gentlemen, if Stuttgart fails then there will be a lot more damage caused than the loss of the prestige of one government. If Stuttgart fails, then the hopes of the 12 million unemployed in the Community and those of two democratic peoples awaiting accession to the Community will be dashed. Likewise, the hopes of this Parliament and its voters for a democratic parliamentary Europe of European peoples will be disappointed. Let this appeal of ours serve to prevent Stuttgart from being condemned to failure.

Mr M Martin (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, several groups have taken the initiative of appealing to the European Council to accelerate the admission of Spain and Portugal into the Community. Their move does not surprise us. Needless to say, we do not approve of it and shall be voting against their resolution. The ongoing debates on the regulations governing Mediterranean products, resources or institutions will not make us change our view.

Those very people who are most in favour of accelerating the process of enlargement show deeply entrenched selfishness in the defence of their interests. Their only motto for the applicant countries is: 'We are interested in your markets'. In opposing enlargement we are, of course, defending the interests of the workers and the economy of our regions, which would be sacrificed in a real war of the poor throughout the Mediterranean region to the benefit of the big concerns. But we know that we are also defending the interests of the people in the applicant countries.

The example of Greece since its entry into the Common Market must be a lesson to them. I urge them to reflect on a recent statement made by Mr Papandreou, according to which Greece's membership of the EEC is detrimental to that country's development prospects.

Enlargement will not take place on 1 January 1984 as envisaged. By helping to throw light on what is at stake and by pointing out the contradictions, we have contributed to this delay. We shall be relentless in our action. We will continue to alert the workers; wine growers, for example, will be interested to know that, in the Commission's communication to the Council on the agricultural question, it claims that 'wine does not pose any particular problem'.

The admission of Spain and Portugal into the EEC cannot help to solve our problems. It will certainly aggravate the difficulties and increase the contradictions. This is why we propose to replace the domination inherent in their admission with mutually advantageous and genuine cooperation which could be established right away through the renegotiation of the 1970 agreements.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, the Members of the Greek Communist Party will be voting against all four motions for resolutions.

We believe that today's debate in the European Parliament on the European Act should have first of all been held in the national parliaments, at least as far as Greece is concerned.

We consider it unacceptable that the Greek Government should have entered into this dangerous game of European Union without consulting the Greek people and the Greek Parliament. We consider it unacceptable that it should have ignored the warnings of our party. We consider it unacceptable that it should be preparing to accept at Stuttgart, a few days from now, new and major obligations to the detriment of the national sovereignty and independence of our country, and that it will be handing over constitutional and other responsibilities to the supranational institutions of the Community, thereby accepting a further 'subjugation' of our legislation to that of the Community.

Alavanos

This will even mean moving towards 'cooperation' on legal matters and matters of public order on the basis of authoritarian models already in existence in certain other Member States.

The Pasok Government inherited from the previous government a Treaty of Accession to an economic community. Now it is preparing to accept a widening of this treaty to one of accession to a political and military alliance closely linked to NATO. Is this in line with the popular mandate? Is this in line with the position of the Greek Government as regards holding a referendum on withdrawal from the EEC? Moreover, is this consistent with its various statements on respecting the national peculiarities of Greece? We call upon the government to distance itself once and for all from this unacceptable matter of European Union.

Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission. — (IT) Mr President, the position of the Commission with regard to the initiative by Mr Genscher and Mr Colombo is well known. This House has been informed of our position on numerous occasions by Mr Andriessen and at the recent meeting in Luxembourg between the Council and a Parliament delegation. It has always been the Commission view that the Genscher-Colombo initiative marks a first step in the right direction and should be encouraged.

Of course, it is not the job of the Commission to comment on matters of security and defence, which one of the speakers mentioned here in the debate. This opinion of the Commission is anyway more or less in line with what the authors of this initiative stated to you when they were presenting their plan.

The Commission's positive view does not apply only to the plan as it was outlined by its authors but also to the text which has come out of the talks at government level which have been going on for about a year and a half. The Commission — I might add — has always been a part of these talks and has always worked hard to see that they produce results which might indicate some real progress along the road to European union.

The Commission's positive view on the current draft declaration on European union presupposes that the restricted but significant reservations of certain Member States on some provisions have in fact been withdrawn.

As for the motion for a resolution concerning the enlargement of the Community, the Commission, which has played its due part in the accession negotiations, is well aware of the hope that has often been expressed in this Parliament, to the effect that the talks which have been dragging on with Spain and Portugal for more than four years now should at last produce a definite conclusion.

The Commission has often spoken during your debates on this matter. We have never made any secret of the obstacles and the difficulties but we have indicated what is to be done to keep the promises which the Member States and the entire Community gave to the people of Spain and Portugal. Since last year, in fact, there have been a number of breakthroughs on fairly important points in the talks.

The Council now has all the information regarding the problems which have to be solved on the social side of the agricultural and fishing sectors. In the case of agriculture, the Commission's initial proposals which date back to 1980 have in fact only just been amended in the light of further information we have obtained and of the concern voiced by those involved in this very tricky sector. Furthermore, a Commission proposal is already on the table with regard to Spain and the length of the transitional measures for the removal of tariffs within the Customs Union. Lastly, let me say that the Commission endorses entirely Parliament's appeal to the European Council.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The motion for a resolution tabled by Mr von Wogau and other Members of Parliament has the full support of the Commission. Only yesterday I had the opportunity to point out in my answer to Mr Cousté's oral question that it is the gradual removal of the individual administrative boundaries which must be seen as politically problematic. It is a cause of constant surprise how it was possible to draft the Treaties of Rome within the space of 24 months, but that there are still administrations and ministries in the Community which more than 24 years after the Treaties came into force, still apparently hesitate to start seriously with their implementation.

The kind of objections we face give me cause to point out that the creation of the internal European market is in principle an obligation of Member States under the Treaties. Its achievement is therefore not just something which depends on the policies of the individual ministries involved. This obligation also requires a Community-oriented attitude, just as is laid down in Article 5 of the Treaty.

Community-oriented attitude means a constructive attitude. The need for a constructive attitude does not permit the removal of frontiers to be abandoned because of alleged technical difficulties, but requires a joint search for practical solutions to common problems. If, for example, there is concern over tax and customs evasion, then common procedures — for example control statements — must be found in order to reduce these risks to an acceptable level.

The slow progress is even more surprising in view of the fact that the Heads of State and Government, for the first time in the history of their meetings, expressly instructed that the necessary decisions be made by a certain deadline. We therefore hope that

Narjes

the Heads of State and Government will reassert their authority in Stuttgart over the ministries and do everything necessary to overcome the entrenched interests of the administrative bastions.

Mr Jakobsen (PPE). — *(DA)* Mr President, I am sorry to have to speak again on this matter. I shall not go into the part of Mr Bonde's remarks intended for domestic consumption in Denmark, but I should not like Parliament to misunderstand attitudes in Denmark.

Mr Bonde is quite right in saying that only a few people in Denmark support the idea of European Union, but the reason is simply that people are not adequately informed about what is involved in the concept. The Danish Government is not in a position to take positive steps on this question, since it is clearly in a minority in the Danish Folketing on this matter, as on others. However, I can promise Parliament that I and many others who are in favour of union will do everything in our powers in the forthcoming year of campaigning to convince the people of Denmark that, if there is any country in Europe which would benefit from the major countries' taking a lead in preferring cooperation on a European basis rather than on the basis of national competition, it is a little country like Denmark. I am quite convinced that we shall convince large numbers of the people of Denmark that this is the course Denmark should also be following. As far as Mr Bonde's remarks about the referendum are concerned, he is barking up the wrong tree; as soon as something is brought up which involves the Danish Constitution, there must of course be a referendum, but in Denmark this is not something which is done every so often just for fun.

Thank you, Mr President, for this opportunity to state that Denmark will one day become involved in this joint cooperation. There are many of us — and their number is increasing — who want this union and this cooperation.

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote⁽¹⁾

ERDF

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-401/83) by Mr De Pasquale and others on the adoption of the new regulation for the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF).

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, please listen to me carefully and with understanding.

We started today's debate on urgent and topical matters at 10.45 a.m. This means that we lost half an hour on a matter which was admittedly extremely important. My fear is that this delay may mean that

we will be unable to discuss a number of questions which the House considered urgent. I would therefore ask you to extend the debate if necessary, and I am particularly interested in the motion tabled by the Communist Group on the mission of the International Red Cross to Iran.

Mr Dankert expressed his regret at the hangings in South Africa...

President. — Mr Alavanos, I understand what you mean, and my reply is that you are wasting even more time. We shall see how far we get.

Mr De Pasquale (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, it was three years ago that Parliament gave an almost unanimous opinion on the new regulation for the Regional Fund. Since then there has not been any action or any comment at all from the Council. Two years have passed and we have gone through four presidencies and they have all been full of promises which were never kept. And now that same promise we were relying on so much has again come to nothing.

I do not know how many times I have said it before but this is an attitude which is politically unacceptable. After a legislative proposal has been put forward by the Commission and after the European Parliament has given its opinion, the Council has no right to shelve the matter and it has no right to interrupt and thwart the legislative process laid down in the Treaty and in so doing make a fool of the other institutions.

In fact, when it comes to the Regional Fund, there is no way the Council should be allowed to create this legislative void by taking such an offhand attitude to its duty which is to review the current regulation. And remember, there was a definite deadline — 31 December 1980 — for this duty. The Council is obliged to take a decision. What does it want? Does it want to leave things as they are? Well, why don't they say so? And if the Council is ready to make some changes along the lines indicated by the Commission and Parliament, why does it not say what it accepts and what it rejects so that we can get started on the consultation procedure and so that we can get together and put an end to this matter?

Mr President, I am not going to waste time by going over the reasons for reforming the Fund again. I only want to say that the Regional Fund has been and is now a way of responding to the needs — yes, I know it has been piecemeal and inadequate — but nevertheless it has been a way of responding to the needs of the weakest parts of the Community and those which have been hardest hit by the crisis. If this response is still to be useful, there has to be a qualitative and quantitative development. We need more funds and the way we use them needs to be organized in a different fashion.

⁽¹⁾ See Annex.

De Pasquale

This being so, I cannot go along with Amendment No 3, by Mr von der Vring, who wants a large part of the Fund's commitment appropriations to be blocked until the new regulation has been adopted. This means going against the positions we have always held, it means putting a spoke in our own wheels because we are using our budgetary powers against ourselves and benefiting the people who want to see the Regional Fund go under.

What we want instead with this motion, which all the groups have signed, is that the Regional Fund be renewed and reinforced, and the necessary decisions have to be taken before the 1984 draft budget is presented, which means that there is no more time to lose. Let me call on the House, Mr President, for a favourable vote in the hope that the Council will listen to us even at this very late stage.

IN THE CHAIR : MR KLEPSCH

Vice-President

Mr von der Vring (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, the Council has been discussing this reform for over a year now. Two Presidencies have made really substantial efforts with a view to reaching a compromise, and there were also possibilities for dealing with, for example, Walloon regional problems, by extending the non-quota section. However, all these attempts came to nothing. We get the impression that the Council has recently gone back to square one as regards the proposal for a reform and the Commission is even thinking in terms of withdrawing it. However, I am strongly opposed to this idea. This is a further demonstration of the way the Council of Ministers is paralysing the Community. A year before the re-election of the European Parliament the Council is presenting the people of Europe and, in particular, the regions involved here, with the depressing picture of a Community which is incapable taking action, and this will affect us too. When we come to conduct our election campaigns next year, people will ask us what we can do about this situation, whether this is typical of Europe and if so, why they should bother electing a Parliament at all.

Today, therefore, we propose making use of the only means we have of wielding power, i.e. the budget, which is also why we have tabled Amendment No 3, which Mr De Pasquale as Chairman has unfortunately spoken against, even though he must realise that there is no way we can change anything if we always knuckle under to the Council. After all, we are not going to use Chapter 100 — which we have already used in the past — in such a way as to prevent the Italians getting their hands on the money. Parliament has shown on various occasions that this instrument is very flexible and quite apart from that, there was no question, in the proposal, of blocking all the appropriations, but merely part of the regional fund. Mr Giol-

itti, if the Commission plays its cards right together with the Committee on Budgets of this Parliament, it will be those governments who say 'no' in Council who will have to account for themselves and not those who say 'yes'. You can count on this. I can also assure you that the Committee on Budgets does not intend to get up to any mischief in this respect, and I hope you will support our proposals.

Mrs Boot (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, one of the fields which has been particularly hard-hit by the current economic recession is that of employment and our group has repeatedly stressed that we must pull out all the stops to do something about this problem. The European Regional Fund is one way of promoting productive investment and the revision of the Fund will make it possible to stimulate the small and medium-sized undertakings too.

It is high time the Council made some decisions, since the Commission proposals have been before it for some two years now. Parliament too wasted no time and, broadly speaking, supported the proposals as steps in the right direction. However, if the Council remains divided, we will have to look for a solution on the basis of Parliament's opinion. This Parliament is in favour of a European approach to structural regional problems. Europe is in urgent need of structural adjustments in the light of altered circumstances.

As regards the main proposals, such as the geographical concentration of the ERDF on the most backward regions which are particularly suffering from the effects of the decline of industry, the Heads of State and Government reached agreement as long ago as December 1981 at the European Council in London, as has also been stressed on several occasions in this House by the Council and the Commission. In January, at the beginning of the German Presidency, Parliament unanimously called for a Council decision on the review of the Regional Fund to be reached before 30 June. Today we have come up with a new motion for a resolution giving the Council a few extra weeks and asking it finally to get round to deciding before the draft budget for 1984 is adopted, i.e. by 2 July.

The Christian-Democratic Group supports Amendment No 3 by Mr van der Vring since we also feel that this Parliament's budgetary powers could be used to bring pressure to bear on the Council of Ministers for a genuine European approach to the problems.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, the European Democratic Group welcomes the tabling of this urgent motion. There are literally only weeks left if we are to be able to incorporate in the 1984 budget anything significant related to it. We will not say more about the implications for our own elections in 1984. In places like Scotland which I represent the European Regional Development Fund is a very important consideration.

Purvis

The Fund has to be flexible. It has to be an arm of European economic policy rather than purely a financial mechanism. We cannot allow what is a European policy to be hijacked by national governments as an arm of their own individual policies. If it is going to be flexible, it cannot be strait-jacketed by rigid criteria, whether geographic or sectoral. We with our experience of its application in Scotland would like to see it much more responsive to localized problems; to be able to be pin-pointed on the restructuring of the European economy that is going on at the moment which may hit anywhere at any time. We support, therefore, the Regional Fund, but it must be responsive to the changing circumstances.

We are happy with Amendments Nos 1 and 2 which point an accusing finger at the Council, but we are less willing to go along with the extreme position in Amendments Nos 3 and 4 seeking to block funds. We do not see this as being particularly responsible. We see it as more likely to kick an own-goal than to have any real effect on the outcome. So we will do everything we can to urge our governments to take a constructive and positive view and to get this decision through quickly. But we feel that threats by this Parliament to do things that it probably will not ultimately fulfil will only show a hollowness which could rebound to our disadvantage; and not just to our disadvantage but to the disadvantage of the disadvantaged in our European Community.

Mr Damette (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, the French Communist and Allies Group will vote against this motion for a resolution because they are opposed to the very thrust of the proposals to which it refers, and they feel that it is normal and positive for the Council to reject the proposal from the Commission.

To be more precise, we had the opportunity to say during the debate on the reform of the Regional Fund that the proposal from the Commission was unacceptable to France. It goes without saying that the French Government cannot but reject it; moreover, it is not alone in doing so.

But that raises a more basic question. We are of the opinion that the Commission is not complying with the spirit of the Treaties in proposing lopsided policies that are in reality intended to solve indirectly the British contribution problem. The new regulation submitted to us does not have much to do with regional problems; rather, it uses these problems as a pretext to carry out inter-State transfers to the detriment of France.

By proceeding in this manner the Commission is exceeding its powers and, in our opinion, misrepresenting the spirit of the European Community.

We also deplore the fact that our House is behaving like a lobby set up to support the initiatives of the Commission and, in particular, those that are most

questionable. We shall obviously be faced with a similar problem when dealing with the reform of the Social Fund, which is equally unacceptable.

It is nevertheless annoying to note this obstinacy in continuing in the wrong direction, an obstinacy which does not enhance the authority of our House. This is why we totally support the French Government in its refusal to accept the unacceptable, and we expect the Commission to prepare reasonable proposals, because that would certainly be the best way of making Europe credible.

Mr Cecovini (L). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a two-year wait for the new ERDF regulation really is impossibly long. You cannot play around with these matters. Regional policy could well rank second as a European policy after the agricultural policy. It is very important because the direct action of the Regional Development Fund contributes to the policy of convergence which is practically an essential element for the construction of Europe. It is also a way of combating the crisis, especially in the border areas, and here I am thinking of Friuli-Venezia-Giulia.

It is vital for the new regulation to institutionalize the integrated operations in the border areas. On his way to Trieste via Austria Mr Bangemann — this is a practical example — found a queue of cars 12 kilometres long at the border. He gave up and tried to get into Italy through Yugoslavia and at the border there he had to wait for four hours. This meant that he missed the European event that was being held in Trieste. These bottlenecks are just the kind of thing that can be dealt with by means of the integrated operations.

That is why we think this motion for a resolution ought to be approved. We shall vote in favour of Amendments Nos 1 and 2 but we are absolutely against Amendment No 3 and so the same goes for No 4. Amendment No 3 seeks to block the Regional Development Fund in order to force the Council to do its duty. You know, this is just like cutting off your nose to spite your face. But there is no way the Regional Fund is going to be disfigured. That is why we feel that Amendments Nos 3 and 4 should be rejected.

Mr Flanagan (DEP). — Mr President, one of the reasons why the people in the north-west of Ireland voted so strongly to join the European Community was their belief that the Regional Fund would be operated in accordance with the ideals expressed in the Treaty of Rome. It has not worked out that way. I can understand the attitude of Mr von der Vring who feels that the entire thing should be stopped rather than go ahead as something meaningless. So unlike Mr Cecovini, I think that the attitude on all sides of the House is consistent. We are expressing in different ways our dissatisfaction with the institutions because of their failure to carry out an effective regional policy.

Flanagan

I will make one suggestion, namely that to make the operation on the Fund meaningful to the people who need it, the funds involved should be channelled directly through the local authorities involved. In that way the money being spent would be seen to be spent by and on behalf of the people for whom it is intended. That, of course, is a proposal which will be resisted by the governments involved. But it is one that I believe goes to the root of the problem being expressed in different ways by the Members of Parliament today, namely, the fact that the money, adequate or inadequate, is not seen to be spent in accordance with the intention of the Treaty to help the people most needing help.

From that point of view I think that the criticism of the Council is soundly-based and I think that if the Commission and the Members of Parliament were to get together a bit more strongly and confront the Council more often, then the dreams that we had about the Regional Fund might begin to become a reality some time.

Mrs Fuillet (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the urgency of the new ERDF regulation is now more than a necessity.

Two years have elapsed, and the Council has still not adopted the new regulation. A very long time ago, I personally tabled a motion that was moreover, adopted by Parliament on the Council's slowness to take decisions on reports. The said resolution was sent to the committee responsible but, since then, nothing has been done about it.

Today's resolution is clear proof that our whole system can be clogged up. For the Committee on Regional Policy to survive, it is indeed necessary to adopt the resolution on urgency, so that the committee can draw up its 1984 budget.

I recall that, because of this situation, it was very difficult to draw up the 1983 budget, and as the rapporteur of the Committee on Budgets, I suffered much at that time. Ladies and gentlemen, it therefore seems to me absolutely essential to know the present stage of the negotiations going on in the Council. It is this budgetary game which tends to discredit the Committee on Regional Policy in our Parliament. Nothing is worse than uncertainty and even if the Council takes a decision contrary to the view of Parliament, it can do so, but it must make its decision known. In that case we shall at least be informed. Without illusions we shall then, like Penelope, pluck up courage, because we shall have been convinced, ladies and gentlemen, that the Committee on Regional Policy has a role to play, an important role in reducing unemployment, a role that will make every European feel a little more European in his region. I am therefore saying that it is really necessary for the Council to take a decision forthwith for we can no longer afford to remain in uncertainty.

In another connection, I must add that last year I was not in favour of the scanty heading 100 of the budget. My stance this time is the same.

Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission. — *(IT)* Mr President, a very brief reply, on just two points. First of all, on behalf of the Commission, let me say how grateful we are to the chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, to all the members of the Committee and to the whole House which has generally been dogged and resolute and — as we have seen today — forceful as well in supporting the Commission proposals for a new regulation for the European Regional Development Fund. As is happening again today, Parliament has always strongly urged the Council to take a decision on these proposals which are needed for what the Council is always asking us to achieve: efficient and effective use of these funds as a way of contributing to the harmonious economic development of the Community. I am happy with this motion for a resolution which the Commission welcomes — let me say this again — as another demonstration of the full support for the proposals which we submitted to the Council and Parliament almost two years ago.

A second brief point, concerning Mr von der Vring's amendment which was mentioned by a number of speakers. I fully understand what the authors of this amendment had in mind and I understand the reasons which prompt them to use this way of putting pressure on the Council. In my capacity as the Commissioner responsible for the Regional Fund, however, I must say — and this is a remark directed at all the groups — that the approval of this amendment would really hinder the operation of the Fund and put a brake on it. The end result, therefore, would be the exact opposite of what is wanted, because the ones to suffer would be the regions and countries which benefit most from the Fund and which, of course, are the ones which are most enthusiastic about the Commission proposals in the Council circles. These are the ones that are going to suffer if a brake is put on the Fund's operation. The people in the Council who are hindering the Commission proposals are quite happy and in fact they are encouraged in their attitude because they are also achieving another result, which is that they are slowing down Regional Fund expenditure. I am making this point because I feel I am duty bound to point it out.

Mr von der Vring (S). — *(DE)* Mr Giolitti, anyone who knows something about Parliament's tactics and how it exerts pressure would ask the Commissioner — you have used this instrument once before — if he can accuse Parliament of ever using this idea of blocking appropriations to hurt any particular country which needed money.

(Applause from various quarters)

Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission. — (IT) I am not reproaching anyone. I am simply pointing out what the consequences might be. I am not reproaching anyone for similar action in the past. I am just saying that in this instance the result will be what I described. The Commission will of course take note of Parliament's decisions and will fall in line with these decisions but the inevitable result — because this is where it leads — will be a slowing down in the financial operations of the Fund.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote (1)

Commerce and craft industries

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-399/83), tabled by Mr Deleau and Mr Remilly on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the situation of commerce and craft industries in the Community.

Mr Remilly (DEP). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to have the opportunity, within the scope of this urgent debate, to deal with the problems related to commerce and the craft industries in the Community at a moment when the crisis is beginning to seriously affect this sector of activity.

The most recent economic pointers show in fact firms having to close down, a decline in incomes and — a new and alarming fact for the year 1983 — almost all undertakings dealing in wholesale or retail distribution and the craft industries will not create jobs; they will not invest, and, in the case of France, for example, 50 000 jobs may be lost.

It is imperative to take measures right now to cope with this situation, because commerce and the crafts, which employ over 15 million people, or one-third of the workforce of all the small and medium-sized enterprises in the Community and 15 % of the working population, are an important sector of economic activity in which small and medium-sized enterprises play a leading role, since they are responsible for 70% of the turnover. As a considerable economic force, commerce and the crafts are also an essential social tool for the protection of jobs and the maintenance of the social fabric by giving life to the towns, serving the rural populations and satisfying the various categories of consumers, for example, the aged and the handicapped who are served by nearby shops.

(1) See Annex.

It is also necessary to take measures because this economic force has so far been neglected in Community policies. Commerce and the craft industries are not covered by any specific Community action, although they are victims of the slow-down in consumption and the lack of interest on the part of public authorities. Is it necessary to recall that the only informal meeting of Ministers of Trade, on 11 May 1979, in Paris, remained a dead letter?

These measures are, once more necessary because any action by Parliament to help commerce and the craft industries will be perfectly in line with these priorities, whether as part of the fight against unemployment, the year of the SMU and crafts, or the guidelines for the 1984 budget, in which the need to continue with efforts to create employment through economic as well as human aid to investment has been acknowledged.

What then should be done? A better knowledge of European commerce is the indispensable prerequisite for any Community action. This is why we propose that, first, the Commission and the Council should make commerce and the crafts one of their priorities and then, in collaboration with the Member States, harmonized, complete and regular Community statistics should be compiled.

In our view, this is the necessary first step towards any Community consideration of this sector and action to help it.

For lack of time, I cannot go into the details of the proposals contained in my resolution. I will nevertheless emphasize the need to help the SMU's in commerce and the crafts to adapt to technological and economic changes and to make it easier for them to obtain loans and investments. Lastly, I would underscore the interdependence between commerce and industry, for it is not enough to produce, it is also necessary to market and sell. On this score, the Community needs a suitable modern system of commerce which can contribute towards the creation of a wide unified domestic market of over 250 million consumers.

Commerce and the craft industries are an important economic and social asset for the Community which we can today no longer afford to overlook, but which we should instead develop, so that in future, confronted with an increasingly technical organization of everyone's life, we can preserve a European society with a human face, a society that can best be guaranteed by shopkeepers and craftsmen.

Mr Notenboom (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, we are very grateful to Mr Remilly and Mr Deleau for this resolution. This is not a resolution which calls for detailed study, it merely reflects the climate at the present moment. It is a resolution which — in the middle of the Year of the Small and Medium-sized Undertakings — is intended to stress certain points

Notenboom

which often take a back seat. On the many occasions when the Members of this Parliament quite rightly applaud measures to promote small and medium-sized undertakings, many people nevertheless still think in terms of undertakings, industrial establishments and other businesses employing 200, 300, 400 or 500 persons. Undertakings of this scale do indeed come under the heading of small or medium-sized undertakings according to the European definition and it is quite right that we should devote our attention to them. However, when they hear the phrase 'small number of workers', very few people will think of the category which Mr Deleau and Mr Remilly have in mind here, i.e. the smallest undertakings of all. Obviously, most of the policy which affects them is in the hands of the national governments, but nevertheless European policy also contains elements which justify or even necessitate our taking a special look for once at these undertakings. Planning is still carried out at national level, including planning involving shops. However, how many small shopkeepers have been ruined by plans — often backed up by substantial state aid — for supermarkets which appear to be the things of the future. And where are they? In many cases they have gone under taking the little shopkeepers with them. Where is the human touch the direct relationship between business and the consumer: young consumers, older consumers, the infirm consumers and travelers? This element is responsible for a very important aspect of what I might call European climate. We are pleased therefore that this emphasis has been made and we should wait until a later date to see what other points need further attention, for which there is no time today.

I should also like to draw Mr Narjes' attention to an aspect which is not mentioned in the resolution — although I did not feel it was necessary to table an amendment in this respect. I should like to ask the Commission not to be over-hasty in intervening on questions of competition policy in cases where a hundred or so of the very smallest businesses form a cooperative, which taken as a whole is still much smaller than a large-scale undertaking, and not to immediately treat such an association as a cartel — since, after all, a cooperative of this kind would have no effects whatsoever outside the national borders — and not flatten it with the theoretical hammer of competition policy. Your colleague and my good friend, Mr Frans Andriessen, whose policy I generally speaking very much support, will know quite well what I mean. I think the Commission's competition policy should also work on the principle that even if the very smallest businesses form cartels, this need by no means imply a position of power — all it means is that if they get together they can go some small way to escaping from the total vulnerability which is often their fate in view of their size if they try to go it alone. I just wanted to add this point and I am confident that Mr Remilly personally goes along with this view too.

Mr Newton Dunn (ED). — Mr President, the European Democrats, like the other groups here, are in favour of helping small industries, in particular craft industries. I hope Mr Remilly will not take it amiss if some of my remarks are critical of his motion, because we, of course, support the principle behind it.

First of all, I think it is wrong that this is being treated under urgent procedure, because there are no real reasons for urgent procedure within the motion, except, of course, that everything we discuss in this House is urgent in the sense that we want everything done as soon as possible. I think it would have been much better if it had gone to a committee, Mr President. My specific complaints are the following.

Paragraph 7 calls on the Commission to give a precise Community definition of craft undertakings. I believe that is completely impossible. How can you define precisely what a craft undertaking is? We cannot get a precise definition of what a small business is in this Community, and I am sure we shall not get one on crafts either.

Paragraph 13, calls for the setting up of a working party within the relevant parliamentary committee. I think it is wrong that we should commit Parliament to doing that in this somewhat empty Chamber this morning.

My main complaint concerns paragraph 8, which calls for complete and uniform statistics on craft industries. Mr President, this is very important, and it is a very wrong thing to call for. The one thing that small industries and craft industries do not want is more bureaucracy and more form filling, saying we exist, this is our size, this is our turnover and so on. They want to be left alone to get on with their work. We are quite wrong to call for detailed statistics on them. It will hinder them and not help them.

When the Commissioner sums up this debate, I hope that, while taking to heart, as Mr Notenboom said, the principle behind this motion that we want to help craft industries, he will not take too seriously some of the details within the motion and that when he reads them he will take them with a pinch of salt.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The Commission thanks Parliament and in particular Mr Remilly and Mr Deleau for this motion for a resolution. In view of the importance of commerce within the Community, which is a quantitative indicator of economic life in the Community and which, from the qualitative point of view, is even more important than it would appear from the quantitative data, the Commission can only welcome the fact that this subject has been brought up once more in this House by means of this motion for a resolution. Commerce is not only the primary tool for the construction of the Community and the development of intra-Community trade, but also the primary beneficiary. In

Narjes

addition it provides the indispensable link between the quantitative and qualitative developments in demand and the producer.

Thus any action on the part of the Community to protect and strengthen the internal market as a legal, economic and political basis for the Community, is also an action in the interests of commerce. The Commission has always attached importance to the advice and help of the various groups in commerce which are based on extensive experience and, in particular, a thorough knowledge of the markets. On an occasion in the past when there were difficulties in connection with setting up an association at European level, the Commission saw to it that the dialogue could be continued, by setting up a committee on trade and distribution composed of 42 heads of undertakings in the various sectors of commerce.

This Committee, which was initially headed by the Commission and its departments, has proved its worth.

The information and opinions forwarded to the Commission by its working parties have been a valuable aid to us in our work, during the textiles negotiations, for example, or the preparatory work for simplifying border formalities.

The members of this Committee — most of whom, incidentally, are to be reappointed in the same functions on 31 August, whereby continuity in the deliberations is ensured — now wish for greater autonomy in the committee's work. We respect this wish and, for this reason, are currently revising the rules of procedure in the light of this new approach, which will give the Chairman elected by the Committee a decisive role to play. This new arrangement has not yet come into force but must first of all be adopted by the Committee itself in its new form.

The European Parliament's action for intensive monitoring of the Committee meetings and the funds earmarked for this purpose together with the related blocking of funds which would otherwise have been available have quite frankly made the work of the Committee substantially more difficult. In view of the extremely limited funds available, committees involved with institutional problems were inevitably given priority over meetings of committees of a more advisory nature which unfortunately had to be postponed. These latter committees included the Committee on trade and distribution and its Working Parties as well as the corresponding working parties of national experts which in view of its shortage of staff, the Commission cannot do without if it wishes to carry out detailed work on the problems affecting commerce and craft industries.

The motion for resolution, which to a great extent falls in with the Commission's thinking on this subject, is addressed not only to the Commission, but

also to the Council and the Governments of the Member States, all of which are obviously competent in matters concerning trade in very different very much interrelated ways. As regards the practical implementation of the measures called for in the motion for a resolution, which come within the competency of the Commission or which call for an initiative on the part of the Commission if they are to be put into practice, we feel that the abovementioned Committee should first of all be consulted so that we can assess the scope of these activities on the basis of the expert opinions of this Committee and subsequently decide on our priorities. As regards the questions to be dealt with, these will certainly include the definitions, which have been such a point of contention, the problems, of statistics and various other issues which may well include the 'hammer of competition policy' mentioned by Mr Notenboom.

I should like to say incidentally, if I may, that I feel the legal aspects could well have been given a little more constructive attention since central purchasing by trade undertakings which have formed an association should not in principle be forbidden. There are ways of arriving at constructive solutions and, as I see it, extremely useful work could be done. Finally, I should like to point out that in this Year of the SMU and Crafts, commerce and craft industries have found their place — which you have rightly stressed — and made their mark via the activities you call for.

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote⁽¹⁾**Aid for the Palestinian refugees*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-402/83), tabled by Mr Barbi and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on an aid programme for the Palestinian refugees.

Mr d'Ormesson (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, the endless war that has been going on for the last seven years in Lebanon leaves Palestinian refugees, who since 1949 have been welcome in this land of refuge, very often in a state of dire need.

Our motion for a resolution aims at enlisting the support of the Community to remedy the situation. My Group considers the motion appropriate especially as the peace preliminaries have been signed between Israel and Lebanon and since it is advisable to encourage the evacuation of all foreign troops stationed on Lebanese territory, whether they be Syrian, PLO or Israeli. The restoration of the buildings damaged since 1975 is also deemed necessary.

⁽¹⁾ See Annex.

d'Ormesson

But genuine peace starts by the systematic destruction of all the weapons of its enemies. One of the weapons that promotes war is poverty. Consequently, is it not by helping the displaced people suffering from it to enjoy decent living conditions once more and, thereby, peace of heart and mind, that we can best prevent war?

May I add that we shall accept the amendments tabled by both Lord Douro and Mr Hänsch, but I am afraid Mr Hänsch's may be replaced by Lord Douro's. I will leave the rest of my speaking time to my colleague and friend, Mr Blumenfeld.

Mr Schmid (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in principle the Socialist Group supports the proposal for aid for the Palestinian refugees. It is a good thing, we think, that the Community should undertake to go beyond what has been possible in the past as regards aid in the framework of the United Nations and anyone who has seen Palestinian refugee camps as I have, will understand our support for this proposal. We also feel that those who object that the Community would thereby be financing the consequences of a war in which it was not involved should disregard this aspect in view of the more important consideration involved. However, we want to ensure that this aid is for the Lebanese government and that the money in fact gets to where it belongs and does not end up anywhere else — particularly in the hands of the Israeli troops who are still occupying South Lebanon.

Social integration — which is mentioned in the motion for a resolution — means, as we see it, making conditions easier for people and guaranteeing young people access to education. It does not mean supporting the idea of a permanent settlement on Lebanese territory and can under no circumstances mean a substitute for or a denial of the rights of the Palestinians to self-determination and everything we mean by a homeland or a State. We will therefore vote in favour of Amendment No 2 and, if Amendment No 1 is to be taken as the basis, I would request a separate vote to be held on Recital C.

Mr Nordmann (L). — *(FR)* Mr President, I am speaking in support of the text of the motion, a motion which is bold and realistic. In order to keep up pressure it is, in fact, important for Europe to play an active part in this matter, even if it does not have direct responsibilities as regards the situation of the Palestinian refugees and although the responsibility of the Arab States in this respect seems to be so obvious, in the light of the 1948 appeals to leave and their persistent refusal since then to integrate these refugees.

In this connection, recent events have shown that there is no feeling of solidarity on the part of Arab States towards Palestinian refugees.

It is therefore necessary for Europe to mitigate the consequences of this indifference by taking humanitarian action. Such action must be free of political demagoguery. This implies that we have to be very watchful about what is done by the United Nations, whose failure in the management of the funds allocated to it and the very content of its programme of action is resounding. Mention of suitable teaching material in the motion seems appropriate because, as recent television reporting has shown, the United Nations action in this field has more often been one of anti-Jewish and anti-European indoctrination. It is therefore important for Europe to come and take over. We approve of humanitarian aid but reject masochistic aid.

(Applause from the right)

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, the Commission shares the concern expressed in the motion for a resolution. As you know, we have for some time now been trying to take account of the difficult situation of the Palestinian and other refugees in the Lebanon and will continue to do so. Since 1972, the Community has, under the agreement with the United Nations Refugee Fund, provided some USD 200 million worth of food aid and financial aid in addition to the bilateral aid provided by the individual Member States. Furthermore, since the events of June 1982 21 million ECU have been provided primarily for the benefit of Palestinian refugees, under special programmes. On top of this, we have provided financial aid for a series of projects by non-governmental bodies for the benefit of Palestinian refugees.

Taken as a whole, these figures show the extent of the aid already provided by the Community, which it intends to continue. We will look into the question of how we can step up this aid on the basis of the funds available. As I have already said, a substantial proportion of the aid has been provided through the United Nations — indeed, since 1972 we have been one of the major contributors to these United Nations aid programmes. However, this organization only to a limited extent is responsible for refugees not living in refugee camps. My colleague, Mr Pisani discussed this question here in Parliament during Question Time last April and, as he said on that occasion, the Community is making its contribution towards alleviating the difficulties in this area by means of medical care, food aid and other appropriate measures.

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote⁽¹⁾

Amendment No 1

Lord Douro (ED). — Mr President, I just wanted to make it clear that Amendment No 1, tabled in my

⁽¹⁾ See Annex.

Lord Douro

name, is the result of a meeting between the coordinators of the groups. It was meant to be a joint amendment and it is not in any way meant to detract from the fact that this was an initiative by the European People's Party and the credit for this resolution belongs entirely to that party.

President. — For the sake of accuracy I should have announced that Amendment No 1 was tabled by Lord Douro on behalf of the European Democratic Group and by Mr Barbi, Mr Blumenfeld and Mr d'Ormesson on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party.

After the adoption of Amendment No 1

Mr Schmid (S). — (DE) Earlier, Mr President, I expressly requested a separate vote on Recital C. Can it be done again because we do not want to vote for Recital C?

President. — I shall be happy to grant your earlier request, Mr Schmid, so that it can be recorded in the Minutes.

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — (FR) Mr President, you have just said that once Lord Douro's amendment has been more or less accepted there is no reason for the others. I should like to point out however — and Lord Douro said so himself — that this amendment is simply a façade. There is some disagreement in his group about signing the motion for a resolution by Mr Barbi and his colleagues. Lord Douro has found a way of going along with the motion for a resolution but there is no way — and there have been precedents in this House — that he can get rid of the other amendments. The point is that when we tabled our amendments we had no way of knowing that he was going to submit this text. This means that the amendments which we tabled and which Mr Hänsch tabled have to be thought of as amendments which need to be put to the vote, because they are amendments to the new text.

President. — I cannot help you, Mr Chambeiron. The only thing I can do is to grant the request by Mr Schmid. Amendment No 1 makes it clear that the resolution has a new form, which is what we have just adopted. Mr Schmid took this into consideration when he spoke. There is nothing else I can do.

I should now like to accede to Mr Schmid's request and put Recital C of Amendment No 1 to the vote separately.

After the vote on Recital C

Mr Hänsch (S). — (DE) It is true, Mr President, that Lord Douro's amendment seeks to replace the whole text. You will not have failed to notice, however, that the text still has three recitals and three paragraphs

and is the same apart from just five words. This means that you cannot think of this as a text which seeks to replace the whole of the other motion but it has to be considered in the same way as the amendments which were tabled by other Members.

President. — We have just done that, Mr Hänsch. Mr Schmid saw how things were going and rightly requested a separate vote on Recital C. Both your amendment and the amendment by Mr Piquet refer to Recital C and there was a separate vote on these.

You could have rejected them. I cannot proceed except in the way I have stated. I cannot repeat the whole vote.

Mr Chambeiron (COM). — (FR) You ought to put the amendments to the vote because you know full well that what Lord Douro tabled is not a real amendment and that our amendments ought to be related to his text.

President. — I have no idea what you are talking about, Mr Chambeiron. As requested, we have voted on Recital C and this recital has been incorporated in the version proposed in Amendment No 1. The other amendments are therefore not valid.

Mr Hänsch (S). — (DE) I do not want to go over the vote again, Mr President. You are quite right in saying that the vote has been taken and that a decision has been made. I should simply like you in your capacity as President to explain to us whether we can regard an amendment in which just five words are changed as an amendment seeking to replace the whole text. There has to be a proper ruling on this, Mr President, and I should like you to see to it that we get one.

President. — I am quite happy to grant your request, Mr Hänsch. I can even tell you that the matter has already been referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. It is just that they have not yet come up with a ruling. I hope we get one soon and then we shall proceed in the way the committee suggests. To conclude the discussion of this matter, let me simply repeat that this question which has been raised has been referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions for a ruling.

Lord Douro (ED). — Mr President, naturally I entirely support your ruling. May I just point out, in support of what you have just said, that none of this might have arisen if it had not been for the fact that at a coordinators' meeting yesterday morning, as I have already explained to the House, it was agreed among all the political groups that we would support a joint text. Subsequently certain groups were unable to fulfil that commitment and that is why the difficulty has arisen. I entirely support your ruling.

EC and Israel

President. — The next item is the motion for a Resolution (Doc. 1-403/83) tabled by Mr Barbi and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on the unfreezing of the financial relations between the European Community and the State of Israel.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, in June 1982, the Commission and Council decided to suspend both the talks provided for under the financial protocol between the Community and Israel and a European Investment Bank contribution of 200 million ECU in view of the armed conflict in that area, although legally speaking this is obviously a moot point and protests were in fact made by the Israeli government.

Now however, as a result of the developments in the Middle East and in particular the negotiations between Israel and the Lebanon and the active support of the United States, a situation has come into being by virtue of the Israeli-Lebanese agreement of 17 May whereby the original grounds which led the Council and Commission to feel they should freeze the financial aid has ceased to exist. At the last part-session, Mr Davignon indicated during Question Time that the Commission was looking into this question in a positive spirit. The German Presidency of the Council has informed me, as author of this motion for a Resolution, which I have also tabled on behalf of the European Parliament delegation to the Knesset, that it thinks it would be extremely useful if the European Parliament were to state its opinion on this question before the Stuttgart Summit, and even hoped that this opinion would be positive. There are still one or two differences of opinion in the Council but Parliament's opinion would certainly contribute towards a final settlement of this question and a decision on the part of the Commission and the Council. There is no need whatsoever to go into further political issues such as the question of the PLO and the complexity of the entire situation in the Middle East in connection with the motion for a resolution before us.

We realize, for the time being, it will not be possible to implement the Israeli-Lebanese agreement completely, since the Syrian government is persisting in its refusal to withdraw its own troops from the Lebanon at the same time as the Israeli troops, and since PLO leader Arafat the day before yesterday stated, among other things, that he first of all wanted to be assured of the safety of the Palestinian refugees in the Lebanon before the PLO units would withdraw from North Lebanon.

Be that as it may, this is a matter of urgency. There is no reason for the European Community simply to stand back and let the United States get on with it. On the contrary, the Council and the Foreign Minis-

ters have unambiguously reaffirmed that the European Community is in principle in agreement with the United States' Middle East policy and upholds it. The United States have withdrawn their so-called sanctions against Israel and it is therefore high time that we acted accordingly. For this reason, I would urge you to adopt this motion for a resolution and I should like to take this opportunity to say that I oppose all three amendments which have been tabled.

IN THE CHAIR: MR ESTGEN

Vice-President

Mr Schmid (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group welcomes the agreement between the Lebanon and Israel as an important and quite practical step towards the withdrawal of invading Israeli troops. As Europeans — i.e. as outsiders — it would be a bad idea for us to take the odd point of criticism which can be found here and there in the agreement as a reason for rejecting it. The Lebanese themselves have adopted this agreement so how can we fail to accept it, if what we want is progress in practical terms. Our aim is the complete sovereignty of a restrengthened Lebanese State and this means, among other things, that foreign troops must be allowed to remain in the country only with the agreement of the Lebanese Government.

As regards the motion for a resolution, we will be able to see how genuine the Israeli Government's wish to establish peace is only when the troops have in fact been withdrawn at least to a mere line of security. As we see it, it is hardly necessary, either logically or politically or from the point of view of Israeli security, to expect the withdrawal of Israeli troops to be accompanied by the withdrawal of Syrian troops. For this reason, we will adopt the motion only if Amendment No 2, which makes this point clear, is also adopted.

Mrs Nielsen (L). — *(DA)* Mr President, we in the Liberal Group welcome today's opportunity to discuss a subject which we regard as exceptionally important. It also became very much apparent during the visit to Jerusalem last February by the European Parliament's Israel Delegation that the freezing of the Financial Protocol is a real problem. The question of whether or not this is the right way to show political will is, I think, open to debate, but I must work on the basis of the motives given in the summer of 1982, i.e. that Israeli troops were present in the Lebanon — which is obviously no cause for rejoicing — and draw a parallel, which leads me to ask, where is the logic in signing a Financial Protocol with Syria — as was in fact done last year, and which is in fact in operation — since Syrian troops have also in fact been present in the Lebanon for so many years now? It seems illogical not to wish to sign a Financial Protocol with Israel whilst signing one with Syria.

Nielsen

Mr President, with the agreements which have now been concluded between Israel and the Lebanon and which concern the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the Lebanon, we have something which should lead to action. A genuine willingness is in evidence. Politicians of all shades in Israel said, during our stay in Jerusalem, that they wanted their sons back — and they meant it. However, I might add for the benefit of the Socialist who contributed to this debate that if you believe that unilateral withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Lebanon will lead to peace, you are out of touch with reality. I hope that the Socialists will agree with the rest of us that the establishment of lasting peace in the Middle East is a matter of importance for us all, and for this reason all foreign troops must simultaneously withdraw from the Lebanon.

As I have already said, the fact that Israel has shown willing, in the Israeli Parliament and in the Lebanon, is an important factor at this stage, so there is no longer any reason for refusing to sign the Financial Protocol with Israel.

(Applause)

Mr Israël (DEP). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the European Community is not very consistent in its Israeli policy. After adopting the Venice Declaration the European Community seemed to be trying to involve the PLO in all negotiations. We expressed regret for the stance at the time, but it became Community policy. Things continued in this vein and to show our displeasure at the invasion of Lebanon we froze a financial protocol.

Today, Israel wants to withdraw from Lebanon. It has announced that it will do so. The Lebanese think that this commitment is sincere, and we all believe the same, but the European Community still sticks to the principle which it stated in Venice and which is today no longer a policy at all. Moreover, we have maintained the freeze on the financial protocol and are giving the rest of the world the impression that we are against peace, that we do not welcome this genuine peace initiative embodied by Israel's willingness to withdraw. Worse still, the Council cannot even express approval of this agreement between Israel and Lebanon, simply because one of the major countries of the Community is against it. Well then, where are we heading for to? We do not welcome a peace treaty and we maintain a freeze on a financial protocol! Frankly, that is unacceptable. We shall vote in favour of the Barbi motion and are grateful to the PPE for tabling it.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, I should first of all like to remind you of the point of departure as regards the situation concerning the relations between the Community and Israel, i.e. the decision of the Euro-

pean Council of 28 and 29 June 1982 postponing the signing of the Second Financial Protocol between the Community and Israel and the meeting of the Cooperation Council at ministerial level. I should like to point out that, for the rest, relations between Israel and the Community have been unaffected by this decision.

The situation, however, has now changed. The Lebanese-Israeli agreement of 17 May 1983 envisages an end to the war and contains a commitment on the part of Israel to withdraw its troops from the Lebanon. Thus, this agreement may represent an important step towards peace in the Middle East, as also stated on behalf of the Council following the meeting of 24 and 25 May this year by its President, Mr Genscher, who stressed, on behalf of the Council, the importance which the 10 Member States attach to the unity, sovereignty and independence of the Lebanon. He also called, on behalf of the Ten, for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the Lebanon. The new situation is currently being thoroughly examined in the Community and in the context of political cooperation, and this is something which should also be taken into account when considering the question of financial relations with Israel. No definitive opinions have as yet been formed on this question and the views of the European Parliament which you are to make known here today will undoubtedly be of vital significance in this respect.

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote⁽¹⁾

Conference on the law of the sea

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-417/83), tabled by Mr Seeler and Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the signing of the final act of the conference on the law of the sea by the European Community.

Mr Seeler (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentleman, this House has already discussed the Final Act of the Conference on the law of the sea some six months ago when the majority took the view that we could wait and there was no need to sign it immediately since our observer status was enough to protect the interests of the Community. In the meantime, the first preparatory conference has been held in New York and it has emerged that observer status is not enough to ensure adequate representation of Community interests. The question facing the Community now is whether it should itself take advantage of the opportunities available with a view to finding acceptable solutions — in particular, to the problems of sea-bed mining — or whether it should leave this to others during the next preparatory phase.

¹ See Annex.

Seeler

As I see it, the arrangements regarding sea-bed mining contained in Part II of the Convention on the whole leave a great deal to be desired, but if these provisions are to come into force in the foreseeable future — which I doubt in view of the interests of several raw-materials suppliers in the Third World — there are undoubtedly also certain positive features, such as, for example, guaranteed access to deep-sea mining for all interested parties and the protection of what is known as 'pioneer investment'.

So far, the arrangements concerning sea-bed mining have overshadowed everything else in the debate — the other aspects of the Convention have hardly been considered, although this is a matter of codifying international law as a whole insofar as it concerns the sea. It concerns things as vital as rights of passage for ships and aircraft through and over coastal waters and straits. It concerns the rights of the coastal States on the continental shelf and the vital questions of environmental protection in coastal waters, access by inland States to the oceans and, last but not least, obligatory international jurisdiction for the protection of rights of passage and use of airspace. I regard these more general aspects of the law of the sea as far more important from the political, economic and security points of view than the section of the Convention dealing with sea-bed mining. Both the five Member States which have so far not signed and the Community as a whole are literally missing the opportunity of being involved in the birth of a new era in the law of the sea, and anyone familiar with the history of international law will agree that it is generally speaking the beginning is the most decisive phase. For this reason, I call on this House to support my amendment.

Mr Janssen van Raay (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the renowned seventeenth century Dutch — or should I say, European — lawyer, Hugo Grotius, laid the foundations for today's law of the sea with his famous books 'De iure belli ac pacis' and, to a greater extent, 'Mare Liberum'. Ever since the seventeenth century the law of the sea has been a European matter, and for this reason I find it absolutely unacceptable and out of the question that a new law of the sea should be drawn up on the basis of new principles and that Europe should now have opted out. For this reason the Christian-Democratic Group welcomes the initiative of Mr Seeler and Mr Glinne and will give its support. It is out of the question that Europe, the Member States of the European Community, should, by simply contenting themselves with observer status and not actively taking part in what is going on at the moment, should be shuffling off responsibility and not getting involved in legislation which, as Mr Seeler has rightly pointed out, is of decisive importance for our shipping, our security, and our

overseas trade. I need only remind you that there is no other part of the world which receives so many goods from overseas by ship as Europe.

Having said this however, I would also like to make it clear that, obviously, we do not go along with every aspect of the Convention, and if I call for Europe to take part in further decision making in this area by signing this convention, this does not presuppose ratification — it would be 'without prejudice', as we lawyers put it. Ratification is another question which we must examine when we have the relevant documents. Then we will be able to say whether we are entirely, partly, conditionally, or not at all in agreement. We now call on these five Member States to shoulder their responsibility and take part in the negotiations. Only in this way will they be able to make improvements, since observers have no right to speak. We therefore wholeheartedly support the resolution tabled by Mr Seeler and Mr Glinne and we hope that as large a majority of this Parliament as possible will direct our Governments to the negotiating table. Of our Group's main experts in this field I would make particular mention of Prince zu Sayn-Wittgenstein Berleburg who has repeatedly in this Parliament called for Community participation. We intend to support the Seeler Resolution.

Mr Helms (S). — *(DE)* I should like to take up the points made by my colleague, Mr Janssen van Raay. There are certain doubts concerning the best ways of bringing about improvements in this complex matter and, as I see it, even the approach advocated by the Socialist Group as regards the signing of the Convention and full participation in the preparatory commission is not exactly self-evident. According to the text of the motion for resolution as it stands — and I have endeavoured to examine it in precise detail — we cannot entirely count on the opportunities for bringing about improvements in the arrangements regarding the seabed in the preparatory committee. On the other hand, if the Community Member States were to sign the Convention — although this is by no means to be confused with ratification — this could nevertheless be regarded as a certain measure of acceptance of the agreement on the law of the sea. The doubts I mentioned before are connected with the fact that five Member States have not yet decided whether or not to sign. Nevertheless, there is no denying that a common position on this question would, in all probability, only be possible on the basis of signing the Convention, as recommended by this Parliament as long ago as 14 December 1982. I should like to stress this point. I would add, however, that if we do sign this must be on the basis of a clear wish to bring about tangible improvements for the Community, and we must make it quite clear that signing does not in itself imply that the Member States, the Community and the Commission are committing themselves to subsequent ratification.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) The Commission welcomes the renewed interest which this House is showing in the development of the Conference on the Law of the Sea. I might remind you that the Commission informed the Council of the results of this conference in a communication dated 16 July 1982. On 13 October 1982 the Commission submitted its final assessment to the Council and proposed, among other things, a decision to the effect the Community should sign the Final Act of the Conference on the Law of the Sea and the Convention on the Law of the Sea as well as the individual Member States.

At the final meeting of the Conference in Montego Bay on 9 and 10 December 1982, the Community, together with the Member States, signed the Final Act of the Conference in accordance with this recommendation, but only five Member States signed the Convention. The Commission stressed in a letter of 18 February 1983 to all the Member States that those of them which had not signed the Convention should be reminded of how important it is that they should sign it so that the Community and all Member States would be in a position to participate fully in the work of the preparatory commission.

At the same time, the Commission warned those Member States which had signed against the risks of a split in the Community if they were to be premature in going it alone, i.e. if they were to ratify the Convention independently, since ratification was the acid test for the Community's position. We respect the motives of those Member States who are hesitant about signing, since these motives are substantial and ultimately lie in the fact that this far-reaching and historic piece of legislation which has been developed over some ten years includes a chapter, i.e. Chapter 11, on which a concensus cannot be reached. This is the real problem facing us here. We nevertheless think it would be a good idea to make use, during the preparatory work, of the chances we still have to influence Chapter 11, even if our scope in this respect is limited by the procedure and texts involved. It would be a good thing, therefore, if the Community could be represented, at least through its institutions. However, this is not possible on the basis of five signatures.

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote⁽¹⁾

Blocking of the appropriations

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-394/83) by Mr Delatte and others on the blocking of the appropriations for the committees operating within the framework of Article 251.

⁽¹⁾ See Annex.

Mr Delatte (L). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, management committees and advisory committees are necessary for the smooth implementation of the common agricultural policy. It is necessary for the advisory committees, which comprise representatives of the relevant professional circles, to be able to participate in discussions before decisions are taken by the management committees. But the Committee on Budgets would like the expenses of these committees to be reduced so that some savings can be made. This is perfectly legitimate. An enquiry is being carried out, and in the meantime a decision has been taken to freeze two million ECU, which will be paid only after the findings of the enquiry are available, depending on the conclusions that will be drawn. It goes without saying that this temporary reduction in appropriations compels the Commission at present to look for savings. However, as in the past, the Commission has decided to continue calling meetings of the management committees while — in order to save money — suspending meetings of the advisory committees. It therefore appears that this is not in keeping with what was decided. In fact, both committees — the management committee and the advisory committee — must meet. It is obvious that it is possible to make savings on these meetings — and I share that wish — but it is necessary to continue holding meetings of the advisory committees. I therefore move that the Commission reconsider its stand and convene — it still has the means to do so — the advisory committees before the management committees meet.

Mr Saby (S). — (FR) Mr President, to begin with, it is not the Committee on Budgets that is involved but the budgetary powers of Parliament, which it exercises through its Committee on Budgetary Control. We quite agree that these committees should meet. The work that has been done and is still being done in the Committee on Budgetary Control is one that must reflect credit on Parliament. It must be pointed out that 37% of the appropriations earmarked for these committees have been frozen but 63% are, for the moment, available. We therefore do not see why the Commission, on its own initiative, thought it appropriate to notify all these committees that they could no longer meet, since it still has the funds to enable them to do so. However, although we agree in principle on the need for these meetings, we should not interfere with the duties of Parliament and the Committee on Budgetary Control. Mr President, this is why we want Parliament to exercise its rights in this area, and this committee should be allowed to complete its work. For this reason, without interfering with the functioning of the committee, we shall abstain on this motion, because we think that Parliament should not be subject to pressure from the Commission or elsewhere in laying down its policy, playing its supervisory role and successfully exercising its budgetary authority.

Mrs Boserup (COM). — (DA) Mr President, I should like in my capacity as spokesman for the Committee on Budgetary Control, to recommend that we reject the motion for a resolution, since it is pointless and a waste of time for a interim report aimed at releasing appropriations to be dealt with in this assembly in July, since it was, after all, the assembly itself which adopted the proposal to block these appropriations, and it must be capable of standing by its own decisions. There has been no question of the work being delayed. It was quite simply a difficult job which took a lot of time. It took the Commission three months to answer the questions put by the Committee and it has taken me three months to get through it all to some extent.

I would therefore recommend rejecting the motion for a resolution.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, I should like first of all to remind you that the appropriations under Article 251 of the budget, which are for meetings of committees, etc., were smaller than the Commission had wished, since it had estimated its requirements as 6 million ECU in the provisional draft budget. The budgetary authorities cut these appropriations to 5.3 million ECU of which only 3.3 million are available on our account, while 2 million are blocked under Chapter 100. The costs to be covered by these appropriations and, in particular transport costs have increased substantially — i.e. by some 28% since 1 January 1982 — and it should also be borne in mind that travelling expenses represent 75% of the total expenditure. Thus the Commission is obliged to keep the costs of running the committees involved down to 55% of the amount we estimated would be required in 1983, since as long as Parliament opposes the releasing of the appropriations which have been blocked, the Commission is quite simply obliged to manage this entire sector on an annual basis within the limits set by the amounts actually available, as otherwise it would be failing to respect the budgetary authority and in conflict with the most fundamental principles of effective administration.

It is the Commission's wish that these appropriations should be released in June at the latest. With this end in view, and in answer to the many questions put by the Committee on Budgetary Control, the Commission issued on 20 April 1983, an extremely detailed report of all the various committees etc.. In addition, at the request of Mr Aigner, the Director-General for the Budget reported very comprehensively and in great detail on the Commission's work in the same area. The Commission currently takes the view that the Committee on Budgetary Control is working in the right direction and, thanks to the highly able and unremitting work of the rapporteur, Mrs Boserup, I am sure even more progress will be made at the

meeting of the Committee on Budgetary Control on 13 and 14 June, i.e. next week. I very much hope that Mrs Boserup will also bear in mind that the Commission would like to see this matter dealt with as soon as possible. As long as the present budgetary situation persists, i.e. as long as a third of the appropriations are blocked, the Commission will be obliged to make drastic cuts in the number of committees, for which it is responsible for financing meetings. On 12 April 1983, the Commission decided that in future it would cover the cost of only two experts per meeting for each Member State and introduced new and more stringent rules for the approval of travelling expenses. Every single member of the Commission is endeavouring, within the areas for which he is competent, to distribute the places equitably on the basis of the priorities, one of which is unavoidable, i.e. that the regulations should be adhered to, which means that the administrative committees *must* hold their meetings. A number of other meetings have been cancelled or postponed because of the reductions in the appropriations. Obviously, only committees whose meetings are not obligatory under Community law can be cancelled.

The Commission realizes that the current situation causes a certain amount of confusion and can therefore go along with the request contained in paragraph 2 of the motion for a resolution. The Commission will continue to do its utmost to find the best possible way of using the appropriations available for meetings. This is a matter on which the Commission has hitherto worked in cooperation with the Committee on Budgetary Control and will continue to do so in the future. The decisions reached up till now reflect the Commission's goodwill in this respect.

Finally, Mr President, it is unacceptable that the work of the Community in one particular area should have priority over other areas. Both Parliament and the Commission itself have affirmed their wish for an active Community developing in all the many areas in which Community policy is implemented. It is only natural, therefore, that committees and working parties from all the various sectors should be able to hold their meetings as this is essential if democracy is to be a reality within the Community.

President. — The debate is closed.

Vote⁽¹⁾

We have thus reached the end of the topical and urgent debate. I should like to thank all the officials and interpreters for the help they have given us.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.20 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

⁽¹⁾ See Annex.

IN THE CHAIR : MR MØLLER

Vice-President

Mr Cottrell (ED). — Mr President, I make no apology for returning to a matter which the House discussed this morning.

At approximately 10.40 a.m. today, it was agreed by this House that there should be a special part-session of the European Parliament on 29 and 30 June. In making this statement I do not seek in any way to challenge that vote. What has disturbed me is that a document has come into my possession. I believe that it has come into the possession of all Members of this Parliament. It is described in English as 'Today in the European Parliament' and it is published by the Directorate-General for Information and Public Relations. It is dated Wednesday, 8 June 1983 and is described as the evening edition. This document states quite clearly: 'Parliament to meet 29-30 June — Chancellor Kohl to address the House'. It then goes on in some detail as to what the arrangements would be. We even find out, for instance, that there will be a short debate and the meeting will end at 7 p.m. and then it will resume at 10 a.m. the following day when Chancellor Kohl will report to the House. We find that the session will take place from 10 a.m. on the 29th and conclude in the early evening of the 30th.

On a previous occasion, Mr President, I congratulated the President of the Commission in employing an astrologer to chart the future course of Europe. Perhaps it is that the Bureau was so impressed by that initiative that they have issued themselves and the Director-General of Information with a crystal ball. There could of course be a much more important explanation why this document has been published, and it was the point which I originally put before the House yesterday, namely that the Bureau had decided in advance that this decision on a special part-session of Parliament would take place and that Parliament would not necessarily be consulted, as subsequently turned out to be the case.

Now, I would think there are so many doubts over the way in which the organization of this special part-session has been carried out that it would be right and proper for you, Mr President, to refer this matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions for a clear decision and a clear set of guidelines as to how future special part-sessions of this Parliament shall be decided, how they should be communicated to this House and who shall have responsibility to decide at the end of the day.

Mr Klepsch, I know you find this very trying because I can hear your remarks from my side. I do speak a little German, so I can understand what you say. You were in the Chair last evening and I do recall you saying, subsequently, that it was never the intention of the Bureau to force this session on the House; it was the intention of the Bureau to consult the House. That, indeed, has been confirmed by a remark that the President, Mr Dankert made to us this morning.

I would submit that this document is clear evidence that that was not the case. If a parliamentary document is published in advance of a vote of Parliament stating that a session would be held, then I would submit that that is a breach of parliamentary privilege. Therefore, I would respectfully suggest to the House that this matter is referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

President. — The document you had in your hands is not an official document. It was produced by the press officers of the Directorate-General for Information and thus is not something which you, as an old journalist yourself, should take any more seriously than anything else that appears in the press. As far as I know it only exists in English. For the rest, the Bureau intends to meet on 21 June in Brussels to decide what is to happen at the special part-session, and I can assure you that I will pass your comments on to Mr Dankert.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I had already informed you this morning that I wanted to speak on today's agenda and not continue the debate on the special part-session as Mr Cottrell has just done.

I should like to know whether item No 89 in the German version which states that Mr Blumenfeld may possibly report on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations will in fact come up for debate today, and I would put the same question in connection with items 199 and 121 which are also overdue as they should have been dealt with yesterday. I should like to point out that if this extremely important report is not debated and voted on until tomorrow we will not be in a position to reach a decision, and for this reason I should like to request postponing this matter to a subsequent part-session.

President. — Mr Blumenfeld, if we do not spend too much time discussing the agenda we will certainly be able to deal with your report today. I should also like to point out that the question of reference to Committee or postponement to a subsequent part-session can only be dealt with when we come the item in question.

Mr Van Minnen (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, I asked to speak on a point of order when Mr Cottrell was making his speech. Obviously, I would not accuse Mr Cottrell of lying, but I can hardly believe that what he said is in fact true, and you have made matters still worse, since if this was a press release, i.e. a document in which Parliament makes its workings public, then this is obviously an instance of prejudging a decision which Parliament had not yet made. In this case, it is far too serious a matter to be brushed under the carpet in the Committee on the Rules of Procedures and Petitions. Something must be done about it as Parliament would appear to be having the wool pulled over its eyes.

President. — Mr Van Minnen, I have taken due note of the point you have made and it will be included in the report of proceedings.

Mr Nord (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, I am very pleased that Mr Klepsch is present as he will be able to confirm what I am about to say. As I see it, Mr Cottrell is quite right. The idea of holding an extra part-session was presented to us yesterday by Mr Klepsch, who was in the chair at the time, in the form of a statement and not a proposal — otherwise I would not have spoken yesterday in order to criticize the way in which the President had interpreted our Rules of Procedure, i.e. that the rule to which the President referred in fact provided no basis for announcing rather than proposing that an extra part-session should be held. It can be seen from this that opinions can differ as to the interpretation of the Rules of Procedure in this respect, but the problem would not have arisen if the President had brought the question up in the form of a proposal rather than a statement. This alone is, I think, sufficient proof that we are in fact not in agreement as regards the interpretation of Rule 9 (4) and I should therefore like to lend my support to Mr Cottrell's proposal to the effect that the question should be referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, as is generally the case in the event of possible differences of opinion on the interpretation of the Rules of Procedure.

Finally, Mr President, I always find it unpleasant, and in this case particularly so, when Members of Parliament blame the Parliamentary services for their own differences of opinion. I do not think this is the proper way to behave and would prefer not to see such things here.

President. — Mr Nord, I assume we all heard what you said, but the decision to hold an extra part-session was reached in a quite democratic manner by this Assembly here this morning when Mr Dankert was in the chair.

Mr Chanterie (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, I should like to make two points. Firstly, that we should respect the decision made by Parliament this morning. This, I think, is very obvious. However, I should secondly like to join Mr Nord in supporting Mr Cottrell's proposal aimed at obtaining guidelines for all future decisions in connection with extra part-sessions, so as to avoid similar difficulties in the future, by referring the matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, which can then draw up a proposal, particularly as regards the venue for future part-sessions.

President. — Mr Chanterie, the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions have already been asked to give its opinion on this matter, but we must

obviously wait until it has met and concluded its deliberations.

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like to thank you for what you have said since I am in full agreement with Mr Nord who gave an accurate account of what happened yesterday evening. I would have been grateful if he had also added that yesterday, in my capacity as President, I agreed to his request that this matter should be referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions without delay, although, in view of this fact, I do not understand why Mr Cottrell should be making this request today.

However, my main reason for asking to speak was to back up the second point made by Mr Nord. As I see it, this House is demeaning itself if it tries to lay the blame for differences of opinion on the interpretation of the Rules of Procedure on the officials responsible for statements to the press.

4. *Community's internal frontiers*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-160/83/rev.), drawn up by Mr Schieler on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the

communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-550/82 — COM(82)400 final) on the draft Council resolution on the easing of the formalities relating to checks on citizens of Member States at the Community's internal frontiers.

Mr Schieler (S), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, under the terms of the Treaty of Rome, the Community has as its task the promotion of closer relations between the States belonging to it, in particular through the elimination of obstacles to freedom of movement for persons, services and capital.

I have the honour of submitting to you, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, a motion for a resolution concerning checks on citizens of the Community carried out at internal borders which initially aims at a discontinuation of systematic checks and their replacement by spot checks, to be followed in a later phase by total abolition of checks on travellers.

The people of Europe were very interested to hear that a Community passport was to be introduced not later than 1 January 1985, according to the Council Decision of 23 June 1981. The introduction of this passport is undoubtedly an important step towards a passport union but the individual citizens of the Community will personally appreciate the progress which this represents only if it makes travelling from one Member State to another less of a problem. If the people of Europe are to realize in their everyday life that they belong in a united Europe, they must be able to enjoy the advantages this should afford.

Schieler

One of the hopes of our citizens is the European passport. However, this will be of no use unless the issuing of this document is accompanied by an abolition of identity checks. Unfortunately, personal checks are still made at the borders and in some cases they can be very annoying. We still have a long way to go before we have a border-free Europe and for this reason it is extremely important from the political point of view that personal checks are substantially reduced at least when the European passport is introduced i.e., systematic checks must be abolished.

The discussions in the Political Affairs Committee were based on the Commission's draft Council Resolution, the aim of which corresponds very closely to that described in the Tindemans' report of September 1975 which advocates the gradual abolition of personal checks at the borders between the Member States with a view to the realization of a complete passport union.

The draft report I have now tabled on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee was examined at our meeting of 14-16 March. The Committee unanimously decided to recommend that Parliament adopt the Commission proposal subject to certain amendments. I might add that during the deliberations of the Political Affairs Committee, we were able to refer to the opinion of the Economic and Monetary Affairs Committee but no account could be taken of the opinion of the Committee on Transport, since this was submitted only a few days ago. Similarly, we had not received an opinion from the Legal Affairs Committee in good time.

We are convinced that the people of the Community regard systematic checks as proof of stagnation in the process of integration in the European Community. We also feel it is an anachronism that no real progress should have been made in this question 25 years after the European Community was originally set up in spite of the fact that the Commission and Parliament have repeatedly dealt with this question.

I might also point out that motions for resolutions by Mr Bangemann, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Glinne and Mr Rogalla also form part of the basis for today's debate. The realization of a genuine passport union has hitherto been put off time and time again, and it has repeatedly been maintained that a passport union would only be possible after the establishment of economic union, harmonization of taxation and the approximation of provisions governing the movement of goods. The European Parliament has never gone along with this point of view. It has frequently pointed out that it does not hold water, and has repeatedly called for opening up the internal borders for the people of Europe — most recently in its Resolution of 26 March 1982.

Parliament has in many questions to the Council and Commission demonstrated its political will to find a solution for the people of Europe, and in this respect

we are in agreement with the founding fathers of the European Community who made it known that they regarded the establishment of freedom of movement in the Community as an essential goal and cornerstone for the realization of a unified Europe.

As regards the Commission's views on the legal aspects, with which the rapporteur agrees, they are based on the principle that Article 3 of the EEC Treaty covers all persons resident in the Community and not only persons in employment, self-employed persons and employers. Thus the establishment of the Common Market implies freedom of movement not only in the economic sector but in general.

I very much regret that I cannot go into a number of extremely important points which should perhaps be made. We hope that the Council is now in a better position to make a decision and there are even signs that it may deal with this question at its next Summit on 17 to 19 June in Stuttgart. There are already examples of passport unions which work in Europe — for example in the Benelux countries or Scandinavia — and I should therefore simply like to say quite briefly that I do not think the objections which are constantly raised are valid.

People claim that a passport union would make things easier for drug smugglers, but I and the Committee take the view that drug smuggling presents a problem not at internal but at external borders, and similar objections have been made in connection with the combatting of terrorism, although I cannot go into this question in detail in view of the short time available.

I repeat, we are in favour of abolishing systematic personal checks as an initial step and feel that the second step, i.e. the total abolition of checks will require, among other things, the harmonization of visa policies, aliens' rights, and rights of asylum and residence in the Community. The political will for European cooperation with an eye to subsequent political union will become more attractive when the man in the street sees the freedom of movement he wants become a reality. I urge you to support the motion for a resolution by the Political Affairs Committee.

(Applause)

Mr Nyborg (DEP), *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.* — (DA) Mr President, I should just like to make a brief remark, which I hope you will not deduct from my speaking time, before I actually get down to the business in hand. I have noticed that considerable time has been spent debating questions relating to the Rules of Procedure and should merely like to say for the benefit of those Members who were involved in this debate that they can relax. The Committee on the Rules of Procedure will look into the problems at its next meeting and find a settlement as soon as possible.

Nyborg

I should like to say that the beginning of a new holiday season is a very appropriate time to resume the debate as to how personal checks at internal borders can be made less irritating. Mr Schieler's report forms an excellent basis and many fine words have been said as regards Parliament's intentions. There will surely be very few Members of this Parliament who would not endorse the Treaty of Rome as regards freedom of movement for persons and goods. We need to show the people of Europe that the Community is a very real and tangible thing, and I can wholeheartedly go along with the report when it says that the citizens of the Community must be made aware that he belongs to a free and peaceful Europe without barriers.

At the same time I should like to draw your attention to our experience in Denmark where we have a passport union with the other Scandinavian countries, which gives us a freedom which everyone is aware of when visiting Sweden, for example. I should like to ask the Commission to consider whether or not the Scandinavian countries could be included in a European passport union as otherwise we would end up with an unfortunate dilemma at the German-Danish border. There are also unfortunately, countries in the Community where the State has started to keep checks on and interfere with the lives of private citizens by means of foreign exchange restrictions etc., which is a kick in the teeth for those who are working for a free common market.

For the rest, I should like to refer to the opinion of the Committee on Transport which has the support of my fellow Group members, Mr Gauthier and Mrs Scamaroni. The Committee on Transport requests the Council to examine the security reasons which might justify the maintenance of passport and/or customs checks. As I see it, this is in most cases an attempt to act out a myth since a modern effective police force has other and far more effective checkpoints than the national borders.

My former colleague in the DEP Group, Mr Junot, drew attention in an excellent report to the possibility of simplifying formalities at airports and I should also like to draw your attention to this report. At all events, however, we must move on.

This is made perfectly clear in my opinion on behalf of the Economic and Monetary Committee. The Commission's proposal that there should be no systematic personal checks at the internal borders of the European Community once citizenship of a particular Member State has been determined should be regarded as a very welcome initial steps towards complete abolition of checks on persons at the internal borders, and I should like in this connection to warn against installing new checkpoints, or whatever they are called, at the internal borders which are of an excessively permanent and sophisticated nature, since it is our unfortunate experience that

once things of this kind have been set up they very easily turn into institutions which it is difficult to get rid of again.

We are to have a new passport which, as far as I know, is to be burgundy coloured — although as far as I am concerned it might just as well be tartan provided it helps us cross the internal borders with fewer problems. The Schieler report very clearly reflects my own personal views and I feel it deserves to be adopted by a large majority.

President. — Mr Nyborg, I should like to thank you for the assurance you have given us in your capacity as Chairman of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions that the question of extra part-sessions which we have been discussing here today will be brought up at the next meeting of the Committee.

Mrs Scamaroni (DEP), draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Transport. — (FR) I should like to concur with what has just been said by my colleague and, like my predecessor on this Committee — Mr Gauthier, and Mr Junot, a few months before him — I would ask this House to help us facilitate the transport of people and goods within the Community.

We are, of course, still subjected to very old-fashioned procedures and it would be much more straightforward to provide for greater ease of circulation while at the same time improving checks.

In other words, I wholeheartedly back what was said by Mr Nyborg.

Mr Rogalla (S). — (DE) The Socialist Group regards this report by the Political Affairs Committee as one of the most important which has been produced since the direct elections and hopes it will become essential reading for all those who say they want to do something for the people of Europe. You can learn something from this report and the rapporteur deserves our thanks for his courage since the public is being led up the garden path, as can be seen quite simply from the recently published police crime statistics from 1982 for the Member State I know best, the Federal Republic of Germany, which were issued in the bulletin of the Press and Information Office of the Federal Government of 23 April. Of the crimes which are of relevance in this connection, offences involving passports, fire arms, drugs — including cocaine, cannabis and heroin — smuggling and illegal trade were among those for which the detection rate was highest, between 99.1 % and 92 % — although these are the very offences which are always quoted as justification for border checks. On the other hand, the detection rate for offences such as rape, attacks on vehicles transporting money and other acts of violence such as murder were right at the bottom of the list. How stupid must people regard those Members of Parliament who concern themselves with the former category of offences.

Rogalla

I should like to make four points in connection with this report. Firstly, freedom of movement for everyone in the Community is one of the things to which the Member States are committed under Community law. It is not a question of the executive powers — out to get in the public's good books — granting any favours, or a latter-day form of particularism, and I would therefore like to say that I am against working here with resolutions which, as a legal form, are not provided for in the Treaties. Secondly, as regards keeping an eye on crime involving drugs or security on the one hand, or monitoring the arrivals of persons from third countries on the other, new methods must be found to replace the system of a barrier in the middle of Europe since our police officers and customs officials are far too efficient to be able to persuade the man in the street that this would not be possible in the course of a year to two. Thirdly, as checks at internal borders are phased out, they will have to be replaced by Community checks at the external borders, which will mean that many customs and border officials who nowadays are working in the rainy north will in future be working in Brindisi. Fourthly, we Socialists wholeheartedly support the Schieler report, including Amendments Nos 1 to 4 by the Political Affairs Committee and Amendment No 10 by Sir James Scott-Hopkins. Everything else we reject.

I will resist the temptation to turn this debate into a demonstration, with appropriate evidence, of how a stroke of the pen made in a spirit of hopefulness could totally change the face of Europe. However, I am prepared to show anyone interested the signs outside saying 'Zoll/Douane' (customs), which are in contravention of Community law and which are nevertheless still to be found at the borders in several Member States, although there are a number of Member States, such as Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands where they have been replaced by appropriate signs indicating the tax border or national border.

Since customs and customs posts between the Member States are a thing of the past, I should like to take this opportunity of urging those Member States who are still vacillating, to bring themselves into line with Community law and I am also counting on the understanding of the customs and border officials involved, their chiefs and their competent ministries in connection with these changes. I should like to stress that the customs and border officials involved are the last people to be held responsible for the current situation, since they are only doing their jobs at the barriers. I should therefore like to take this opportunity — with the explicit agreement of my Group — to thank them for their work. Away, I say, with border controls, barriers and 'Customs' signs at the internal borders in the interests of a better and more equitable Europe!

(Applause)

Mr Klepsch (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this House is adopting Mr Schieler's very circumspect and balanced report on behalf of the Polit-

ical Affairs Committee in good time for the Stuttgart summit and we welcome this opportunity for Parliament to discuss and approve an initiative on the part of the Commission which should lead to decisions in the Council. Obviously, my Group agrees with previous speakers that this constitutes a major step in the right direction but that our ultimate goal is still before us. What we are trying to do here today is to bring about a decision in the Council regarding what can be done immediately. Clearly, what we really want is total abolition of personal checks, and I think we can see from the example of the Benelux countries that very substantial and rapid progress can be made in this direction. We also feel that the people and voters of Europe would hardly be able to understand how a joint European passport could be introduced without these accompanying measures.

I should like to deal with two points which I regard as particularly important. On the one hand, the report rightly points out that it is up to the governments to take joint action in combatting serious international crime, such as drug trafficking and terrorism. I can very well remember President Giscard d'Estaing's initiative on this question, which we also discussed in this House, and wonder why no progress has been made in this area, as it is quite obvious that it is not border checks which play a decisive part in combatting terrorism, serious crime and drug trafficking, but rather coordinated action on the part of the Member States, since if we were to count the number of people who get caught at the borders for minor offences, such as those who have defaulted on maintenance payments, end up on the wanted lists and get caught at border posts, I should like to say that anyone who wants to increase this number still further would have to introduce, in the Federal Republic of Germany for example, additional and equally thorough checks at the borders between the individual Federal *Länder* — such as between the Rhineland Palatinate and North Rhine Westphalia — to install a special cordon around Bonn. However, it is quite right that we should be calling on the Council finally to take these measures, since this should in no way prevent it getting down to the question of abolition of personal checks immediately.

This brings me to my second point. The abolition of personal checks will obviously have to be accompanied by the abolition of the myriad trivial checks and obstacles which are features of the internal borders of the Community nowadays, and if I point out that these cost some DM 30 million per year, I am sure everyone will realize that we have not yet made the progress at the internal borders which we should have according to the spirit and letter of the Treaty. My Group therefore calls on the Council not to delay in implementing this initiative by the Commission, which now has the support of the House. We therefore welcome the Schieler report. Mr Janssen van Raay will speak on our more specific wishes.

(Applause)

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, when we have a broad type of report such as this, everybody is all in favour of it, but then we come down to the nitty gritty, the precise details. Mr Rogalla and Mr Klepsch come from a country where they are always ardently in favour of suppressing frontier controls, but when it comes to lorry permits, 'Oh, no, we cannot do that'; when it comes to airline rights, 'Oh, no, we cannot do that'. So, we are all to blame, and I am afraid my country is to blame as well on various things, and I think we ought to admit that. It is no use just making gracious, broad and laudable statements without being prepared to go home and tell one's own government and own officials where they have to get moving.

This report is all very well if we can move to open channels and fewer controls, and so on. But it is not the actual, it is often just the notional controls that are the trouble. I fly from a provincial part of the United Kingdom to Brussels and Strasbourg once a week, and I have to get out of my aeroplane somewhere — Manchester, London or wherever — and walk around for an hour or more through imaginary controls, controls which do not actually exist but are notionally there, such as customs and immigration and emigration and security and so forth. They are very easy going, but they still notionally exist.

So, even if we achieve what Mr Schieler and the Political Affairs Committee are proposing and ease the formalities at the border, unless they are abolished altogether we shall not get anywhere; we shall still have the delays, the inconveniences and the expenses that these notional checks amount to.

One of the problems in my country is the multiple responsibilities. When you go through the airport formalities you are dealt with by the Home Office for immigration, drugs and terrorism, you are dealt with by the Treasury for customs, you are dealt with by the Ministry of Agriculture for rabies and pets, but none of these is prepared to give up its own little prerogatives to the other, so where do we start? Surely, Mr Klepsch said, the police and undercover work should be able to deal with all the problems that face us in these various fields and get them away from the borders.

There are vested interests — duty-free shops which apparently pay for a third or a quarter of all the cost of running our airports; exchange controls — what are the French going to do without people at the border to stop all these tourists getting out of the country with their money in their pockets?

EEC travel should be domestic travel. That is really what we must aim at. As well as a green and a red channel, we need a white channel, and the white channel must be for domestic and European flights. Some countries are better than others and some are worse. I think Britain is good with its special channels for both passports and customs, but it is very resistant

to full abolition. France is good at not checking a passenger coming in on a through flight. The London-Lille-Strasbourg flight is a case in point: the passenger stays on the plane and is not checked until the final airport. That is a good point. Belgium seems to be appalling at both ends. Mr Narjes knows this full well, as we met at the end of a very very long queue the other night trying to get out of Brussels, and spent half-an-hour getting through emigration to get out of the country. Could we not set up a working-party of Member State officials — I have no doubt there is one already, but it should be chaired by the Commission — charged politically by the European Council and the Council of Ministers very forcefully to implement the best practice from each country throughout the Community, to overcome these inter-departmental rivalries and to aim for complete freedom within a specified time-limit.

I ask the Commission, if they do not get the necessary cooperation, why they do not invoke Article 3 (c) of the Treaty and take the Member States to the Court of Justice.

Mr De Gucht (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, the first time you try to cross a border, you get your first taste of the eternal passport and other controls, which not only cause extreme irritation because of the time lost, but it is there at the internal borders that any faith which the European citizen might have had in the whole idea of Europe begins to falter. While edging forward waiting his turn, he quite rightly asks 'if we still can't simply cross the border without all this palaver what must it be like with the more problematic areas of Community policy?' How is Europe ever to overcome the problems of the monetary compensatory amounts, exchange rate fluctuations, butter mountains, wine lakes and what have you? For this reason, the passport union and the abolition of checks at the internal borders of the Community are not minor issues compared with monetary, political and economic problems in general.

Another reason why more attention should be paid to the passport union and the abolition of checks is that a great deal could be done at very little expense in this area. Why, for example, do we not have separate lanes for Community residents at the borders? Why are there no separate desks at the airports? It would not cost a fortune to produce immediate results in this respect and, quite apart from the practical advantages, the people of Europe would not only start to get the feeling of belonging to a European Community but the Community would become more real to the rest of the world too.

We should not let ourselves be put off by the problems still standing in the way of abolishing checks at the internal borders, i.e. terrorism and trafficking in fire arms and drugs, since it is very often at

De Gucht

the external borders of the Community that the major problems arise, and the abolition of checks at the internal borders would not necessarily immediately result in a free for all. Greater cooperation and mutual assistance between the various police forces and the authorities could prevent this happening, as shown by the success of the Nordic Passport Union. The European Community is also ready for a passport union and the start is to be made in 1985 with the introduction of the European passport. However, generally speaking, interest is on the lukewarm side, and this is quite understandable since it makes no difference whether you are standing in a queue with a European passport or with a national passport — you are still standing in a queue. If there is to be any point in a European passport, it must be a practical thing which the people of Europe can use to move around the European Community unhampered. In other words, give us the European passport, but let us not have too many checks on it. Then the impact of measures of this kind would be considerable and other measures, in the economic and monetary field, for instance, which so often call for efforts on the part of the people of Europe, would undoubtedly gain substantially in credibility.

Mrs Hammerich (CDI). — (DA) Mr President, as the rapporteur has pointed out, relaxation of personal checks at the borders is an element in the development of a European passport union, the first step towards which was the agreement to introduce, as from 1 January 1985, the standard burgundy-coloured passport bearing the name of the European Community at the top. The purpose of introducing this standard passport is to promote the sense of European identity, and it strikes me as somewhat naive to think you can use outward ploys like this to change people's sense of identity. In Denmark, at any rate, the plan for the standard passport has had exactly the opposite effect and been the source of considerable irritation among the Danes — but enough of that. I am sure suitable countermeasures will be found so that we will never end up with a burgundy-coloured identity.

The second step is to be the relaxation of personal checks at the borders, and I should like to say that as I see it, it is nice to think that people should one day be able to travel freely across all the borders in the world. This is an idea which we Scandinavians had as far back as 1929 when we set up the Nordic Passport Union which today comprises Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland. What this means is that in practice Denmark exercises border controls *vis-à-vis* the south on behalf of the other Scandinavian countries and that we do not need passports to travel throughout Scandinavia. For example, we do not need a passport to travel to Sweden. The more progress the Community makes as regards relaxing personal checks at its internal borders, the more the other Scandinavian countries are likely to feel a need to intensify

checks on persons coming north from Denmark and this may mean that in future the Danes will once more need to have a passport simply to travel to Sweden, which in turn means that we may once more have to choose between Scandinavia and the Community, i.e. between a Nordic Passport Union and an European Community Passport Union. We have had the Nordic Passport Union for years, we are used to it and glad of it, since for us it is a symbol of the free and friendly relations between our peoples. There can be no doubt that the majority of the people in Denmark are glad they have the Nordic Union and would like closer cooperation with the rest of Scandinavia. The Nordic Union, for example, is concerned at the new plans for relaxing personal checks at the internal borders of the European Community and the Scandinavian countries have also agreed to make a joint effort to combat the import of hard drugs — which is hardly compatible with Denmark's relaxing checks at its borders.

We would urge the Danish Government, before taking this new step, to look into the question very carefully and to discuss it in great depth with the people of Denmark rather than simply taking the matter into their own hands without due regard for the views of the people. We also call on the Danish Government to discuss the question with Norway, Sweden and Finland in detail and with respect for the interests of those countries.

Mr Janssen van Raay (PPE), draftsman of the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to begin by making a point of order which I hope you will not deduct from my speaking time.

I am the draftsman of the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee. My report was ready and was to be dealt with next week. Simply on the basis of a request by Mr Narjes, who pointed out how important it is that this matter should be dealt with in Stuttgart, we decided to forego a promise made by Mr Rumor, the Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee, who, out of courtesy to our Chairman, Mrs Veil, agreed that this report should be dealt with in July. Obviously I also did my bit in view of the great importance of this matter. My report has not yet formally been adopted by the Legal Affairs Committee but I am convinced, knowing my friends in that Committee as I do, that they would have gone along with my amendments. However, from a purely formal point of view I am not speaking on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee. The European People's Party has been so kind as to take over, at my request, the amendments contained in my opinion and table them.

I should now like to start officially with the five minutes allocated to me by first of all complementing Mr Schieler on his excellent report, for which I am particularly grateful. That was point No 1. I was very

Janssen van Raay

pleased at the points he made, which correspond exactly with our own views, since we hope that our children and the younger generation will one day be able to get into their cars in Copenhagen and drive to the South of Italy via Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg and France without being held up at the borders.

In addition, we have always — and this is my most important point, been in favour of the principle of spot checks instead of systematic checks. However, I would remind Mr Schieler, Mr Rogalla, Mr Klepsch and Mr De Gucht that we are familiar with this practice at the Dutch-Belgium border where people drive across at a speed of 100 km per hour and where only the occasional vehicle is stopped. However, the Commission's proposal to the effect that the spot checks should be restricted to citizens of Community Member States is unworkable, since as soon as you restrict such spot checks to the citizens, you must first of all establish citizenship, and in order to do this the vehicle travelling at 100 km per hour or so must be brought to a standstill, after which you can ask the traveller to show his passport so as to find out whether or not he is a Community citizen. However, this would mean that the whole idea — which is already a reality between the Netherlands and Belgium and which has been held up as an example both by Mr Schieler in his report and by Mr Rogalla — would be tuned into a mere illusion, and for this reason I, as rapporteur, have heeded Mr Schieler's call for certain legal refinements. Here is such a refinement for you. If you adopt my amendments, you will get exactly what you want — namely abolition of systematic checks. However, you will have to put up with a few spot checks involving the odd Third Country citizen too. This is the only way in which you will get what you want. Thus the word 'citizen' must be deleted as otherwise the proposal is unworkable in practical terms.

Secondly, I wholeheartedly support what Mr Schieler had to say both in his speech and in his report as regards the question of terrorists, and I had in fact contacted the security authorities even before reading his report. The matter is quite simple. Terrorists are not detained at the borders. Our security departments arrest terrorists by other methods, on the basis of other information, but not by means of border checks, and there is a great danger facing us here, ladies and gentlemen. It is not the Ministries of Finance or the Ministries of Transport which are making life difficult for us here but rather — and the Netherlands is no exception in this respect — the departments of Justice, which are using the combatting of terrorism as a pretext for intensifying rather than easing border formalities as a trap for people who have not paid their television licences or to get DM10 out of Germans who have parked their cars in the Netherlands for more than an hour. The unfortunate citizen is being more and more closely monitored by the

most up-to-date computer equipment, border checks are being stepped up and the difficulties are being increased rather than reduced, as we would wish, for all sorts of dubious purposes of this kind. I would therefore call on Parliament to be on its toes. Surely we cannot fall in with this kind of thing, since if we let the departments of Justice continue in this direction we will end up with exactly the opposite of what not only I but all of us have so far advocated here today, and I would say therefore, 'Watch out! All this talk of keeping checks on movements of terrorists is only a pretext'. To take up the point made by my Scottish friend, Mr Fergusson, I should like to say that obviously we must have some other kind of protection instead, but what Mr Schieler and Mr Rogalla want is for all the checks to be moved away from the internal borders to the external borders. Neither they nor myself have advocated abolishing checks at external borders. I hope, therefore, that you will read my amendments.

Mr von Wogau (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the opening up of the internal borders of the European Community for persons, goods and services was one of the basic objectives of the Treaty of Rome. Today, more than 25 years after the conclusion of the Treaty, it is high time this commitment was finally fulfilled.

The European passport is to be introduced in 1984 and will constitute an important symbol of the fact that people can be German, French, English or even, Frau Hammerich, Danish, and a European citizen at the same time — and I know from several friends that a lot of people in Denmark share this view. A sense of patriotism does not preclude a sense of European identity.

(Applause)

However, what are the citizens of the European Community to think if they stick this fine passport in their pocket and then take it out at the border and find out that they are subjected to exactly the same checks as before? We therefore go along with the proposals contained in the Schieler report and call for accompanying measures and the abolition of systematic checks. I also go along with the amendments proposed by Mr Janssen van Raay. When a traveller is crossing a border it should indeed be enough to show the European passport — perhaps through the car window — after all it is to be burgundy-colour — to demonstrate that one is a European citizen and then to be automatically waved on without further ado. I also support the idea of separate lanes for European citizens.

I should like to say for the benefit of our colleagues from the United Kingdom that I can still remember the first time I entered Britain. There are three separate lanes, one for British citizens, one for European Community citizens and a third for 'others'.

von Wogau

Thus we have already been promoted from the status of 'others' to that of EC subjects, but I think it would be a good idea if the news were to get around the United Kingdom that it is also a member of the European Community and for this fact to be reflected on the signs at the borders.

As for the objections which have been raised, my friend Mr Janssen van Raay has already defused them fairly effectively. After all, drugs, for example, do not come from Community Member States — they do not originate in Luxembourg, France or Great Britain, but from third countries. The European customs and border police authorities would be better employed seeing to it that the external borders of the Community, the coasts, ports and airports were better protected than wasting their time at the internal borders of the European Community.

A great work of European literature, 'Michael Kohlhaas' by Heinrich von Kleist, begins at a barrier. 'Once he was riding to a foreign land with a pair of young horses, all three well fed and radiant' the author writes, when in Saxony he came to a barrier which he had never before encountered on that road. For the horse trader, Michael Kohlhaas this marked the beginning of tragic entanglements in his fight for his rights. We should do our bit to ensure that one day the people of the European Community will no longer find their way blocked by barriers, and give a sign today, in the form of our resolution, that this Community is capable not only of producing documents, but also of bringing about practical changes in the interests of its citizens.

(Applause)

Mrs Boot (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, in this debate on the citizens' Europe, I should like to draw your attention to a petition submitted to this Parliament by a citizen of Nigeria in which he complains that, after living in the Federal Republic for ten years, he is still obliged to apply for a visa every time he wants to cross an internal Community border. He calls for an arrangement whereby people who have been granted an unlimited residence permit by one of the Member States should no longer need to keep applying for visas.

The Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions have discussed this matter at considerable length and have come to the conclusion that it is a question of harmonizing visa policy in the Member States. Up to now, the entire problems involving harmonization of visa policy, the right of residence for citizens of third countries, the right of asylum and legislation on fire arms and narcotics have been dealt with as side issues in the context of opening up the internal borders. This is understandable, since the Community is primarily concerned with the welfare of its own citizens and only secondarily with the rights of aliens.

However, following this petition, our Committee feels that a start should be made on settling these quite separate problems, and the only way in which this can be done is by harmonizing our entire legislation regarding aliens.

As regards the harmonization of visa policy, a number of speakers have already drawn attention to the fact that this has already taken place in the Benelux countries and the Nordic Council, and we advocate harmonization of this kind for the Community as a whole. This might have the additional advantage that third countries might in turn treat Community citizens similarly, i.e. without making any distinctions on the basis of their country of origin. This would certainly be very positive from a psychological point of view for the European citizen with his European Passport. Our Committee, which wholeheartedly supports the Schieler report and the amendments tabled by Mr Janssen van Raay, hopes that an arrangement will be introduced in the near future whereby citizens of third countries who have been granted an unlimited residence permit by one of the Member States will no longer be obliged to apply for visas.

Mr Estgen (PPE). — *(FR)* Chateaubriand once said that a generation was equivalent to 33 years, or the life of Christ.

Here we are already in the second generation of Community policies. But even today, it is still hard for the citizens of Europe to believe in a united Europe, in the Common Market, in a Community where goods, money and people can circulate freely, because they are obliged to undergo the kind of tiresome experiences at the Community's internal borders which we all know about. This is all the more true for the workers, students and apprentices living in frontier regions who are subjected to such experiences every day and at times when traffic is at its heaviest. Already back in December 1974, the heads of State and government decided to set up a passport union and to abolish checks on individual passports at the Community's internal frontiers. Ten years later, and more than a quarter of a century since the Treaty of Rome was signed, the people in our Member States are still unable to move freely from one Member State to another, as the Community's internal frontiers continue to be the scene for barriers, halts and checks, all of which are anachronistic and irritating relics of a Europe which existed before the Community. That is the European reality with which our citizens are confronted on a practical basis, and never mind about the Europe which regulates the lead content of petrol or the transportation of horses destined for slaughter or even European scientific and technical strategies.

I am well aware of the same old arguments which are always trotted out. We have heard them all again this afternoon: the fight against terrorism, crime, drugs.

Estgen

But how many terrorists, criminals or drug merchants have been arrested at our internal frontiers without a prior tip-off? These somewhat unusual citizens are generally only too well aware of what route to take to avoid being checked. What is more, the drugs they smuggle are hardly ever made inside the Community but are brought in from third countries. It is, therefore, the external frontiers of the Community which must be strengthened, as we have already heard.

Then there is the argument about customs officers being threatened with unemployment. This is largely illusory. I can quite easily imagine a body of European customs officers working together in mobile stations in frontier regions, carrying out their individual investigations and making prompt hauls, which is what is happening to a certain extent already in the Benelux countries and which has proved to be much more effective. The Community ought to devise a plan to develop infrastructures at the external border posts of the Community both to protect our internal market and to safeguard our citizens. I personally have experienced greater difficulty in entering the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg from the Federal Republic of Germany than I have in crossing from West to East Germany. You must admit that that is a shocking state of affairs.

As for the controversy concerning whether it is better or not to set up a special channel for Community citizens at frontiers, I feel that — in an intermediate phase — this would instil in people an awareness of being Europeans, especially at ports and airports. This would already be a great step forward. Internal barriers and frontiers are always the tokens of a type of apartheid, of mistrust and fear. We must abolish them as soon as we can within our free and democratic Community. We must give the idea of free circulation practical meaning and we must give the people of Europe the feeling of belonging to a true European Community.

Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission. — (DE) I should first of all like to thank the rapporteur and his associates for having tabled such a constructive and comprehensive report on this subject, which is of such great political significance, at such short notice. In particular, I should like to thank the Legal Affairs Committee for the part it has played in enabling us to present the united opinion of this Parliament and the Commission to the public before the Summit, so that those meeting at this Summit will know what situation and expectations on the part of the citizens of Europe to take as their point of departure.

It was stated in the final communiqué of the 1974 Summit that a working party should be set up to look into the possibility of introducing a European passport and ultimately establishing a passport union. After many years of discussion, it only proved possible to make the first step in principle two years ago — I am referring, of course, to the European passport,

which we can hope today will be introduced by the end of 1984. What we want now is to take this partial success, which cost us such major efforts, as a basis for going a step further in the direction of what I repeat is the professed aim of all the Heads of State and Government without exception, i.e. a Passport Union which would principally involve the substitution of checks at the external borders of the Community for the personal checks which are currently carried out at internal borders.

What we are aiming at is the complete abolition of personal checks, and I therefore go along with all those who have spoken in terms of a mere first step. We must not lose sight of this ultimate goal, even if we get the impression today that it will take some time to achieve it. The Member States are hesitant for the reasons which have been discussed here today, such as the combatting of terrorism and drug trafficking etc. which I do not intend to go into. Not all these arguments are convincing and if we do not simply sweep them aside, we can join the ranks of all those who have deplored the fact that far too little has been done to put an end to the present unsatisfactory situation and to make checks at the internal borders superfluous within the foreseeable future.

Why don't we have a Europol, as well as Interpol, which could be responsible for the checks at the external borders and which would bring about a situation whereby checks at internal borders would be just as superfluous as, for example, between the German Federal States where, I might add, the police forces of the various *Länder* enjoy a certain autonomy? The fact that in the Federal Republic, the police forces work on a *Land* basis, has not led to the fight against crime being substantially less effective in Germany than elsewhere, since we also have models for effective cooperation between the police authorities of the various *Länder* without the man in the street being forced to be involved in the process through border checks.

With a view to meeting the security needs of the various States, we have proposed, as an initial step, a draft resolution which has a genuine sense of proportion. It really does not go to extremes either from the legal point of view or in the choice of goals, but rather represents a symbolic first step towards revolutionary changes at the borders and, while I am on this particular subject, I must repeat how I deplore the way in which certain Member States oppose this objective, which they describe as illusory, utopian, unrealistic, and I don't know what. Let us make no mistake about the stubbornness we will have to contend with on the part of some Member States!

The crux of our proposal for a resolution, which as I said, was drawn up with a great sense of perspective, and of the compromise between the security interests of the Member States and our wish for European integration, is, on the one hand, the replacement of syste-

Narjes

matic checks by spot checks on travellers showing a European passport and, on the other hand, the setting up of special border-crossing points, particularly at major ports and airports. This, we think, would be a balanced solution.

The rapporteur has tabled a number of amendments, many of which constitute improvements to our proposal and bring it up to date. We shall therefore be glad to adopt them. I should like to draw particular attention to two points. Firstly, lane markings. We considered this question at some length but did not make any explicit proposal in this respect, since we take the view that it would be better if this practical question were to be decided in the light of the particular situation at the various border-crossing points, rather than issuing across-the-board instructions, not only because of the costs with might be involved but also in view of the type of persons predominantly using the border crossing in question. Imagine, for example, a bus containing citizens from both third countries and Community Member States. If you had to sort them out into the various lanes, this would be causing more trouble than necessary. For this reason, we are a little more flexible and feel that each situation should be judged on its merits — not with a view to making anything more rigid, but with an eye to the possibility of achieving usable results more quickly.

The Political Affairs Committee calls for proposals for the harmonization of visa policies, aliens' rights, the rights of asylum and residence, and the laws relating to firearms and drugs. As long ago as 15 September 1982 I had an opportunity of stressing in this House that the Commission also feels that the problems must be solved before we can have a Passport Union. We agree with the Committee that these elements will be indispensable both for the preparation and the implementation of the Passport Union, and intend to work on this basis.

I might perhaps add at this point that the problem peculiar to Denmark has been mentioned twice today by Danish members, once by Mr Nyborg and once by Mrs Hammerich. I should like to say to Mr Nyborg, that there is nothing of either a legal or political nature to stop any Member State lowering the minimum requirements he outlined for the presentation of passports and the entry clearance procedure still further. No Member State needs to think twice if it wishes to discontinue passport or other checks off its own bat. The problem is intensification and I can only agree when you say that until we have a Passport Union proper, it should be left to each individual Member State to decide how far to reduce the checks it carries out. This, I think, was exactly the point you wished to make.

However, if, like Mrs Hammerich, we take a different approach to the problem, we could end up with Denmark having to make a fundamental choice and decide whether it belonged in the Nordic Union or the European Community. She presented the problem

of conflicting objectives in such a way as to imply that they could lead to insoluble dilemmas. On the other hand, we can obviously not expect the other nine Member States to call a halt to the reduction of border checks simply because Denmark is against the idea out of consideration for the Nordic Union, although this would be the logical consequence of Mrs Hammerich's approach. The way you have described the situation — and I think we have more in this vein in store for us — we would end up with conflicting objectives for which it would be virtually impossible to find a solution.

I should like to continue by mentioning the amendments tabled by Mr Janssen van Raay. We must stand by the principle of travellers having to prove their nationality of a Member State until visa policy has been harmonized to a certain extent — though of course not completely! What we are all aiming at — and this follows on from yesterday's debate on the Macchiocchi report — is the establishment of special rights for the citizens of the Member States, so that they will become aware of being European citizens and realize that their status as European citizens involves certain legal advantages, not to say privileges. Easing checks for citizens of Third Countries cannot, therefore, be our primary aim. We must have the courage to draw a distinction between Community citizens and citizens of third countries.

As regards the two amendments tabled by Sir James Scott-Hopkins, we cannot go along with them for the following reasons. As we see it, simply producing a European Passport should be adequate proof of citizenship of a Community Member State. If this is the case, any request for further evidence would be superfluous — indeed would constitute the opposite of what we are trying to achieve. Instead of easing the situation it would complicate it further and the citizen would have good reason to take offence. I cannot imagine that this is what Sir James Scott-Hopkins has in mind.

Finally, I should like to draw your attention to two trains of thought. Firstly, the debate on passports gives me an opportunity to mention a situation involving current national passport arrangements which I regard as downright deplorable from the European point of view. There is one Member State in which a passport costs over HFL 50 and must be renewed every five years. This fee is prohibitive for young persons and many have doubts about attending sporting events in the neighbouring Member State or wonder whether they can really afford to cross the national borders if they have to pay such a fee every five years. All our solemn statements in favour of youth and in favour of European action for youth and advocating opportunities for young people to get to know each other more quickly, more widely and a more naturally, will be somewhat undermined if we do not first of all see to it that crossing borders does not require the acquisition of a passport for a prohibitive fee.

Narjes

My second point is also a very practical one. It is already been said on occasion that, by way of an has border checks could be carried out in a fairly easy-going manner. The holiday season is upon us, so what is to stop the Ministers for Internal Affairs of our Member States using the forthcoming holiday period to put this European goal into practice for at least the few busiest weeks? The citizens of Europe would show their gratitude at next year's elections.

Finally, I should like to stress that, in spite of everything, we will do all in our power to make some progress in this battle against national intransigence on the matter of borders.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

5. Family policy

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-1196/82), drawn up by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on family policy in the European Community.

Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (PPE), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to introduce briefly this motion for a resolution on family policy in the EEC, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

Above all, this report deals with a subject which is extremely complex and important. The fact is that family policy has many aspects and involves a wide range of differing objectives, not only because it has to do with anthropological, psychological, educational, political and economic problems, but also because some of its aspects involve a more general concept of the world.

All the Member States — albeit to varying degrees and more or less explicitly — have what we might call a family policy.

This comes about more or less automatically since, on the one hand, every political decision affects families — i.e. it has a 'family aspect' — while, on the other hand, there is a family aspect to all sectors of political life.

There is absolutely no mention of the word 'family' in the Treaties of Rome and Paris, and up till now the heads of government have hardly ever considered the family aspect of their policies.

Nevertheless, by virtue of the powers given to it by the Treaties — and, hence, its direct legislative power — the European Community can no longer ignore the family dimension when drawing up its policies. Moreover, the Treaty of Rome, although essentially an economic treaty, contains explicit social provisions, and these were subsequently widened by the Heads of State and Government at the 1972 Paris Summit.

However, the family must not be considered a static and timeless entity, a relict of a bygone age, but as something which is in continuous transformation and is adapting to the contemporary situation, something which has a history, which has evolved and will always continue to evolve. The needs of the family of today are not its needs of yesterday, nor those of tomorrow.

Even if the links between its component parts have not changed, the family's way of life has changed a lot over the years. This is mainly the result of the faster pace of life, the flight to the cities, the greater independence of young people, the increasing influence of the mass media and the ongoing process of women's emancipation, as a result of which the women of today intend not only to be mothers in the full sense of the word, but also to play a role in social and professional life.

This means that any suitable family policy must nowadays be dynamic, so that it can take account of the changing face of our society which, in turn, has repercussions for the life of the family.

Up till now, however, family policies in most of the Member States have largely been of a fragmented and sectoral nature, and their provisions have frequently been imprecise, superficial and inadequate.

Albeit timidly, the European Community has also taken action directly affecting families. I need only mention the measures to help the families and children of migrant workers, the measures to protect families in their capacity as consumers of goods and services, and the measures currently being prepared on motherhood, parental leave, and so on. However, these welcome moves on the part of the Community are fragmented and do not yet satisfy the need for a genuine, consistent and comprehensive family policy aimed at maintaining and developing the family as a community, as an institution with its own autonomy but always available in dealings with others.

In this context, the family must not feel itself to be simply the object of family policies 'imposed from above' and accepted unquestioningly; there must be thorough and full involvement over a period of time sufficient to allow active participation on those matters affecting the family most directly and to provide an opportunity for responsible growth as the object of rights and of duties towards society.

This is the background to our motion for a resolution, the object of which is to lay the foundations for a genuine and proper family policy which will contribute to the achievement of a Europe which is something more than an economic power, something less fragile and less ephemeral. If this is to be achieved, Europe needs the families, just as it needs to embark upon a policy for children and young people, who are the hope and the basis for its future.

Cassanmagnago Cerretti

This is why the time has now come to construct a Europe of deeper significance, one which reflects the aspirations of its 270 million inhabitants and in which the families are the milestone.

We also believe that our motion is even more appropriate at the present moment. In the extremely critical and difficult situation currently facing Europe, embarking upon a common family policy could be the first step towards creating the conditions for a political and psychological climate which will give Europe the impetus it currently needs if it is to overcome its uncertainty and instability.

I would emphasize that the motion I am presenting is the outcome of a lot of hard work in committee; the result is that, despite starting from differing — and sometimes opposing — points of view, it was possible to reach agreement on basic positions such as the following:

... the family is an effective, educational, cultural and social unit which uses and consumes goods and services and is an evolving entity ... it provides the best environment for the development of the couple and of children and plays an important role in maintaining social balance and progress.

The Community budgets should reflect the quantity and quality of the Community's own commitment to family matters. Access to the resources should be as flexible and rapid as possible, so as to encourage cultural research, while trusting in mankind and the peoples and respecting nature and the history and living experience of every person and every group.

The fact of belonging actively and constructively to society, the fact of being a couple and of belonging to each other and of accepting interchanges between the sexes and the generations will be the results representing the freedom which the Institutions will have managed to give every single person within his or her own geographical, historical and political limits.

I would also point out that the motion for a resolution, far from laying down utopian objectives, sticks to proposing a realistic framework within which it will be effectively possible to achieve a comprehensive Community family policy integrated into all the other policies.

Pending the definition of an overall family policy, the motion calls on the Commission to draw up an action programme for the years 1983-1988. This programme should include the following three types of measures:

- the provision of funds for the launching of a European family policy;
- positive action: to include a further increase in assistance from the Social Fund, so that it can increasingly become the instrument of a compre-

ensive social policy which covers all family problems;

- the implementation of a coordinated research programme relating to the problems currently facing families;

Finally, it states that 'despite the difficulties of the present period of crisis, policies providing for collective accommodation and associated social services should be continued, while encouraging the exploration of new methods of education'.

This is not an ambitious programme, but I would repeat that its implementation would be extremely important and significant and would mark a new and major step towards the achievement of a European policy and towards the construction of a European Community which is well-balanced and has a human face. In this context, the revision of the Treaties of Rome should be a matter of urgency, and we hope that this is something which will be taken up in the Committee on Institutional Affairs.

I therefore call upon the House to support this motion for a resolution, which was adopted in committee by 16 votes with 5 abstentions.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR NIKOLAOU

Vice-President

Mrs Duport (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti had a somewhat difficult passage through the Committee on Social Affairs, probably because ideological aspects were dwelt on to the detriment of economic and social aspects, which we consider crucial in any family policy. In order for we Socialists to be able to approve of this report, we should like a number of amendments to be adopted, emphasising social and other aspects and cutting down on the ideological phrases.

Let me explain myself. If each one of us is convinced, ladies and gentlemen, that children and their development are at the heart of the family question, but that such development is itself largely conditioned by the development of those taking care of children, we must logically accept the consequences of our convictions and refuse to allow any discrimination against whatever form the family might take. The traditional model — doubtless still the most widespread — is not the only one in which children can flourish. It is in the interests of children that we therefore propose that family allowances be attributed to the children themselves from their birth until they reach the age of majority, rather than to one or another of the people who may be responsible for them.

Duport

We cannot accept the arguments behind the amendments submitted by Mr Calvez and Mrs Pruvot for a policy to increase the birth rate. Considering the crisis we are living through, it is out of question to ask young people to found families, unless, we are capable at the same time of offering them other perspectives than those of ever increasing unemployment. Today, five million young people are unemployed and there may be seven or eight million of them tomorrow. All the same, sociologists are well aware that demographic trends are not governed by a rational approach — fortunately, I would say. The debate on the birth rate has no place in this report. The traditional family is in a state of crisis. I will pick out only two reasons for this which is a direct consequence of the economic and social policies conducted in the majority of European countries. The disruption of the family is due to the unbridled and chaotic industrialization and urbanization which took place at the beginning of this century. They gave rise to the rural exodus, the abandonment of certain regions, and the overcrowding of people into low-quality, cramped housing in suburbs without amenities. It is therefore no wonder that family loyalty has disappeared, as the family is no longer extended to include grand-parents, aunts, uncles, etc. Neither should we be surprised at the disappearance of good neighbourliness, which is difficult to recreate in overcrowded suburbs.

I would like to warn you against a tendency we have — and I do it myself in an amendment — which is to consider occupational mobility as a panacea for the problems of under-employment. The deindustrialization of a region such is practised at the present time has enormous repercussions, signifying uprooting and imbalances, and is diametrically opposed to what we are seeking in any family policy.

Societies which are based on inequality to the extent that ours is generate powerful social tensions which find their echoes in family relationships, creating insoluble conflicts, particularly in the case of the least privileged. A good family policy can be much better achieved through economic and social policies than through moralistic speeches.

I trust that Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, who has given a fair amount of attention to social policy in her report will be able to accept the points we have proposed and then we will be able to adopt this report without difficulty.

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, the Christian-Democratic Group tabled two major motions for resolutions in the first six months of this House's legislative period. The first called for a programme of action to improve the situation of women and the second called for more work to be done on a European family policy. The first of these resolutions — on the situation of women — has met with success, but the second — on family policy —

has taken much longer to set in motion. The fact that we now have this report before us is thanks largely to the tenacity and the sheer hard work put in by the rapporteur. It received a broad measure of support from the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and it is a report which we too very much welcome.

It became all too apparent in the debate on the situation of women in Europe how little we really know about family matters. We have plenty of statistics at our disposal on the situation of women in paid employment, but we are very much in the dark as to the situation of women in unpaid work — that is, in the family. In the course of the earlier debate, I remarked that we in Europe know a good deal more about the economic value of apples, pears and tomatoes than about work in the household and family, a subject on which we draw a blank in the European statistics. And yet, as everyone knows, the family is of major importance from the economic, social, cultural and educational points of view. It is in fact a cornerstone of our society. Some researchers even go so far as to claim that the way in which families operate in particular geographical units affects the way in which democracy itself works in those same units. However much credence we can attach to that, the fact remains that the Community takes too little interest in the family and my Group believes that more needs to be done.

I should like therefore to draw your attention to three specific matters. Firstly, we should pay greater heed to the changes which have taken place in family life over the last few decades. I am thinking here, for instance, of the changing role of women, many of whom now go out to work. I am thinking of the reduction in the size of families now that the birth rate has declined. I am thinking of the increasing number of elderly people living alone, with all their specific problems, and I am also thinking of the large number of unmarried people living together — with or without children — who are families in fact if not in the eyes of the law. Neither our national legislation nor the social and other family aid services have adapted to the change in situation, with result that a lot of people — children as well as adults — are slipping through the safety net.

I would also draw your attention to the problems faced by particular categories of families, and I am thinking here of the families of people on the dole, who are having to get by on rock-bottom social benefits. I am also thinking of families with low incomes because only one of the parents is working, and that only on poor pay. I am also thinking of families who are having to bear the burden of a lot of children or perhaps handicapped or sick or aged relatives. And then of course, there are the families of migrant workers. At a time of budget deficits and savings, there is an increasing tendency to save on social

Maij-Weggen

welfare benefits, which strikes first and foremost at the most vulnerable families. I am pleased that the Community is looking into this matter.

Thirdly, I should like to draw your attention to the situation of children, which is always closely connected to family policy matters. By no means all children are brought up in families, but a good 95 % of children are brought up in one family context or another, which makes it vitally important that family life — whether organized along traditional lines or in a newer form — should receive the full and positive attention of national governments and European institutions. After all, children are a valuable asset, not only in the eyes of their parents, but also in social terms. For that reason, we stand four-square behind the rapporteur's proposals to establish a European programme of action in the interests of the family. And, Mr President, if the European Community were to give a new dimension to its social policy in this way, it would be fulfilling one of my Group's most fervent wishes.

Mrs Squarcialupi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I had prepared a speech for today which I have modified after reading the news that there is to be a year dedicated to children who are the victims of violence within the family. Detailed statistics kept in the Federal Republic of Germany show that, in that country, about a thousand children die each year as the result of violence inflicted upon them within the home by members of the family, and that there are at least several tens of thousands of children injured, even tortured.

Warnings had already been heard on this subject from various bodies who tried to identify the causes of the problem. In the case of the Federal Republic these were found to be the following: the first cause was alcoholism; the second lay in the economic difficulties undoubtedly associated with unemployment; the third cause was bad housing.

This news also led me to think about the role which a Parliament like ours can play if it really wants to have something to say to families, as well as about the possible function of a Community policy if it is to provide concrete aid.

I also thought about Parliament's role with regard to the tragic divisions created within certain families, such as those of immigrants, which are often forced to remain divided or where the role of father, mother or children has to be clandestine.

This, in turn, made me think about last Tuesday's negative vote by certain circles in this House on the motion to give foreigners — Community citizens — the right to vote in local elections, thereby enabling them to participate in decisions of immediate concern to families and family life.

I think some political circles are creating a certain amount of confusion when they speak of strengthening the family solely on the basis of attitudes and ways of life which have been largely left behind and to which there can be absolutely no return. One of these outmoded attitudes is that of returning women to a subordinate role within the family, and hence within society, and obliging them to bear the burden of the social services which are the first to be deleted from the budgets of certain Member States for so called economic reasons — whereas we all know there is enough money available for arms and waste.

I therefore think that Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti's report — on which we congratulate her — contains sufficient elements — although we would like some of them strengthened and have tabled amendments to this effect — to make the family feel itself to be a living element of society, and we think it could provide a focal point and a factor for the free development of the human personality, although this must certainly not be achieved at the cost of any one of its components, be they children or women.

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* Ladies and gentlemen, today's debate is indeed a far cry from André Gide's saying: 'Families, I hate you!'. We are unanimous here today in expressing a desire to recognize the value of the family and to promote it. We are pleased that Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti's report was adopted unanimously by the Committee, with a few abstentions, expressing certain reservations which — I hope — will be raised during this debate. I should just like to say to Mrs Duport that the Liberal Group will be voting for some of her amendments, the majority of which seek to take into account the economic and social situation of families.

I feel that this report and today's interesting debate illustrate the fact that — contrary to what was once thought — people everywhere in the Community realize that the family is still a basic refuge and a supreme value in our society. Everyone wants the family to flourish, with each member of it really finding his own personal satisfaction and playing his or her part. That is what will allow families to remain what they always have been throughout the centuries, namely a vital source of emotional and material support on which our society depends.

The report contains a number of proposals which I do not want to go over. I simply want to stress what seems important to me and my Group, namely the need to take into account the economic, social and also psychological climate in which families are living. This means that note must be taken of changes that have taken place and that, if we want the family to remain a source of affection for older as well as younger members, it must adapt to new realities such as the new role of women. The woman must not be seen solely as the pillar of the family, but must continue to play the role she always has within the

Veil

family, through which she can find her own equilibrium, without having the feeling of being the person on whom everything depends while at the same being its least privileged member.

The happiness of the children must also be considered. I should like to raise a point here with Mrs Duport, more as my own personal opinion than on behalf of all of us. When talking about demographic trends and the number of children in a family, I am not arguing on behalf of a policy to promote the birth rate, which is a purely economic viewpoint. On the contrary, I want to talk about the happiness of children in the home and that of a married couple. I think that it is vital to point out — it is not said often enough — that having children is a joy and that, for children themselves, to be brought up in a large family is a joy. When I look at families nowadays who only want to have one child, knowing as I do, of course, that we are no longer in a situation where it is necessary to have ten children in order for two or three to survive, I am sometimes anxious for those couples who only have one child because they risk losing it, in an accident, for example. However, when people talk about the selfish attitude of young couples, I must disagree. I believe that, on the contrary, it is because they want to give too much to a single child, they want so much for that child that, in reality, they do not want to take the risk of having to share. Maybe it is a kind of loving to be able to offer one's children what was not possible before, namely a good education and various opportunities for development. But on the question of the number of children, I should like to say that large number of children gives a society dynamism and youth and this we must not forget. The Liberal Group will therefore be voting in favour of this report, hoping that a number of amendments will be adopted, and in belief that the European dimension which we will have given to this debate will permit family policy to be regarded as an open policy based on generosity, tolerance and, above all, hope in the future.

(Applause)

Mrs Spaak (NI). — *(FR)* I should like to congratulate Mrs. Cassanmagnago Cerretti on her excellent report, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, and should like to add a few points of my own, including one inspired by what Mrs Veil has just said.

Mrs Veil expressed satisfaction at the fact that the idea of the family was being greeted unanimously here today. I, however, should like to point out my surprise at this debate — which to me seems so crucial — being conducted almost exclusively by female Members. Why are our male colleagues, who are usually so loquacious, being so strangely silent today?

(Applause)

In addition, while I should like to acknowledge my debt to Mr Eisma, who gave me his turn to speak,

which was very kind of him, I do hope he will bring this debate to a virile and resounding conclusion.

The society in which we live has of course been built on the traditional model of the family. The traditional family is moreover the cornerstone of civil, fiscal and to a large extent social law in our Member States. Today we are faced with a major alteration in our society; all the fundamental values of society are being questioned, including that of the family. Loss of faith in this basic value is one explanation for the drop in the Community's birth rate, which is a disquieting phenomenon which ought to be taken in hand by the European Parliament without any further delay.

While I should like to say to Mrs Duport how much I appreciated her speech, I must say that the belief that a Community whose birth rate is falling as tragically as ours risks turning into a Community in its death throes is not the same thing in my opinion, as practicing a policy to increase the birth rate. A society without children is a society in decline.

I agree with you that there is no longer one type of family nowadays. Without discouraging the traditional form — far from it — which is, after all, still the most common, we have to give other families — whatever their kind of organization — an equivalent legal status. Such families must not be penalized or underprivileged in any undue manner, but must be given proper consideration because they are a reality of our society.

The people of Europe are directly involved in this problem because the family is still the basis of our social organization and, in my view, it is the duty of the European Parliament to credit it with the attention it deserves and with a consistency that it both needs and merits.

I should just like to mention the unworthy example of my own country, Belgium. Any reform to do with the family seems to be unavoidably linked with tax in some way, whether such reforms deal with fiscal, social law, or education or working hours, they all seem to be executed in the shadow of budgetary deficits, with no overall medium or long term vision. This really is an example which ought not to be followed at European level. On the contrary, we need a family policy which is an integral part of all measures which contribute to improving the quality of life for all of us through a fair distribution of tasks among men and women.

This is also the central precondition for a society in which children are allowed to exist, as stressed by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti's report, on which I should like to congratulate her once again; this policy must become an essential ingredient in Community policy as a whole.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Estgen and please note that I say 'Mr', after what Mrs Spaak has just said.

(Applause)

Mr Estgen (PPE). — *(FR)* On hearing Mrs Veil's speech, Mr President, I had intended merely to applaud her and not bother to speak myself, but after Mrs Spaak's remarks about men, I feel I do have to say a few words.

In spite of its biological basis, the family is not the same in all countries and at all times. Nowadays, there are some people who oppose it, seeing it as an outdated institution hampering society's progress, whereas there are others who believe that it is still an essential basis for all social life, with a basic value as a refuge, as Mrs Veil so rightly said. I am of this latter opinion.

Of course, we cannot ignore the changes taking place within the family: families are smaller, the number of divorces and of single mothers is rising, the number of mothers who have a job outside the family has increased and mobility is greater. This creates problems for families, but these problems are not insurmountable. The family remains the basic structure for bringing up and educating children and I am not just considering the role of the mother in educating children, Mrs Spaak, but also that of the father. I do not say this as an orthodox person for whom the family is automatically the ideal environment for educating a child, I report it as the conclusion of very recent research on the influence exerted by the family on the results children obtain at school.

This social dimension of the family in modern society and the problems it engenders cannot be ignored by the European Community which, by virtue of the Treaties, is also responsible for raising the standard of living of its citizens.

Family policy comes under the general heading of a policy for well-being with the emphasis on the quality of life, and is provided for in the Treaties. It is the point where economic, social and moral aspects meet. In this area, collective and individual responsibility cannot be separated. It is well known that the living standards of a whole family rapidly go down with each child born. The Community must therefore not ignore the family and its special problems when working out its policies and family policy, in the full sense of the word, must form an integral part of all Community policies.

Enormous vistas open up before us: how can we harmonize to a greater extent the requirements of economic, professional, school, cultural and social life with the legitimate aspirations of the modern but stable family? This is an enormous task, both in extent and degree. But we must not just concern ourselves with broader problems. We must also tackle

the practical problems of individual families. In this context, I believe effective aid should be given to family advisory centres, not just those who are responsible for family planning but also and above all those pluridisciplinary advice centres which also take charge of psychological, legal, educational, moral, religious, etc. problems of married couples and their children. Courses in preparation for marriage and before having children also come into this category. The serious nature of our current economic problems must not be allowed to prevent us from looking further ahead, because economic and demographic changes are closely linked. The ageing of our populations will increase social burdens.

It is high time that this House should concern itself not just with the welfare of baby seals, horses and egg-laying hens — laudable though that is — but also with families and children.

As the president of the 'Action familiale et populaire de Luxembourg', I am not just convinced that it is a basic duty of society to guarantee the moral, spiritual and material welfare of families, but that it is also its duty to promote education for and through the family. I am highly troubled by the drop in the birth rate that we have seen in all our countries and which, in some Member States — including my own — is assuming disastrous proportions. For this reason I shall be supporting the amendment submitted by Mr Calvez and Mrs Pruvot aimed at restoring the institution of the family, its identity and eminent social role in the face of this decline in population which has economic and social consequences which threaten our future.

In the material sphere, we must above all deploy a housing policy. It is worthwhile investing in roads, but it is even better to invest in accommodation, since such a policy would help to fight unemployment by providing work for many different trades and at the same time would bring benefits to families.

To close, I should like to say something about particular formulations or amendments which seek to place various forms of cohabitation on the same footing as that of the family. I find this train of thought pernicious. Individuals are free to step outside the rules and to ignore a society's norms, but cannot then legitimately assume all the advantages which society gives to its institutions, since the individuals concerned are not fulfilling the corresponding obligations.

Finally, I should like to utter a word of warning about definitions of unhappy children. It is true that there are unhappy children in all social classes and children who are ill treated, but to the eyes of the world outside, misfortune is too often thought of exclusively as inadequate material conditions, whereas there is a poverty of spirit which is sometimes much harsher than physical poverty.

Estgen

However, the interests of a child should not be opposed to that of its parents' rights. In the same way, the notion of a biological parent is finally unacceptable, since it reduces procreation to a biological act.

Naturally, special attention must be paid in all Member States to highly underprivileged families. Serious thought should be given to introducing a minimum family allowance.

Be that as it may, this report — on which I heartily congratulate Mrs Cassanmagnago — makes a very valuable contribution to a Community family policy which can only serve as a policy for the future of Europe.

(Applause)

Mr Eisma (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, I am not exaggerating when I say that producing this report was a real struggle, especially in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, and we feel that improvements could be made to various aspects of the report even at this stage. For this reason, I have tabled a number of amendments with a view to gaining greater recognition of social forms other than the classic one based on the marriage bond.

I should like to discuss one of these amendments in more detail, i.e. Amendment No 41 relating to paragraph E (c) of the motion for a resolution on page 6 of the report. The amended clause would then read: (whereas it is convinced that) 'in the interests of personal happiness, measures are needed to enable families wanting children to have them and to bring them up'. Mr President, there can be no doubt that the rate of population growth in the Community has slowed down, and that there has even been a decline in the population in some Member States. It is claimed that this might have disastrous repercussions leading to a substantial weakening — if not the end altogether — of the European Community as a partner of the major powers — as is claimed, for instance, in the Vié motion for a resolution — or, as Mr Calvez and Mrs Pruvot put it in their amendment: '... an extremely damaging effect on the prospects for the future of our society'.

I think that kind of thing is totally irresponsible in the absence of any research to establish an optimum size of population. Clearly, you cannot have too few people living in a country, because then the infrastructure becomes too costly per person. But to have too many people is also an undesirable state of affairs — and that is something that we in the Netherlands are qualified to talk about — because of the increasing need for restrictions on personal freedom and the problem of ensuring that there is sufficient work and income for all. So there must be an optimum level of population, and research into demographic forecasting as proposed in paragraph 4 of the report should therefore aim to ascertain what is the optimum population.

So long as we have no such evaluation, it is quite wrong to resort prematurely to using the decline in the birth rate as an argument for introducing measures to enable families who want to have children to do so. The only valid argument for having children — whether in a family context or not — must be personal happiness, and I hope that my Amendment No 41 will receive a broad measure of support.

(Applause)

Mrs Phlix (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in the short time available to me, I should like to make a few comments on the excellent report produced by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti. Social changes have now reached the family, the very heart of social existence itself. That does not mean to say, though, that fundamental values are in jeopardy; a sound family is and will remain the bedrock on which the members of the family can develop their own personalities, and will continue to provide the security in which children can grow up. But at a time of declining birthrates, the family must not be misused as an instrument of demographic policy. It would be a fatal mistake to limit the freedom of manoeuvre of the family and sell it short. The result would be to destroy the family as such, with all the repercussions from the point of view of the individual, society in general and demographic developments. You cannot turn things upside down. Our view is that couples must have the right and the unrestricted freedom to decide for themselves on how the major responsibilities for outside work and family affairs should be distributed. We must also take a rational view. If, for the sake of making savings, we advocate the idea of more sick, handicapped and aged people being cared for at home, we must also accept that this will require adequate accommodation. Caring for such people at home means that society in general has to bear its share of the responsibility too.

That being so, I should like to draw the House's attention to Amendment No 29, which calls on the Commission to study the possibility of extending the social security system to cover unpaid housework, giving priority to accidents which may result therefrom. It is a well-known fact that most accidents occur at home, and in many cases they result in permanent invalidity without any kind of risk insurance cover. I expect critics will say that this is not a specifically European matter, but my view is that we should find room for this particular aspect as part of a system of European social security. Solutions can be found to the technical problems too so long as the political will is there.

Ladies and gentlemen, if a family is to function properly, each and every member of that family must

Phlix

make an effort, and must show love, respect, a sense of responsibility and solidarity. That is the best recipe for success, and social services and legal instruments must give priority to these qualities, and are essential wherever these elements fall short of the ideal or break down entirely. Any society which recognizes and advocates a family structure must make the material resources available, and must create the right climate and the right values to allow the family to thrive as such.

(Applause)

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE), *Chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.* —

(GR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the family has been the creative moment in all societies and all States, and the value of the family has been underlined in the apposite speeches made by all the previous speakers, men as well as women, for we must not discriminate unfairly against the so-called strong sex, whose interest in protecting the institution of the family is at least just as great as that of women. We must do everything possible to ensure that families have the necessary resources — material and otherwise — so that they can continue to meet the requirements of the human and major social role which they fulfil.

In this motion for a resolution the European Parliament calls for a comprehensive Community family policy based on a five-year programme. Within this programme, however, I would point out that it is essential for priority to be given to certain categories of less-favoured families such as the families of migrant workers, and immigrants, single-parent and *de facto* families, families with incomes far below the subsistence level, and families comprising elderly persons who are in particular need of protection.

It is my view that any moves undertaken, whether they be in the form of general social action or financial aid, will be doomed to failure unless we succeed first of all in reducing the chaos which has been created between families of all kinds throughout the world by the stern laws of modern life and by other unfavourable factors. I recommend the valuable report by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti and I hope that its adoption will prepare the way for special Community programmes aimed at effective assistance and protection for the family.

Mr Moreland (ED). — Mr President, I hope that the House will not consider that my group is ignoring this topic because of our sparse attendance. I think the Parliament knows why our attendance is sparse. But I think it is important for my group to contribute to this debate because it is an integral part of our own party political philosophy to support the family. In this context I am very happy to support the report

that we have today which is a very comprehensive report.

I suppose I should say, as a British Conservative, that I am naturally hopeful that today will be an appropriate day for the family to be debated because I am hoping it will be a happy day for a certain mother of twins. Perhaps some others might support me in that respect.

Secondly, and more profoundly, those of us from the United Kingdom always feel that we have an excellent example of the unity of the family and the importance of the family in the role of our own head of State.

If I may make two small critical points regarding the report — and I can say that the criticisms are very small indeed compared to the praise that I would give. First of all, there are a number of times references to seminars, studies and so forth. I just wonder whether we have not got past that stage and ought to be putting our whole emphasis on action.

Secondly, of course we have a whole range of proposals in this report. Again, perhaps, we lose sight of the priorities we should be looking at. My own priority — but others may have other ideas — is that the Community should develop its role in helping the handicapped. I am grateful for the contribution that is in this report but I would rather it had been stronger.

Having said that, Mr President, my group very warmly supports this report and congratulates the rapporteur on all her hard work.

Mr Contogeorgis, *Member of the Commission.* —

(GR) Mr President, on behalf of the Commission I should like to start by saying that Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti's excellent report gives a valuable review of all that can be done in this field if we are to make progress and strengthen the family as an institution in the Community.

I should like to thank Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti for praising the efforts the Commission has made up till now to strengthen the institution of the family, while at the same time pointing out that these efforts were backed up by minimal financial resources.

I agree with the rapporteur that the measures taken up to now are inadequate in relation to the objectives of a more comprehensive family policy at European level. On the subject of a more comprehensive family policy in the Community, I would point out that the various Member States — and this must be borne in mind — have somewhat differing approaches to family matters. It would be good if there were a uniform approach to family matters, although no one can say whether it will be possible to achieve a clear-cut view for or against in all cases, for instance as regards an increase in the birth rate. At any rate, it will be more difficult

Contogeorgis

to reconcile views on family policy than on other subjects such as combating poverty, old people, etc. The differences of opinion on the family are mainly the result of the differing approaches to the role of the family as the creator of new generations, and on this point the report makes it clear that the principle aim of family policy must be to protect all members of the family, and more particularly the children.

Mr President, it would appear that the family in the Community will in future have a major role to play in caring for the aged and the disadvantaged, and the Member States have their own views on this point. The number of old people is increasing, and the rapid increase in the number of old people in need of care could form the basis for a reconsideration of the role of the family, as well as for a strengthening of the family as an institution, whether it be the family in the traditional form or the *de facto* family. The current period of crisis increases the need to put an end to efforts to establish various institutions and provide all kinds of services which might replace the best instrument we have for providing care at an initial stage, i.e. the family. An increasing awareness of this wider role of the family could be a decisive step towards establishing more comprehensive family policies in the Member States.

The Commission will at any rate play a coordinating role in these measures and will increase its own efforts. This coordinating role presents difficulties in view of the Member States' differing views on family policy, which I already mentioned, as well as in view of the differences in progress in related fields such as that of women's rights. Nevertheless, I think it must be made clear that the Commission could never replace national policy on matters of national responsibility.

As is pointed out in the report, the Commission has already assisted the family in various fields and will continue to do so in future, even though the means at its disposal in terms of both staff and money are extremely limited.

Without giving any undertaking to set up a programme of action, as proposed by Mrs Cassamagnago Cerretti, I should like to mention briefly some of the actions undertaken by the Commission, just so as to show that something can be done even outside the framework of a specific programme. For instance, the existing regulations on the social security and freedom of movement of migrant workers and their families have to some extent made it possible for these people to be assimilated into the host countries — in a way, in fact, which is a model at international level. Other special measures have also been adopted in favour of migrant workers and their families. I would mention Directive 486 of 1977 on the education of the children of migrant workers, and various pilot programmes on improving the accommodation of the less-favoured and of migrant workers etc.

All this has been possible under the programme of action in favour of migrant workers and the members of their families decided upon by the Council of Ministers on 9 February 1976.

Talks with the European bodies concerned with family matters within the Community are continuing in various ways. The bodies in question are represented on various consultative committees such as the consumer affairs committees and the committees on agriculture, and there are also regular meetings between the representatives of these bodies and the responsible departments of the Commission to discuss matters concerning the position of the family. Strengthening the family is also an objective which has been pursued by the European Social Fund in the form of financial participation in setting up crèches for children whose mothers are attending vocational training courses, as is being done in Leeds in the United Kingdom. There are other measures which could be mentioned, such as the proposal for a Community directive on leave to be granted for family reasons, a study into the distribution of vocational, family and social burdens, etc.

Action at national level is the main feature of all these activities, and this will remain so in future. That means, unfortunately, that the Commission will not be able to assume the cost of measures such as those proposed in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the report in favour of single-parent families or families with incomes below the subsistence level.

For this reason, the Commission's role in these matters will be restricted to what it has achieved up to now in the pilot programmes and the studies into combating poverty. Moreover, as I have already said, the Commission is not in a position to meet other demands made in the report, not only because of the restricted nature of the funds available to it under the Community budget, but also because of lack of staff.

As regards the points concerning family policy, I would mention that, in addition to the special chapter in the annual social reports which have been published since 1959, there are also comparative tables on the various national social security systems, on the basis of which certain Member States have in the past started to grant aid — for instance for girls remaining at home or in the form of supplementary age-linked assistance — on the grounds that other Member States were paying such grants. As you will appreciate, the Commission has always supported — and will continue to support in future — every effort to give a family dimension to the policies being pursued in the economic, social and agricultural sectors, as well as in other sectors. The Commission believes that this will be more useful than an attempt to give a European dimension to the family policies being pursued by the Member States.

Mrs Maij-Weggen (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, Mr Contogeorgis mentioned a proposal for a directive on parental leave, but we have not yet received any such proposal. Could he perhaps say what stage this proposal has reached, as we are greatly interested in it.

Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission. — (GR) Mr President, this is a proposal which the Commission is studying and which it will be submitting to Parliament.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

6. Seeds

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-223/83), drawn up by Mr Diana on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-1300/82 — COM(82) 895 final) for a regulation fixing the amount of aid granted for seeds for the 1984-85 and 1985-86 marketing years.

Mr Stella (PPE), deputy rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, for reasons beyond his control Mr Diana has had to depart and I am therefore taking his place to express the views of the Committee on Agriculture.

To get a good harvest you need good seed and that is why seed production is of strategic importance for European agriculture. It would therefore be a bad mistake to rely to a large extent on the world market. In an excellent Commission report which came out last year and which reviewed progress after 10 years of seed market organization, it was noted that aid has lost its ability to play a guiding role in production. The report states clearly that aid provides a supplement to the income of seed producers but it is totally ineffectual in the face of the one factor which influences the decisions of farmers, namely the market price of imported seeds. In view of these facts, it would be sensible to expect the Commission to redefine the organization of the market in seeds, whereas instead it is again proposing for the 1984-85 and 1985-86 marketing years a continuation of the present system, albeit with an average increase of 10 %, apparently to cover increased production costs in the two-year period. It has to be said right away that, given the average inflation rate in the Community, an average increase of this order would certainly be insufficient to cover the rise in costs, especially in those countries where the inflation rate is above the European average and which would therefore find it much more difficult to compete. The proposal to stop aid for certain legumes, such as vetch and peas, gets the support of the Committee on Agriculture on account of the tremendous increases in the production of these crops and because they benefit from other aid measures as a

result of Regulation 1431/82. The committee also supports the idea of increasing aid for certain trifolium and lucerne species which give low yields for the area cultivated.

It is also our view that durum wheat seed should benefit from the organization of the market in seeds, given the importance of this crop in some areas which are among the poorest in the European Community and in view of the need to improve the crop genetically. It also seems fair to propose that premiums should be refused to varieties which do meet specific quality requirements, although it has to be remembered that in most cases seed production is cyclical over a number of years and that as a result, if it is going to be effective, production aid must run for at least two years and far enough ahead of the marketing year.

The Committee on Agriculture feels that the Commission proposals can be accepted at present, although we recommend that the level of aid be increased to cover the real rise in production costs. At the same time we feel that there is a need for a study to review the current organization of the market, bearing in mind long-term trends, so that we can give new impetus to this sector which is of vital importance for the future of agriculture in Europe.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, I should like first of all to take this opportunity of thanking Mr Diana, who is unfortunately unable to be present, and the Committee on Agriculture for the support they have given to the Commission's proposal, and also to thank the deputy rapporteur who has stood in for Mr Diana. I take this as a reflection of the importance which the Committee attaches to this sector of Community agriculture.

It should be pointed out in this connection that although the Community covers its own requirements in the case of most types of cultivated seeds, certain varieties are nevertheless in short supply, and it was with a view to ensuring Community seed production and reasonable incomes for the seed producers that an arrangement involving production aids to this sector was introduced some 10 years ago. So far, the arrangement has proved effective but this obviously does not rule out the possibility of subsequent improvements. The Commission will take account of a proposal by Parliament on this matter.

In the context of rising production costs, the Commission has proposed a standard 10 % increase in the aid for the 1984/85 and 1985/86 marketing years. If we take the annual fluctuations into consideration, this increase is roughly in line with the amounts generally proposed for other agricultural products for 1983/84. Any further increase would merely leave the Community with an even greater surplus on its hands than it has already in the case of certain varieties.

Dalsager

The Commission also intends to examine the possibility of reintroducing the system whereby the aid was paid on a yearly basis and possibly extending the arrangement to include durum-wheat seed and other varieties. However, it does not think that this is the right time to amend the proposal in this respect.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

7. Milk and milk products

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-225/83), drawn up by Mr Curry on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-107/83 — COM (83) 127 Final) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 804/68 on the common organization of the market in milk and milk products.

The following oral question with debate (Doc. 1-190/83) by Mr Seligman and others is also included in the debate :

Subject : Surplus milk and milk products

1. In view of the allegation that the surplus milk and milk products in the Community is caused by overproduction by the large efficient producers, can the Commission provide conclusive evidence on this matter ?
2. Will the Commission indicate whether there has, in fact, been an increase in sour milk and milk products only from the large producers during the last two years and that medium and small producers have remained static ?

Mr Battersby (ED), deputy rapporteur. — Mr President, at the request of Mr Curry, who is absent from the House because of *force majeure*, as he is voting today in the British national election, I am presenting his excellent and very important report to the House.

I must first of all emphasize the fact that this motion for a resolution was unanimously adopted in the Committee on Agriculture on 20 April. Secondly, I must emphasize the importance and urgency of the proposals. We have found that although the Community programme to subsidize the consumption of dairy products in schools is excellent in principle, it is inefficient and over-bureaucratized in practice. The programme is operated by local government officials with limited budgets and a wide range of responsibilities. Simplification is vital if these procedures are to be effective.

The major problems are that there is too great a delay in payment of the subsidy to the authority administering the scheme, which creates cash-flow problems for local authorities and becomes an extra charge on

the ratepayer. There is also too great a diversity or complexity of rules governing dairy products eligible for subsidy. Finally, the range of dairy products eligible under the present scheme is very restricted.

The solutions offered by the rapporteur are to accelerate subsidy payments so that payment is received within 10 days after presentation of the demand, secondly, that the rules be harmonized and simplified and finally, that the range of eligible products should be widened. On this last point we believe that the range should be extended to include cottage cheese made from skimmed milk, yogurt with a 75% milk content by weight, milk-based puddings for school lunches and whipping cream with a 40% minimum fat content.

There is a further point I would like to make, namely that teachers should be incorporated in the scheme. This could possibly increase the willingness of schools to use the scheme and would be definitely a positive move.

On the amendments, I would recommend that Amendments Nos 1, 4, 8, 2, 6, 3 and 10 be accepted by the House. I must, however, recommend that we reject Amendment No 5, by Mr Eyraud. This is a device to destroy the whole *raison d'être* of the report. It would automatically exclude all the extra products and would negate the unanimous decision of the Committee on Agriculture taken, as I said, on 20 April. I must also advise the House to reject Amendment No 7, by Mr Bocklet. Whilst understanding his reasoning, which is perfectly logical, restricting the inclusion of extra products to a trial period of two years would make it impossible to plan or to establish long-term supply programmes. We want this proposed scheme to be a success and not to strangle it at birth by lukewarm support.

On Amendment No 6, the wording of the English text requires modification to relate it to the other linguistic texts. The second sentence should read : 'Calls on the Commission to examine in particular', instead of : 'Calls on the Commission to concentrate on'. Perhaps the translation service could look into this for us.

With these comments, Mr President, I would again call on the House to adopt the Curry report unanimously and would also recommend acceptance of all the amendments, except, of course, Amendments Nos 5 and 7.

This debate also includes the oral question by Mr Seligman and others, and I would like to make one point here. The question is concerned with the allegation that bigger milk-producers are responsible for the milk surplus, and this is used as a basis for the proposition that bigger producers should be selectively penalized. This also applies, of course, to the more efficient farmers and their penalization.

Battersby

It is very important that we recognize that there is no fair definition of big or small milk-producers that can be applied throughout the Community. The structure of dairy farming and its profitability differs substantially between the countries, and a selective penalization of big farmers is a totally inappropriate way of dealing with the Community problem of surplus milk.

Mr Woltjer (S). — *(NL)* Mr President, I shall be very brief, because my opinion is a favourable one. I should like first of all to thank the rapporteur for his report and for the correct and very clear way in which he has gone about his work. The Socialist Group fully supports the Commission's proposal. In our view, the programme aimed at making milk products available at school is of great importance, and we therefore believe that the proposals the Commission has now made to improve the situation take us a good step along the road towards a definite programme on milk products at school.

Having said that, I share the criticism made by the rapporteur on the way in which the programme has been carried out. So far, it has been, in my opinion, much too bureaucratic and inflexible, and the products concerned have been subject to too many restrictions.

I should like to make it crystal-clear that, by subscribing to and supporting the programme, we certainly do not wish to give the impression that we think the milk problem can be solved by this particular expedient. That would be absolutely impossible, and I believe that the Commission, in weighing up the proposals, should not try to solve the problem by such devices as the fat content, but should try quite simply to institute a good school-milk programme or a good programme for children at school. That should be the essential starting point — not the other way round. So far, the programme has not reached that stage, but — let me repeat — the Socialist Group supports the proposed improvements, and I would urge the Commission to give serious consideration to the amendments and improvements proposed by the rapporteur, and to include them in future programmes.

Mr Bocklet (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European People's Party also supports Mr Curry's motion for a resolution. In particular we welcome the attempt to simplify the administrative modalities of this regulation, and it seems to me that Mr Curry's report shows that something can indeed be done in this respect.

We approve in principle of the extended range of products, but we feel that neither the Commission nor the rapporteur have so far shown to our full satisfaction that this will result in increased sales. For that reason, we propose that this measure be restricted to a two-year period. We are of course aware that the Council has already agreed on a five-year period, but

we would ask the Council to reconsider the matter. We feel that it would be more sensible to see what happens over the first two years.

The greater the range of products on sale at school, the less inclination there will be on the part of those selling the products — in most cases, the caretaker — to actually make the effort to sell the products to the schoolchildren. We therefore feel that we should not only simplify the administrative procedure, but also give some consideration to this problem too.

One final point — we are giving our support to this directive on the grounds that it will increase the Community's share of the financing of this project. I should like to draw your attention here to the situation in the part of the Federal Republic of Germany I come from, North Rhine-Westphalia, where the provincial government incomprehensibly cut back its spending by DM 3 million last year, thus foregoing its right to DM 27 million in the form of cheap school milk from Community funds. As a result of the Community increasing its share of the financing, the children in North Rhine-Westphalia can once again reap the full benefits of cheap school milk, and I believe that this alone deserves the House's support.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — *(DA)* Mr President, as Mr Curry explained in his report and as Mr Battersby has very capably explained here this afternoon on Mr Curry's behalf — for which I should like to thank him — the programmes for subsidized milk in schools should be considered in the context of the Community arrangements aimed at promoting the consumption of dairy produce in Community, while at the same time ensuring that the school children in the Community enjoy the highest-quality and most appropriate diet possible. There are programmes drawn up by the Member States but which receive Community aid. This aid has so far corresponded to 112.5 % of the target price for milk. However, this contribution conditional on the Member States paying an amount corresponding to at least 12.5 % of the Community aid themselves. The arrangement has been in force for five years, but there is no getting away from the fact that it has so far not been quite as successful as we might have wished. In fact, over the last few years we have seen a slight reduction in the amounts of dairy produce supplied under the national programmes.

The aim of this Commission proposal is to make these arrangements more effective by replacing them by a Community aid system which would not be conditional on contributions on the part of the Member States themselves. However, the Member States can supplement the Community subsidies on a national basis. This change should also mean increased scope of application for these measures, for which standard rules of application could be laid down for the entire Community.

Dalsager

Commission is aware, for the rest, of the economic problems which face educational establishments wishing to take advantage of this arrangement, and for this reason, it has clearly stated that it would prefer the subsidies to be paid directly to the suppliers of the products in question so that they can sell them at lower prices. In this way, the schools could be relieved of financial problems.

On the other hand, the Commission is prepared to re-examine the range of dairy products eligible for aid, and we will attach great importance to restricting aid to products with high milk content and nutritional value, since if we are to encourage healthy consumption habits among young people, we must offer them high quality products. Not least, we should promote the consumption of milk fat, since milk fat contains most of the flavourings and nutrients which make for the quality of the final products, from the point of view of both taste and nutrition.

The Commission also shares the rapporteur's interest in simplification of the administrative aspects of this arrangement and for this reason is thinking in terms of extending the range of products eligible for aid only to a limited extent. As regards the first amendment to the Commission's proposal for a regulation, I should like to say that even if the Commission has itself spoken in favour of direct payment of the aid, it nevertheless sees no need to amend the proposal, since the implementing provisions will be laid down subsequently in the implementing regulation.

As regards Mr Seligman's Oral Question, I should like to say that we obviously cannot conclude, on the basis of the most recent figures for developments in milk production, that it is exclusively the major producers who are responsible for the rise in milk production. We have nevertheless noted a certain correlation between the yield per cow and the size of the herd, the greatest average yields being found in large herds. However, other factors have also played their part — such as the weather last summer, which was particularly favourable to milk production in certain parts of the Community. Then there is the increased average yield per cow and an increase in the percentage of milk delivered to dairies even in those Member States where the average dairy herds are relatively small.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

8. *Horses intended for slaughter*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-229/83), tabled by Mrs Herklotz on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the transport of horses intended for slaughter.

Mrs Herklotz (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this report has its origins in a motion for a resolution referred to the Committee on Agriculture by this House two years ago, and undoubtedly harks back to one of the many campaigns conducted in the German and international media, which have often enough — and unfortunately with good reason — highlighted the problem of the transport of horses intended for slaughter. Animal protection is an important factor in our countries, so it is hardly surprising that a variety of parliamentary bodies have for a long time now been taking an interest in questions centering on this controversial business. Of particular importance here have been the debates in the German Bundestag — some of which I myself have attended — and the report of the parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe. In all cases, it has been German parliamentarians who have brought up this problem, although most of the horses intended for slaughter have not been destined for Germany. Both the German states — but particularly the Federal Republic of Germany — are in the main countries of transit in terms of animal transport.

Something like a million horses are imported into Western Europe for slaughter every year from the Soviet Union, Poland, Yugoslavia and other Eastern European countries, while Greece and Ireland are exporters of horses within the European Community. The main consumer countries are Italy, France and Belgium, and the French horsemeat butchers and consumers in particular are keen on the horses being slaughtered in the country of consumption, rather than being imported in a deep-frozen state.

Horses are transported by rail, road and sea, and cases of ill-treatment and cruelty during transport have in the past repeatedly given rise to protests throughout Europe and particularly in Germany. The main complaints have concerned excessively long journey times, inadequate feeding and watering facilities, unsuitable means of transport and inadequate veterinary care during transport and loading.

This report and its attached motion for a resolution call for international and Community provisions regarding the protection of animals during international transport to be tightened up to put an end to the cruel treatment inflicted on animals.

After detailed discussion, the Committee on Agriculture has decided to call for a maximum, medically justifiable, transport time to be laid down, for uninterrupted lorry journeys to be restricted to 500 km instead of the present 800 km, for road transport across frontiers to be allowed to use only crossing-points with veterinary control, feed and watering facilities, for the introduction of an 18-hour deadline for feeding and watering during transport, for a ban on 'cross loading' — which has been shown to result in

Herklotz

panic and injuries during marshalling and starting-off and braking operations — and for all transport containers to be fitted with partitions.

The report goes on to call for the Community to itself accede to the European Convention for the protection of animals during international transport, for the Commission to submit proposals for improving the existing Community directives, based on this report. The German Animal Protection Association has come out in favour, after the report had been approved and the motion adopted, of introducing an 8-hour deadline for feeding and watering horses during transport, on the grounds that even the 18-hour feeding and watering deadline called for in the report were not adequate for horses' needs.

The association has done a great deal of work, and for this reason, I have tabled this amendment personally, leaving the decision up to the House.

Voices are often raised in favour of a general ban on the transport of horses for slaughter, but I believe that such demands must be rejected for the time being, on the grounds that the transport operations are effected by third countries and are thus not subject to any of the Community's own standards.

The important thing is to keep the interests of the consumers in the importing countries in mind, and to reconcile them with respect for all living creatures. After all, civilization can be judged by man's attitude to other defenceless beings.

(Applause from the left)

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

President

Mrs Veil (L). — *(FR)* On a point of order, Mr President, it was after 6 p.m. when the rapporteur was called to speak about a question which could not wait any longer, namely that of the transport of horses, but the vote was supposed to be at 6 p.m.

We always have voting time at 6 p.m., and this time it was very important. I find it unacceptable that the start of voting time was held up so that a rapporteur could speak.

(Applause)

President. — Mrs Veil, I note your remarks.⁽¹⁾

9. Application of the Rules of Procedure

President. — The next item is the examination of the interpretations which, in accordance with Rule 111 of the Rules of Procedure, the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Petitions has forwarded to

⁽¹⁾ Request for the immunity of a Member to be waived: see Minutes.

me and which I submitted to Parliament during Monday's sitting.

There are five interpretations, all of which have been published in the Minutes of Monday's sitting, and so all Members have had an opportunity to see them.

In accordance with Rule 111 (4) of the Rules of Procedure, the matter must be put to the vote only if there are any objections. As provided for in the Rules of Procedure, 10 Members of the House have objected to the proposal by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions on Rule 49, concerning motions for resolutions entered in the register.

Parliament must vote on this proposal, and since in practice it might be referred back to committee I shall apply the procedure under Rules 82 to 85, which means that I shall allow the mover of the rejection motion to speak for three minutes, then one speaker for and one against and — if he so wishes — the Chairman of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

Mr von Hassel (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, I should like to see this report referred back to committee. This attitude is dictated by my experience as president of a national parliament and by a desire not to make your task more difficult, Mr President. This consideration for the office of President prevents me from being too outspoken in declaring the view that this procedure which was embarked upon on Monday is incompatible with parliamentary principles.

(Applause)

My reasons for this view are, firstly, that the motion was properly entered in the register, as has been normal hitherto. Secondly, what we have before us now — and not even in all the languages — is not an interpretation but a revised version. Thirdly, the far-reaching reworded versions for the future should not be implemented without being referred to committee and without the possibility of debate. I am afraid that this procedure has nothing to do with proper parliamentary procedures. Fourthly, it would appear that they are to apply retrospectively. This is totally impossible.

(Applause)

If we wish to change something — and we are prepared to listen to the arguments in favour of doing so — it should only apply to the future. Fifthly, I also contest the 'interpretation' that we are interfering in the President's organizational sphere of competence.

The conclusions concerning the Zagari report are a political decision on the basis of the report itself. 240 colleagues in this House have demonstrated this political will, but it is a fact which is completely ignored by this document.

von Hassel

In the meantime a few Members have tabled a proposal that the interpretation before us be incorporated into the Rules of Procedure as the basis for future decisions. For this to be done, the committee responsible must discuss the matter thoroughly and put the necessary proposals to the House. The decision of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions is therefore not included in the minutes of 6 June. I request that the Irmer document and the motion by Mr Luster and others should be referred back to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. But since the Rules of Procedure have considerable political and legal significance, I also request that at the same time both documents be referred to the Political Affairs Committee and the Legal Affairs Committee for their opinions.

(Applause)

Mr Herman (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, after a thorough and unheated debate the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions decided, on the basis of indisputable legal arguments, that Rule 49 was not applicable to the subjects expressly dealt with in Rule 24 (2) of the Rules of Procedure. By virtue of this rule, it is the Bureau which is entitled to take decisions on questions of internal organization. Of course, the Bureau only has its power because it is, as it were, permanently delegated to the Bureau by the plenary Assembly, which remains sovereign in the matter and may at any time withdraw this mandate from it. But it is unthinkable that the serious act involved in relieving the Bureau of this mandate, and which could only be interpreted as showing a lack of confidence, or even disavowing it, should be taken in a rush without a debate by using the simplified procedure under Rule 49.

I shall not list here the other legal and logical arguments underlying the conclusion proposed by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, since they are summarized in the report before you. Neither shall I talk on the second question you have put to the committee as to how it is possible to amend such a proposal. It is a technical problem which I feel should not be raised here.

I should simply like to add that all those who are in favour of Strasbourg — since the problem has now been raised in so many words — have no reason to object to this rational interpretation of our Rules of Procedure, since Parliament may, at any time, either by invoking Rule 47 or Rule 48 or even by simply calling upon the President, give the Bureau all the instructions necessary for what it considers to be the best internal organization of proceedings.

(Applause)

Mr Luster (PPE). — *(DE)* I should like to raise a point of order under Rule 83. Firstly, I consider that it

is no longer possible for the matter we are now supposed to vote on to be the subject of a decision by parliament since you yourself, according to the verbatim record before me, stated on 10 March this year, and I quote :

In accordance with Rule 49 (5) of the Rules of Procedure, the motion for a resolution without a number on the consequences to be drawn from the European Parliament's adoption on 7 July 1981 of the Zagari report has been signed by more than half the Members of Parliament.

You informed Parliament of this in your own words in accordance with Rule 49 (5) and added that in your view a certain time should be allowed, under Rule 49, for interpretation of the Rules. This is what happened.

Secondly, if it is intended to bring about a vote by means of an interpretation of the Rules of Procedure, I would ask you to check whether this is not contrary to the provisions of the Rules of Procedure in that it makes a considerable difference for the quorum whether the vote is on an interpretation or on an amendment of the Rules. An amendment requires a majority of the Members of Parliament, while an interpretation only requires a simple majority of those present. I hold the view that an amendment should be made, and I would ask you to take account of this.

Thirdly, I should like to join Mr von Hassel in pointing out that yesterday Mr Pfennig and I tabled an amendment on the point raised by the rapporteur, Mr Herman, so that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions must, in accordance with Rule 111, deal with this amendment first.

Mr Nyborg (DEP), Chairman of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. — *(DA)* Mr president, I cannot at this stage force myself to become as excited as many others apparently can. The interpretation of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure regarding Rule 49 (3) and (6) is an interpretation of principle and does not relate to any specific matter. The Committee's thinking was as follows: firstly, an interpretation has already been given which lays down that Rule 49 cannot be used to circumvent Parliament's normal procedure for instance in connection with the conciliation procedure, the budget or changes in the Rules of Procedure. Secondly, Rule 24 (2) of Parliament's Rules of Procedure — which were adopted by an absolute majority of the Members of Parliament — contains a provision to the effect that the Enlarged Bureau reaches decisions on questions concerning Parliament's internal organization, as well as on questions concerning relations with bodies and organizations which do not belong to the Communities. The Committee on the Rules of Procedure therefore concluded that Rule 49 cannot be applied in the case of decisions on the internal organization of the European Parliament.

Nyborg

I might add that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure did not express an opinion on the request put forward by a majority of Parliament's Members in the von Hassel motion for a resolution — which I myself in fact signed. However, the Committee would like such decision to be reached in accordance with the procedures laid down in the Rules of Procedure. I therefore recommend that the interpretation reached by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure be approved.

(Mr Schieler asked to speak)

President. — Mr Schieler, I do not want any further discussion. The Rules of Procedure are quite clear on this point. Mr von Hassel has spoken in favour. There can be one speaker in favour and one against — plus the Chairman of the Committee, should he wish to speak. We can therefore proceed immediately to take a vote on the basis of the text submitted to me by 10 Members and which runs as follows :

'Les soussignés, Membres du Parlement Européen, s'opposent, en se fondant sur l'article 111 du règlement, à la prétendue interprétation de l'article 49 du règlement proposée par la commission du règlement et insérée dans le procès-verbal de la séance du 6 juin 1983.'

That is what we shall be voting on. If you accept this proposal it means that the problem is referred back to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

I therefore put to the vote the objection to the interpretation of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, on the understanding that, if it is not adopted, the question is referred back to committee.

(Parliament agreed to the request for referral back to committee)

I note that I have not received any objections to the other interpretations, which are thus considered to be adopted.

Mr Gontikas (PPE). — *(GR)* Mr President, I asked to speak some time ago to say that we have violated the Rules of Procedure in three different ways. The first infringement, to which I also drew attention on Tuesday, when you yourself were not in the chair, is that Parliament is not responsible for concerning itself with this working document from the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. The Bureau undertook to answer me on this point, since Rule 111 (3) was not properly applied in view of the fact that, as can be seen from the minutes, only 8 of the regular Members were present in committee.

The second infringement, as Mr Luster has already pointed out, is that Parliament had already decided on

7 March on the basic question of its place of work, so that it is not possible to go back now.

My third remark, now that the matter has also been raised by the Chairman of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, concerns the misinterpretation of Rule 24 (2) ...

President. — Mr Gontikas, you are not raising a point of order but starting a debate on the matter. The question has been referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and we shall wait to see what the committee suggests.

Mr Estgen (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to point out that Mr Luster gave here an interpretation of what you said during a sitting. We voted for referral to committee but what is the legal position now with regard to this motion for a resolution? I should like to have this point made clear.

President. — Mr Estgen, you know as well as I do that the resolution, once it has been adopted and with reservations as far as the view of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions is concerned, has been referred back to the committee of which you are a member.

10. *Votes*⁽¹⁾*MAHER INTERIM REPORT (DOC. 1-1327/82 'AGRICULTURAL INCOMES')**Motion for a resolution as a whole — Amendment No 17*

Mr Maher (L), rapporteur. — Mr President, I have been informed that Mr Helms is withdrawing this amendment. However, I want to make a comment on paragraph 10 since it is the only paragraph where I am proposing to make a change myself. I am dropping the last sentence from paragraph 10. I hope that will be accepted. I am making that statement at this time with your permission.

President. — We shall discuss paragraph 10 when we come to it. If I forget I hope you will remind me.

Mr Helms (PPE). — *(DE)* The rapporteur, Mr Maher, has asked for the last part of paragraph 10 to be deleted. It reads: Through the creation of a Rural Fund, intended to operate in all sectors of the rural economy. If this is approved by the Assembly, and if you agree, Mr President, then I am ready to withdraw my amendment, No 17. I made this proposal to Mr Maher during the debate.

⁽¹⁾ See Annex.

President. — Very well, Mr Helms, but I am sorry we cannot discuss the texts here. There is a text which has to be voted on. The rapporteur is going to propose that part of paragraph 10 be deleted. The vote will first be taken and then if it falls you will be right. At the moment, however, I cannot predict what Parliament is going to do. That is the way things stand at the moment.

Paragraph 18 — Amendment No 16

Mr Maher (L), rapporteur. — Mr President, I have a difficulty with Amendment No 16. The date of 1 September 1983 is mentioned for the Commission to come forward with new proposals. I have indicated that this, in my view, is totally unrealistic and I could not support the amendment unless the proposers are prepared to drop the date. If they are, I would recommend it.

Mr Früh (PPE). — (DE) If it is just a question of the date, Mr President, we can take a generous view. We are not insistent about that but we are insistent that Commission produce something new.

President. — This means that the amendment is being changed. The proposal is that the date of 1 September 1983 be left out.

Mr Früh (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, in order to exert a bit of pressure, could we not add the words *as soon as possible*?

President. — I am not sure if that would exert any pressure, Mr Früh, but I do know that this would be an oral change to an amendment, and I should like to avoid it. I think we can manage without *as soon as possible*.

11. *Horses intended for slaughter (continuation)*

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the report (Doc. 1-229/83) by Mrs Herklotz.

Mr Eisma (NI), rapporteur for the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. — (NL) Mr President, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection sees the welfare of animals as an important aspect of a caring attitude to the natural environment. Animals must be transported with care if we are to avoid causing them distress. Transport within the Community is covered by Directive 77/489/EEC, which unfortunately makes horses and other solipeds subject to the same provisions as cattle, sheep, goats and pigs, despite the fact that horses are very different from these latter species, both physiologically and ethologically. They have to put up with a great deal more suffering as a result of long-distance transport, which means that they should be subject to more strin-

gent regulations than the other species, something which is reflected in Amendment Nos 1 and 2 tabled by the Committee.

It is unnecessary, and therefore uneconomical, to insist that these more stringent regulations be applied to the other types of animal too, which is why the transport of solipeds belongs in a different section of Directive 77/489/EEC, as stated in Amendment No 4.

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection recommends the adoption of a number of provisions relating to the transport of horses, most of which are incorporated in Mrs Herklotz's report. What we think is missing from her report, however, are provisions relating to unloading and resting at crossing-points, as well as a clause stipulating a maximum length of 3.7 m for pens in road vehicles, and that is what our Amendments Nos 8 and 9 set out to achieve. All the amendments I have mentioned so far merely add to Mrs Herklotz's report, and are not in opposition to it.

There is, however, one point on which my Committee begs to differ from the Committee on Agriculture, and that has to do with long-term developments. The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection believes that the long-distance transport of live horses should be discouraged in the longer term, and be replaced by the transport of refrigerated — and I stress the word refrigerated rather than deep-frozen — carcass meat, as is reflected in Amendment No 3. The Committee on Agriculture, on the other hand, is afraid that, in the event of the transport of live horses being banned altogether, the trade would move to third countries and could thus be beyond the Community's control. They also feel that such a ban would have adverse effects on the Community's trade with the exporting countries. The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection shares these fears only insofar as they concern a transport ban in the short term. What we are talking about, though, is not a transport ban but rather the possibility of discouraging the transport of live horses in the long term. This could be done by setting up export abattoirs in the exporting countries, if necessary with Community support.

Amendment No 11 calls on the Community to encourage the building of abattoirs for the slaughter of horses in Greece and on the Federal Republic of Germany's eastern borders. Mr Kirkos recently tabled a motion for a resolution drawing the Community's attention to Greek abattoirs. I am sure he will take pleasure today in the support of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, at least as far as horses are concerned.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (S). — (DE) The Socialist Group would like to thank Mrs Herklotz for her report. We think it urgently necessary for this House to concern itself with the conditions in which horses

Seibel-Emmerling

are transported both within the Community and into the Community. It is thanks to European public opinion, and in particular the shrill protest of those involved in animal protection, that the very worst excesses and the most brutal types of cruelty to which horses were exposed for so long now seem to belong to the past. But much still remains to be done before we can find a truly satisfactory solution. As Mr Eisma said just now, horses are extremely sensitive creatures, and cannot be measured by the same yardstick as sheep, goats and pigs. That being so, we very much welcome the amendments tabled by the rapporteur and by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, as well as almost all the individual amendments. The feed and water provisions and the call for partitions in large containers are just as essential as the ban on transporting pregnant horses, mares and their foals and old animals, which would not survive the journey long distances to the abattoir. Personally, I would strongly advise you to give your support to all the efforts being made with a view ensuring that, in the long term, live animals are no longer transported over such long distances. However good the legislation, cases of cruelty are always bound to crop up with animals being tormented until death brings them release. They ought to be allowed at least to meet their death in a near-by abattoir and I can see no real reason why this should be contrary to the consumer's interests. Nowhere in the European Community is freshly slaughtered meat consumed on the spot. It is always allowed to hang first, something which has nothing to do with deepfreezing, but is simply part and parcel of the perfectly normal circumstances in which we consume meat. I could understand people's reservations about deepfreezing the meat, but there is nothing whatever to prevent us from transporting hung meat. Let us therefore get together to work out, over the longer term — but preferably not too long — effective conditions for ensuring that the consumer has access to fresh hung meat which is properly checked under optimum conditions during transport, thus obviating the need for animals to be subjected any more to unnecessary cruelty.

(Applause)

Mr Mertens (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, having heard what the previous speakers have had to say, I am sure that no one will now have any doubts as to the fact that the horses we are talking about today do not have the wooden sensibility of children's rocking horses. We have already heard that horses are in fact highly sensitive creatures, and I can only go along with that. It therefore follows quite simply that we have a duty to ensure that, if such transport is unavoidable, it should at least be done properly. I believe there are signs that the situation

has been improving quite substantially for some time now, following on from the Commission's directives of 1977 and 1981. But, despite these, shortcomings are still evident, and we therefore welcome the fact that Mr von Habsburg has set the debate in motion once again with his motion for a resolution, and we also welcome the fact that Mrs Herklotz's report has given us such a thorough analysis of the situation and such an accurate indication of what needs to be done. I do not think anyone could have done a better job than Mrs Herklotz.

We shall be pleased to give our support to the other measures, but I should like to say that the use of road transport is no improvement. Clearly, lorry drivers — like railway staff — could show a little more empathy for the things they are transporting. The real problem is that it is more difficult to keep a check on road transport.

Secondly, there are a number of people who claim that it would be better to transport carcasses rather than live animals. I can only remind these people of the Latin saying which goes: *De gustibus non est disputandum*. As we all know, personal taste is something that can indeed be argued about, and we should bear this in mind. I do not believe that we can change the existing circumstances until people's tastes change. We shall be voting for Mrs Herklotz's motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

Mr Eisma (NI). — (NL) Mr President, I should like to join in congratulating Mrs Herklotz most sincerely on her excellent report. I am in the happy position of being able to agree with virtually everything she has said and with absolutely everything said by the draftsman of an opinion. My only quarrel with the Committee on Agriculture is that I think it quite extraordinary for live animals to be transported thousands of kilometres before being slaughtered, instead of first of all slaughtering them and then moving the refrigerated meat around — and it does not have to be deep-frozen, so French housewives need have no fear that the taste will be affected.

What is, in my opinion, missing from the report is a ban on the transport of excessively young, old and sick horses, something which clearly should not be allowed to happen. That is why, along with a variety of other amendments, I have tabled Amendment No. 10, which I would warmly commend to your attention. On the other hand, we cannot support Amendments Nos 6 and 7 tabled by Mr Moreland to the effect that horses should be slaughtered purely for humanitarian reasons and not for consumption. We are aware that various religious sects tell their adherents not to eat pork or beef, but we see no reason to outlaw the consumption of horsemeat as well.

Eisma

Finally, I look forward to hearing the Commission's reaction to the report and the amendments, and preferably to receiving its agreement to amend Directive No 77/489/EEC in line with Parliament's wishes.

Mr Habsburg (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, animal protection issues have always laboured under the need to reconcile legitimate human interests with loftier moral duties. For much of the time, it is like walking a tightrope, with a high risk of putting a foot wrong somewhere or other. More so than in many other subject areas, caution and a sense of proportion are at a premium here. That being so, I should like — in my capacity as author of the original motion for a resolution — to thank the rapporteur, Mrs Herklotz, most sincerely for her excellent and exemplary work.

(Applause)

Not only has she highlighted the matter at hand in remarkable fashion, she has also presented us with a motion for a resolution which not only proposes solutions for the problems at hand, but also points the way for future work on the same subject.

For thousands of years, horses have been man's partners and companions, and they have a right to be respected and treated accordingly. All too often, though, we have welshed on our obligations out of sheer greed and as a result of the inhuman system of production — without regard to losses — practiced to the east of our present borders.

It is now time that we — as protagonists of the ideal of a Europe based on morality and the rule of law — paid some heed to our obligations *vis-à-vis* our fellow creatures — which are, like us, God's own creation — without over-sentimentalizing things and affecting other people's legitimate interests. That is the purport of Mrs Herklotz's motion for a resolution.

Finally, I should like to address a special word of thanks to my Greek colleague, Mr Gontikas, whose fight for a more humane attitude to animals in Greece played a not inconsiderable part in the preparation of this motion for resolution, which I would now ask the House to adopt.

Mr Moreland (ED). — Mr President, like previous speakers I would like to congratulate the rapporteur. But I would like to beg two questions.

Firstly, why should horses be forced to travel such long distances before they are slaughtered? Secondly, the fundamental question, why should horses be slaughtered for commercial reasons at all?

Now I do not think that in this Parliament I am normally regarded as one who would be totally on the side of the animal welfare lobby. Certainly I am in favour of the slaughter of animals where it relates to necessary food; where it is necessary for the jobs of a number of people or where they are predators. But in this case it does not seem to me to be necessary at all.

Why should we kill horses for food at all, particularly when they are eaten in countries which happen to have a surplus of certain foodstuffs that could easily substitute for it? So I would beg the question, why do we need to slaughter horses for commercial reasons at all? Whether it be for humans or for pet food, it seems to me to be wrong. Indeed, a considerable amount of emotion is created in my own country when it is discovered that children's ponies get transferred across the English Channel and are used for pet food in continental countries.

So I would oppose this. I would also ask why 500 kilometres? Why can a slaughter not be done humanely much nearer? Why do we have to have that figure at all?

So, Mr President, I hope that the Parliament will support my amendment. Certainly I support the basic content of the report that Mrs Herklotz has put forward. But I would remind the House of the point I have made on previous occasions on animal welfare issues namely that we are very happy to take a strong line when it is animal welfare issues outside the Community — the seals issue is an obvious one — but we seem to take a slightly different attitude when it is an animal welfare issue within the Community, and I think we should be consistent.

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — *(DA)* Mr President, this motion for a resolution makes four requests to the Council and Commission and I am pleased to be able to say that, generally speaking, I can go along with the views reflected in these requests.

As regards the tightening up of the provisions of Directives No 77/489 and 81/389 the Commission stated when they were adopted that its intention had been to lay down minimum requirements for standard implementation of the system for international transport of animals. The Commission, therefore, has initiated detailed discussions regarding transport requirements for the individual types of animals with a view, in the first instance, to making a recommendation to all the parties involved. The Commission expects that account will be taken in these discussions of all the various details such as loading, feeding and watering.

As regards the question of limiting the time animals spend in transport, the Standing Committee on Agricultural Research is currently, on the instructions of the Council of Ministers, conducting detailed studies as regards the physiological, animal-behavioural and economic aspects. And I think therefore that we should wait until these studies have been completed before drawing any final conclusions and taking the matter further.

As regards the proposal to approach the other Member States of the Council of Europe and other countries involved in the transport of animals for

Dalsager

slaughter through the territory of the European Community, I am pleased to be able to inform you that this has already been done. A meeting of experts held towards the end of 1981 under the Council of Europe's *ad hoc* committee on the international transport of animals concluded, *inter alia*, that both all the Member States of the Council of Europe and non-Member States which nevertheless regularly transported large numbers of animals to countries which had signed the Convention, should also become contracting parties to the Convention. The committee also called on the Ministerial Committee to consider recommending to those Member States which were not also Member States of the European Community that they should implement the provisions of Directive No 81/389 as far as possible.

As regards the wish to the effect that the European Community should become a party to the European Convention for the protection of animals during international transport, the Commission is waiting until the supplementary protocol has entered into force. In other words, we can only become a party to this Convention after all the existing parties have signed the supplementary protocol.

Mr President, I should like to conclude by thanking the rapporteur on behalf of the Commission for this excellent report.

Mr Eisma (NI). — (NL) Mr President, in order to avoid a misunderstanding, am I to take it from what the Commissioner has said that he is in favour of all the amendments tabled?

Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission. — (DA) Mr President, I did not state my views on the amendments which have been tabled. I was speaking on the motion for a resolution as tabled by the rapporteur. The Commission goes along with the proposals it contains.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at the next voting time.

(The sitting was suspended at 8 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MR KLEPSCH

Vice-President

12. Common commercial policy

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-376/83), drawn up by Mr Blumenfeld on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-64/83 — COM(83) 87 final) for a regulation on the strengthening of the common commer-

cial policy with regard in particular to protection against unfair commercial practices.

The following oral question with debate (Doc. 1-352/83), tabled by Mr Israël and Mr Cousté on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats to the Commission, is also included in the debate :

Subject : Development of trade between East and West Germany and its repercussions on intra-Community trade

In view of the increase in trade between East and West Germany, which is subject to an exemption arrangement designed solely to favour trade between the two Germanies, does the Commission feel that the 'Protocol on German internal trade and connected problems' is being applied correctly? Are the Commission's checks sufficient to prevent frauds concerning the origin of goods and the deflection of trade?

Can the Commission supply the European Parliament with the most recent data on German internal trade from the Federal Statistics Office?

Are these figures merely forwarded to the Statistical Office of the European Communities or does the latter assist in the collection of data?

Which are the sectors worst affected by the deflection of trade? What steps does the Commission intend to take to lessen the effects of the abuse of Community outlets by East and West Germany for products from other Comecon countries?

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, this proposal from the Commission to the Council and the way it has been dealt with by this House prompt me to make a number of critical remarks regarding the unusual procedure adopted in this particular case. What I have in mind is not the fact that we who are taking part in this debate have been waiting for the chance to do so since Wednesday afternoon, and are now discussing this extremely important issue in what is virtually an empty Chamber — that, after all, is just a parliamentarian's fate. What I feel bound to criticize, in my capacity as rapporteur, is the procedure itself.

In April 1982, the Council discussed a memorandum drawn up by the French government which called for the Community to be given special protection against unfair competition in international trade. In June of the same year, the Council then officially called on the Commission to draft a regulation, and at the end of March 1983, the Commission forwarded its proposal to the Committee on External Economic Relations in accordance with Articles 113 and 235 of the EEC Treaty, which provide for the European Parliament to be consulted. It was at the plenary meeting in the part-session of May 1983 that we were called on to debate the Commission's proposal and reach decisions

Blumenfeld

accordingly. Both the rapporteur and the Committee refused to do so, on the grounds that it was impossible — both technically and substantively — to produce and debate a report in such a short time. I must add, though, on behalf of the Committee that, by the time of our last meeting on 26 May of this year, we had discussed a draft which neither the Commission nor the members of the Council concerned regarded as a final draft. It was merely a provisional document, and — as I have been told by members of the Commission and the Council — it has still not been finally approved.

So, at this moment in time, we are discussing a regulation which is in effect not a final proposal — a somewhat unusual situation. As a result of the pressure put on the Committee on External Economic Relations and the other committees whose opinion was required, we have not been able to discuss the important and, indeed, fundamental, wishes and amendments formulated by the Legal Affairs Committee.

In fact, we only received their comments once the procedure had run its course. That is not intended as criticism of the Legal Affairs Committee so much as of those bodies — to wit, the Commission and the Council — which put this pressure on us. I should like to say quite clearly and categorically that we cannot and will not go along with any similar procedure in the future, and this attitude is reflected in the motion for a resolution tabled by the Legal Affairs Committee.

The subject matter we are dealing with is complex and complicated. Parliament is not often consulted on the basis of an urgent proposal pursuant to the above articles of the EEC Treaty, despite the long history of the proposal in the hands of the Council and the Commission acting at the Council's behest. In voting on the individual questions, we must therefore be quite clear in our own minds that we are in fact debating and voting on the proposal for the Council's EEC regulation on the strengthening of the common commercial policy with regard in particular to protection against unfair commercial practices and on the motion for a resolution closing the procedure for consultation of the European Parliament on the Commission's proposal. Both proposals have now been discussed by the Committee on External Economic Relations, and are contained in Document 1-376/83 of 1 June 1983.

I would refer you here to the report, which is brief but reflects the main points the Committee has managed to discuss in the short time available to it. Let me repeat that the comments made by the subsidiary committees were not taken into account in our final decision because of the pressure of time. It is my belief that the Commission's proposal can only be properly evaluated in a wider context. Both the Commission and Parliament are convinced of the

need for measures designed to strengthen the internal market, but these should not be made part and parcel of more stringent protectionist measures *vis-à-vis* third countries. In other words, we reject any attempt to draw a formal connection between perfecting the measures needed to strengthen the internal market — which the Council and the Commission are discussing at present — and this proposal for a regulation. I should also like to point out that, in the course of the deliberations of the Committee on External Economic Relations, a number of highly critical comments were made, with regard in particular to the danger that protectionism could spread...

(The President asked the speaker to conclude)

As rapporteur I have 10 minutes' speaking time.

President. — Five minutes only, Mr Blumenfeld — that is what was decided.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE), rapporteur. — *(DE)* I was told I had 10 minutes, Mr President, and I would ask you to let me speak for the full 10 minutes.

President. — In that case I would have to deduct it from the time available to your group.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, you cannot make dogmatic rulings just like that.

President. — Mr Blumenfeld, I have no wish to get involved in an argument. I should really have made the point earlier, because we have applied the same rule all day that rapporteurs are allowed only 5 minutes' speaking time.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE), rapporteur. — *(DE)* When I spoke as a rapporteur yesterday, I was allowed 10 minutes.

President. — I am merely complying with decisions taken by Parliament at the beginning of the part-session.

Mr Blumenfeld (PPE), rapporteur. — *(DE)* Mr President, you must do what you think is right. My Committee was very critical on the danger of protectionism, but, all in all, we thought it essential to make the point — as is reflected in the amendments — that all the measures being proposed by the Commission to the Council are not only compatible, but also comply, with our international legal obligations and in particular our obligations under GATT. There are fundamental differences of opinion on two articles — Nos 12 and 13 — but the important thing here is to decide whether the Commission should be given more powers at the expense of the Council, and whether, pursuant to Article 12, the Commission should, in a 'crisis situation', be more or less empowered to take decisions under an urgent procedure. This question occupied the Committee's minds for a very

Blumenfeld

long time, and in the end we decided, by a narrow majority, to retain Article 12, although I personally take the view that it should be deleted. It will be up to the House to decide whether any amendment is in order.

(Applause)

Mr Sieglerschmidt (S), draftsman of an opinion for the Legal Affairs Committee. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, for the sake of simplicity, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made earlier on the procedural aspect by the rapporteur for the senior committee, the Committee on External Economic Relations. Parliament should indeed refuse more often to put up with the pressure of time that results whenever the other two Community institutions do not leave themselves enough time for the preparation of a draft regulation like this one.

The Legal Affairs Committee welcomes the broad measure of agreement on this issue with the senior committee. However, it would have been easier for the House as such to vote on the amendments if the senior committee had been able to give them its blessing and — numerous as they are — incorporate them into its own motion for a resolution.

The Legal Affairs Committee decided that its main priority was to avoid the incalculable repercussions of leaving too much leeway for interpretation, to ensure that the provisions were legally unambiguous and to clarify what the legislation was getting at wherever the wording of the proposed regulation was insufficiently clear to the man-in-the-street, if I may call him that.

I should like to comment briefly on the most important clause in this proposal, i.e. Article 2 (2), which gives a legal definition of what is meant by unfair commercial practices. An error has crept into the text here — at least in the German version of the text — and the Legal Affairs Committee's Amendment No 8 should in fact read: '... Not all practices attributable to third countries which are incompatible with the obligations of the third country *vis-à-vis* the Community'.

So much for that brief clarification; moving on to the text itself, we have deviated from the text of the proposal for a regulation, but at the same time we cannot agree with the proposal put forward by the senior committee on the grounds that we felt that the obligations of the third country *vis-à-vis* the Community should be incorporated into the article too. That is perfectly straightforward, and is firmly rooted in international law.

As regards Article 12, which the rapporteur himself referred to, and which provides for provisional measures, the Legal Affairs Committee would like to make it clear in the text of the regulation too that these are indeed provisional measures, and that the Commission should not be able to simply allow the

measures to run on and on on a kind of 'permanently provisional' basis, but should be compelled to initiate the normal procedure as provided for in the proposal at the same time as the temporary measures are instituted.

As regards Article 13, the Commission's proposal provides for the Council to be involved in cases where the consultative committee cannot reach agreement. The Legal Affairs Committee felt that the Council had lost nothing here, but that responsibility lay with the Commission, which should take its decisions on its own. Our work here was inevitably of a somewhat rough-and-ready nature, and this is brought out clearly by the errors which have crept in. For instance, in Amendment No 18, we should add: 'The decisions shall come into effect after five days', the rest being deleted. The Legal Affairs Committee intends to vote for the proposal for a regulation, but we felt that it should be rooted firmly in commercial law, and that we had a duty to clarify matters as far as possible.

Mr Rieger (S). — (DE) Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group, I should like to express my support for the Commission's proposal for a regulation on the strengthening of the common commercial policy with regard in particular to protection against unfair commercial practices. My Group is absolutely convinced that the time has come for us to take a fresh look at the foreign policy instruments at our disposal and — as is the case here — to improve them. In view of the major economic problems facing us and the escalating trade conflict, we can no longer afford to sit idly by and allow such things as the 'world economic summit' to be cursorily changed into something completely different, and the really urgent issues forced into the background. We are disappointed at what went on, and what we want to know is who was really representing European interests? We can only conclude that it is up to Europe to look to its own interests first and foremost and do its level best to see that they are respected. We therefore support this proposal for a regulation, which is a step in the right direction and will lead to greater cohesiveness among the countries of Europe.

Previous speakers have already said that the committee was forced to conduct its deliberations against the clock. That being so, we owe a special word of thanks to the rapporteur, Mr Blumenfeld, for everything he managed to get done in what were adverse conditions. One really central point is that the Committee on External Economic Relations voted in favour of Article 12 of the regulation. We see this as a clear indication of the fact that the Commission absolutely must be given a chance to take provisional measures without delay at a time of crisis to protect the Community from harm. I would therefore appeal to the Members of this House to go along with the decision taken by the Committee on External Economic Relations and to approve this central element of the regulation.

Rieger

The committee has also made it clear — and we Socialists wish to associate ourselves entirely with this — that the proposal, which accords with Article 113 of the EEC Treaty, was intended to — and indeed does — comply with our obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The Socialist Group takes the view that to insist on one's rights has nothing to do with protectionism of any hue, but is on the contrary a legitimate and essential means of stabilizing relations with our main trading partners and of bolstering up the international trading system.

We call on the Federal German Government, as the current Council Presidency, to cast aside its reservations and its unreasonable shilly-shallying and to take steps to ensure that the Council concludes its deliberations on these regulations — in the affirmative — as quickly as possible.

We regard the proposal for a regulation as a political step forward on the part of the Community, and we firmly believe that it will have the required effect. It is encouraging for both us and the people of the Community to see that Europe is capable and ready for action.

Mr van Aerssen (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my Group gives its unstinting support to both what has been said just now by Mr Blumenfeld and his proposed amendments to the Commission's proposal. While we are not particularly happy with the proposal itself, we do recognize that, at the current low-growth phase in the international economy, some Member States are having trouble coping with the problem of structural change at the same time as protecting their foreign policy flanks.

We realize that it is difficult for the Commission when it tables a proposal like this one, but after the discussions in the committee, we believe that the amendments proposed by the European Parliament — and which I think will receive the Commission's blessing — will ensure that the proposal complies with the terms of GATT, an essential point if it is to meet with our approval.

I am not so optimistic as Mr Rieger in thinking that this is no more than a procedural matter and not an entirely new ball-game designed to protect us against unfair commercial practices. To take the Commission's statements at their face value, what this proposal amounts to is no more than a way of improving the current range of instruments at our disposal, not the introduction of an entirely new state of affairs under international law. That is a vital point as far as we are concerned, because otherwise we could not give our approval to the proposal. We believe that those who have been particularly prominent in calling for this instrument should now keep their word and champion the cause of the internal market at the Stutt-

gart Summit. After all, what we have here is a composite proposal combining the use of our available range of instruments at the Community's external frontiers and measures designed to strengthen our internal market. That is perfectly logical, it is what we were promised, and we now expect that promise to be kept. We assume that the Commission is fully aware of the fact that the Treaties of Rome give it the wherewithal to defend its position, although this regulation may conceivably put the Commission in a somewhat difficult psychological position at international conferences, with Americans in particular claiming that the Community is in effect doing just the same as they are with the American Trade Act.

It is up to the European Parliament and the Commission to use this range of instruments with all due care, and we Members of the European Parliament should hold a watching brief to ensure that these facilities are not misused.

Mr Prout (ED). — Mr President, my group warmly supports the Commission's proposal. It is vital that we provide the Community with weapons to defend its legitimate trade interests similar to those possessed by its main trading partners. Moreover, our present inability to take effective action in the face of unfair practices could lead to a retreat into national measures.

In some respects, however, Mr President, we do not think that this proposal goes far enough. Accordingly, we have tabled 9 amendments extending its scope. In many cases they seek to bring the draft text more in line with United States Article 301 procedure. Our amendment to Article 2 (2) makes it possible to uncover unfair practices in those areas of commerce, for example services, where so far no international rules exist. All the complaint would have to show would be that the measure is in principle unfair or discriminating.

Our amendment to Article 2 (3) replaces the onerous requirement of proving material injury to Community industry by the lighter burden of material injury that burdens or restricts Community commerce. To consolidate this point, we also wish to amend Article 2 (4) to make it clear that the term 'commerce' includes services. Amendments have also been tabled to other parts of the regulation, where appropriate, to include services.

The amendments to Article 3 seek to extend the range of potential complainants and their rights. The changes to 3 (1) allow 'any interested party and not merely a Community industry' to lodge a written complaint as a result of unfair commercial practices. Our amendment to Article 3 (6) follows the United States definition of interested party. The addition to Article 3 (5) requires that the decision not to investigate should be conveyed to the plaintiff in writing, including the reason for the Commission's decision.

Prout

Further procedural rights, Mr President, are extended by amendments to Article 6. In particular, we seek to alter Article 6 (2) (a) to extend the scope of Commission investigations, to extend the time-limits set by Article 6 (4) (c) (i) (cc) in appropriate circumstances and to entitle the parties to legal representation. Moreover, we see no reason why provision should be made for an appeal to Council. Consequently, we wish to delete the last sentence of Article 13 (1) and the whole of Article 13 (2).

Finally, we wish to draw the Commission's attention to a difference in the English, and in at least one other, the German text. At the end of Article 6 (2) (a), the English version adds the words 'provided the firms or organizations concerned give their consent'. They do not appear, I am told, in the German. In our view, any such clause would severely weaken the regulation and should be deleted.

Mr Fernandez (COM). — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission's proposal is a response to a real need. The French Communists and Allies have repeatedly stated that the Community has the resources or can find the resources to keep a firm hold — as is fitting — on its position in the world in the face of its main competitors, the United States and Japan in particular.

It is obvious that the aggressive trade and economic policies of the Americans make it all the more necessary for the Community to equip itself with effective commercial policy instruments. We therefore approve of the Commission's proposal for a regulation as a contribution to the efforts that can and must be made by the Ten jointly, to open up possibilities for relaunching the economy which is now more urgent than ever before. What is more, this proposal is very much like the memorandum submitted by the French Government on 26 April 1982 to the Community institutions. In passing, we should like to make it clear that this type of proposal is by no means a protectionist measure since it seeks to endow the Community with measures such as would have permitted it, for example, to give immediate retort to the sale of American flour to Egypt.

We therefore hope that the Council will adopt this regulation as soon as possible. That is the purpose, Mr President, of the sole amendment that we have tabled. That is our approach in a nutshell, Mr President.

Mr Israël (DEP). — (*FR*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Europe must guard against irregular commercial practices. It must do so, not by resorting to protectionism, but by making sure that existing Community rules are respected. We approve of the Commission's proposal seeking to strengthen the instruments of the common commercial policy. We are in favour of both objectives, the first of which seeks to step up the use of supervisory measures in

accordance with existing legislation and the second of which is intended to help in the struggle against unfair measures which could harm European interests, and which could take the form of setting up a precise procedure for the receiving of complaints and the taking of decisions.

Now we can only hope that matters will not be made more complicated by the Council. Experience does indeed show that the Community is often handicapped by indecision on the part of the Council. The outcome of the Council's policy of caution is that, frequently, the Community's borders are more open than others, while the Community does not itself succeed in penetrating external markets to the desired degree.

This state of affairs must alter as from today. The Community's external trade is vital as it represents 24 % of our gross internal product, whereas the equivalent figures for Japan and the United States are 10 % and 8 % respectively. Convinced as we are that this is true, the Group of which I have the honour to be a Member says 'no' to protectionism, which has been creating havoc since the recession began, whether inside or outside the Community. I repeat, a common commercial policy must be devised quickly and implemented.

With your permission, Mr President, I should once again like to refer to trade between the two Germanies which is the subject of an oral question annexed to this debate and which we — Mr Cousté and myself — have tabled. Although the Treaty contains precise provisions for the regulation of German trade, there are a number of quite specific anomalies which are well known by the specialists. Indeed, it is common knowledge that many goods from Eastern bloc countries or elsewhere enter the Community's internal market via the two Germanys and end up flooding our market.

The Commissioner will either back or quash what I have just said. Whatever the case, it would be useful for Parliament to have precise and comprehensive statistics on this trade which affects a number of sectors. I am making this insistent demand today, so that we can quickly have the facts before us.

You may well consider, Mr President, that I am being picknickety, but I believe that this is a crucial question given the effect it has on certain parts of the market in one sector or another. That is why the DEP Group attaches special importance to this question.

Mr van Aerssen (PPE). — (*DE*) On a point of order, Mr President, I should like to point out that, a year ago, this House voted by an overwhelming majority for the report drawn up by our then colleague Mr de Clercq, who is today the Belgian Minister of Finance, on matters dealing with external trade with the Comecon countries. That report devoted a detailed

van Aerssen

chapter to German internal trade, coming to the conclusion that it complied very strictly with the rules and was not contrary to the Treaties of Rome.

President. — That was not a point of order.

Mr Seeler (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like first of all to say to the Commission that, when I first had a chance to look at this proposal, I was more than a little surprised at the fact that the Commission had made such a proposal at all. So far, the Community has only benefited from avoiding anything that might have disrupted the free flow of trade, something which was and is all the more essential given that our economy is much more dependent than that of the USA on an undisrupted flow of external trade.

However, after studying the proposal with more care and in more detail, I have now come to the view that it may indeed make sense and be of some use to make an instrument like this available to the Commission, because after all having such an instrument at one's disposal does not mean that it has to be used all the time. So long as there is no need for it to be put to use, it seems to be that this kind of thing is no more than a precautionary measure which might even have a preventive effect by in dissuading our trading partners from indulging in unfair practices.

I should, however, like to make clear that this regulation must not be allowed to invalidate or circumvent the rules of GATT. On the contrary, the Commission should — and I am sure it will — use this regulation as a means of enforcing compliance with the GATT rules wherever necessary.

Perhaps I may be allowed to comment briefly on Article 12 of the proposal for a regulation, which has already been referred to by a number of speakers. In effect, it gives the Commission a means of adopting emergency measures in cases of urgency to prevent damage being done by unfair commercial practices. As the rapporteur has already said, the motion tabled in the Committee to have this provision deleted was rejected, and I would ask the House to ensure that the amendment to the same effect meets with the same fate. Without the facilities made available to the Commission in Article 12, the whole collection of measures is incomplete. The Commission must be in a position to react quickly at any sign of danger and particularly if it realizes that action is needed fast, rather than waiting for the long-winded system of checks to run its course.

Having said that, I must underline what Mr Sieglerschmidt said earlier to the effect that this provision must not offer a means of circumventing the normal examination procedure. There must also be some means of ensuring that the Commission's temporary measures are lifted immediately, should scrutiny show

that they were not justified. My Group therefore supports Amendment No 17 tabled by Mr Sieglerschmidt on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, as a result of which Article 12 will be formulated more precisely and, in my opinion, more clearly. I hereby withdraw my own Amendment No 5 in favour of Mr Sieglerschmidt's.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, it is certain that dealing with the question of protection against unfair commercial practices is a step in the right direction. Nevertheless, we have substantial reservations on this Commission proposal as far as Greek interests are concerned.

Firstly, we believe that the problems involve not only the mechanisms but also the political will which is needed to use these mechanisms. We have noticed that although the legal basis exists and although the principle of Community preference is provided for in the Treaties themselves, they are most flagrantly violated when it comes to grapes, cotton, tobacco, fruit juice or a number of other Greek agricultural products.

Secondly, for Greece the problem of protection against unfair commercial practices is first and foremost the problem of protection against competition, both fair and unfair, from the other nine Member States of the EEC. I would simply point out to you in the short time I am allowed that two thirds of Greece's trade deficit comes from our trade with the other Community countries.

Thirdly, I think that trade practices such as anti-dumping measures and so on are not simply ways of enforcing the law but are also mechanisms serving specific political and economic interests. It is no coincidence that this subject is being debated jointly with Mr Israël's question, which seeks to create problems in the relations between the two Germanys, relations which are one of the few bridges of peace still remaining in Europe. It is no coincidence that anti-dumping measures are constantly used to the disadvantage of the socialist countries. This factor, in addition to the political problems which exist, will in any case mean for Greece economically distorted and damaging relations both with the socialist countries and, if you like, with the United States, Spain etc.

In view of these reservations and despite the positive character of the motion, we shall abstain from voting.

Mr G. Fuchs (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the proposal for a regulation examined by Mr Blumenfeld's report is, in my eyes, a highly significant step in our progress towards forging a greater European identity. It is often remarked that we are the major trade power in the world. According to the trade statistics, this is indisputable, but are the statistics enough for us to truly merit the name of a power?

G. Fuchs

In a world in crisis, where competition is fierce and where unfair practices proliferate and which are totally inimical to the idea of a market which is itself already more theoretical than real at the best of times, I do not believe that it is. Given these conditions, trading is just not enough, in my opinion, and it is essential that we are able to assert ourselves with regard to our main partners and, if necessary, deploy the same weapons that they use.

We know off by heart the speeches on liberalism fed to us by the United States and Japan. But we also know that behind these speeches lies the reality of what goes on in these countries. What is there liberal about a number of recent decisions on the steel industry, naval shipyards or agriculture? What is liberal about the recent agreement on self-limitation in the automobile industry concluded between the United States and Japan? We are aware of the legal provisions behind which these countries do not hesitate to hide in order to protect their interests, such as Japanese standards or the American Trade Act. That is why I regard the proposed regulation before us as vital. I say that we must be able to react swiftly and effectively to acts which sometime amount to overt attacks on European producers.

But swiftness and efficiency presuppose well-defined strategies. In this respect, I would say that Article 12 of the proposed regulation, which refers to conservative measures to be taken by the Commission as a safeguard, appear quite indispensable to me. Indeed, what use would an instrument be that only allowed our Community to react after several months had gone by? I know that there have been some rumblings of concern with respect to this Article 12, since some people are afraid that it will possibly involve us in dangerous protectionism. Let us take this Article for what it is, ladies and gentlemen, namely, a weapon of dissuasion whose effectiveness is drawn as much — if not more — from its existence than from its application.

Ladies and gentlemen, our Community has already proved its commercial importance; now it must prove that it is a political reality. Let us not water down the proposed regulation before us, but adopt it as it is.

(Applause)

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, according to the agenda, the debate on the Commission's proposal is combined with the oral question on German internal trade, and I shall begin by commenting briefly on the oral question.

I should like to get that out of the way first before dealing with the other matter in somewhat more cohesive detail. By signing the protocol incorporated in the EEC Treaty on German internal trade, the Member States gave recognition to the special conditions obtaining as a result of the partition of Germany.

According to the protocol, German internal trade continues to be compatible with the EEC Treaty, and as a result of the unusually rigorous checks kept on it, the Commission has in the past seen no reason to doubt that the protocol was being correctly applied by the authorities in the Federal Republic of Germany. Nor has any Member State or interested party so far addressed any complaints to the Commission.

Moving on to the other subject of today's debate, the commercial policy regulation, I should like first of all to thank Mr Blumenfeld and the other gentlemen who have been grappling with this subject, particularly as they have had very little time to go into the issue. I am grateful to them for bringing out this report so quickly despite all the handicaps, and for making it possible for Parliament to reach a rapid decision. The Commission too has a vested interest in getting a quick decision from the Council on this matter.

Not so long ago, the European Council gave directions for the Community to be placed in a position to act as quickly and effectively as its trading partners on matters of commercial policy. As we all know, this was not always the case in the past, which was due primarily to the distinct lack of interest in taking decisions on the part of the Council of Ministers. The Commission wanted to put the European Council's directions into effect quickly and efficiently, which was why we have submitted this proposal and asked for the decision to be taken at short notice. That applies in particular to the Council of Ministers.

There are a number of things I should like to clarify right at the outset. First of all, the proposal cannot — and is not intended to — be a replacement for any of the provisions in the Treaty. Nor does it replace the existing regulations on such matters as anti-dumping or anti-subsidy measures. It is intended merely as an addition to what we already have, an addition which we feel is necessary. I am pleased that the debate brought out the fact that the Commission attaches the greatest possible importance to ensuring that whatever we do in the commercial policy sphere is strictly in accordance with the provisions of GATT. Being so dependent on world trade, the Community itself is vitally interested in ensuring that international rules and procedures are strictly adhered to, and if we expect that kind of thing of others, we must of course be prepared to do the same ourselves. On this point, I think it is worth pointing out that we have no intention of copying or approximating our legislation to Section 301 of the American Trade Act. On a number of occasions in the past, we have criticized these American provisions as being potentially in violation of the GATT provisions on the grounds that they make it possible for action to be taken against all unfair or unreasonable measures taken by third countries without actually specifying what is meant by unfair or unreasonable.

Haferkamp

Our proposal adheres strictly to the GATT outline provisions and is therefore — deliberately — a step behind Section 301. Some amendments have been tabled seeking to include the services sector, but GATT at present contains no rules in this field. The conference of GATT Ministers did, however, decide in December of last year to take a look at the question of trade in services within the framework of GATT.

We are involved in these studies and have an interest in their outcome. But if we take as a basic principle the need to adhere to the GATT rules, we should refrain from introducing things now which are not provided for in GATT. So long as we establish GATT conformity as a basic rule and bear it in mind right from the word go, whenever GATT expands to cover other fields — e.g. the services sector — then our scope and this instrument will automatically be registered as being in accordance with GATT.

One major element in the proposal is the decision-making procedure. We have suggested the introduction of a procedure which will ensure that decisions are actually taken, and that the decision taken by the Commission will come into effect unless the Council acts by a given deadline. There has been some criticism of our proposal, and we realize that this will be repeated over the coming weeks and in the course of the Council's deliberations. As I said at the beginning, we complained about the fact that the Council has not always acted quickly and effectively in the past on commercial policy issues. Should the Council bring itself — as indeed it can — to take decisions quickly, the decision-making procedure we are proposing could be seen in a completely different light. What it boils down to, then, is that the Council should undertake to reach a decision on important matters quickly and by a given deadline, and that is the main thinking behind our proposal.

We must be in a position to protect the Community's interests in the commercial policy sphere against unfair commercial practices, and on this point, I should like to comment on certain questions which have been raised with regard to what is meant by unfair commercial practices. On the one hand, we have to bear in mind the scope of GATT and the members of GATT, and on the other, we must not lose sight of the fact that we have a lot of trading partners in the world which are not signatories to GATT, the result being that it is not enough simply to base our considerations on the GATT rules. Hence our attempt to use as a yardstick the commercial practices which are generally recognized and used by the Community's main trading partners.

This formulation should not be seen as a kind of back-door which we would like to leave open as a potential weapon in a protectionist battle. I have said often enough in this House that I do not see protectionism

as a possible way out of our present difficulties — on the contrary, it is a path which, in my opinion, would lead us into even deeper trouble.

(Applause)

I should like to make it clear that, wherever the House feels that our proposed definitions require further fleshing out or clarification to avoid any future misunderstandings, the Commission is prepared to seek a different formulation which will be suitable both in terms of conformity with GATT and with regard to the question of the importance of provisional measures. It goes without saying that provisional measures must be genuinely provisional and must not — as Mr Sieglerschmidt said just now — run the risk of becoming 'permanently provisional'. They must indeed be provisional and must not be misused in any way. That of course goes without saying. What we are talking about here are questions of the right wording. Our aims are exactly the same as yours, and we shall endeavour, with your help, to make sure that the wording is perfectly clear. What we need now is a quick decision on the part of the Council on our proposal in the light of whatever additional proposals you decide to adopt.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

13. *Transport infrastructure — Financing of a Channel tunnel*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on two reports and an oral question :

- report (Doc. 1-85/83), drawn up by Mr Martin on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-1170/82 — COM(82) 828 final) on a transport infrastructure experimental programme ;
- report (Doc. 1-372/83), drawn up by Mr Vandewiele on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the financing of a Channel tunnel ;
- oral question with debate (Doc. 1-39/83), tabled by Mr Berkhouwer on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, to the Commission :

Subject: construction of a tunnel under the English Channel

In view of the various new plans put forward recently for the construction of a Channel tunnel, does the Commission think that the time has come for it to launch the initiatives required to bring about the realization of this European project *par excellence* ?

Mr M. Martin (COM), rapporteur. — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, by adopting unanimously — after lengthy discussion — the motion for a resolution which it was my responsibility to submit on its behalf for your approval, our Committee on Transport has shown once again and to a marked degree the interest which it attributes to Community-oriented infrastructures.

The Committee believes that the document from the Commission to the Council for its examination constitutes a step forward on the path towards a common transport policy such as was defined in the Treaty of Rome.

We feel that the implementation of an experimental programme for transport infrastructure would make a real contribution — albeit limited — to the fight against unemployment in Europe because it would create jobs.

Of course, everyone is entitled to ask questions about the method used for defining projects which could benefit from Community finance, and about the scope of the proposed programme. Two figures are revealing in this respect: the total cost of the projects put forward by Member States is 9 680 million ECU, whereas the amount which could be earmarked by the Commission amounts to 1 500 million ECU: less than a sixth of the total, and perhaps even a little less.

But given the present circumstances, the Committee on Transport considered that there was an urgent need to get beyond the draft stage and to enter the phase of implementation, and to leave the realm of high-sounding ideals for that of practical decision-making.

Thus, the method used for devising an experimental programme of infrastructures appeared to the Committee on Transport to offer a pragmatic and realistic approach in line with current opportunities.

The Commission based its work on contributions from various Member States and compared the extent to which they were complementary *a posteriori*, the aim being to create suitable conditions for results to be reached.

Naturally, this method does not preclude incompatible projects being proposed. Nevertheless, it is up to the Commission to throw light on these problems and to create a minimum common action programme which will benefit from Community aid.

If we turn now to the question of the impact likely to be made by a transport infrastructure policy — of which the experimental programme will of course be a part — on efforts to create jobs, it is essential that we specify to what extent such a contribution could be effective.

The spectre of 12 million unemployed, whose numbers are continually increasing, is sufficient justification for us to pull out all the stops to halt this trend

by creating the conditions for full employment. Transport policy — on a par with certain branches of industry employing a large labour force — must obviously lead the way.

The motion for a resolution that we are presenting will not permit anyone to harbour the illusion that massive unemployment can be cured at a stroke by transport infrastructures.

Let us remind ourselves of the facts: we need to create a million jobs every year over a five-year period if we are to solve the unemployment crisis. We might also bear in mind the fact that social and economic progress are two terms which simply cannot be dissociated.

Thus we should also turn our attention to the negative consequences which policies of reducing the purchasing power of workers cannot fail to have on their consumption and thus on the production of goods, affecting, in turn, employment — including where transport infrastructure is concerned.

More than the direct impact — of necessity a transitory one — which might result from the provision of jobs through infrastructures, it seems that our ambitions ought to focus on the longer term consequences implied by the existence of new or modernized infrastructures.

The main contribution to the problem of unemployment that can be made by infrastructures is mainly that of additional opportunities for increasing the circulation of goods and people, which is one of the most important objectives of the Treaty of Rome.

But no infrastructure policy, however Community-based, can act as a substitute — like a spare wheel — for an overall economic policy geared to combatting unemployment.

The Committee on Transport views an infrastructure policy aimed at job creation as a three-tiered exercise: firstly the distribution of small but feasible projects among our 10 Member States which, in the medium term will...

(The President urged the speaker to conclude)

Mr President, I am coming to the end but I wanted to make a point of order. I am in fact entitled to five minutes this evening in accordance with a rule which is supposed to have been laid down for the presentation of Thursday's reports. I should like to point out, however, Mr President, that this report figured on the agenda for the special session on employment in Brussels. Together with Mr Faure's report, it was postponed to the following part-session in Strasbourg, last month.

It should have been discussed on Monday. But it was postponed from Monday to Tuesday, on Tuesday it was deferred to Thursday and on Thursday, at the last part-session in Strasbourg, at midnight, it had still not been dealt with.

Martin

Under these conditions, our Assembly decided — at my proposal, which was followed almost unanimously — to postpone the report to this week. So it was on the agenda once again for Thursday, to be discussed in the afternoon, with a report by our colleague Mr Vandewiele on the question of the Channel Tunnel. It was decided to give 10 minutes to the rapporteurs. Now this time has been cut to five minutes. In my opinion, Mr President, this is highly regrettable and I should not like it to be seen as a discriminatory move against reports emanating from Parliament's Committee on Transport. I therefore request two extra minutes on account of the circumstances which I have just pointed out.

President. — I will grant you a further two minutes from your group's entitlement, as it has plenty to spare.

Mr M. Martin (COM), rapporteur. — No, Mr President, I am not speaking on behalf of the Communist Group, but am expressing the unanimous opinion of the Committee on Transport.

President. — Why are you making it difficult for me, Mr Martin? I am only doing for you what I did with Mr Blumenfeld, who is also speaking on behalf of his Committee.

Mr Veronesi (COM). — He can have my six minutes!

Mr. M. Martin (COM), rapporteur. — (FR) The proposals are as follows: firstly, the distribution among the 10 Member States of projects that are modest but feasible in the medium term will have the effect of directly creating jobs in the regions concerned, and also in the national industries involved in these projects, industries such as metal working, construction and also services. The spin-offs could be very great indeed according to the nature and duration of these projects.

When creating infrastructures of Community interest, we are quite convinced of the merits of favouring production in the individual member countries so as to effectively encourage spin-offs as regards jobs. The symbolic value of such huge projects as the launching of the Channel Tunnel would have a significant impact on employment.

Secondly, the existence of new infrastructures should permit better communications, enabling firms to cut their transport costs which should make them more inclined to take on new people.

Thirdly, the existence of new infrastructures of Community interest and the modernization of older infrastructures creates conditions for developing the manufacture of transport equipment; the manufacture of public transport equipment, in particular, can create many new jobs.

I should like to finish by adding that the Committee on Transport also emphasized the importance that should be given to combined transport and, in addition, subscribed to the idea of a project proposed in documents submitted to it on equipment to enhance the use of railways, particularly for certain types of traffic, and that on equipment in ports and airports designed to improve connections between the different forms of earth, sea and air transport. It should be specified that this includes another significant type of infrastructure, namely, navigable waterways, or canals.

The commitment expressed by the Commission, which seems to be an effective response to the Council's demands, has therefore been greeted positively our Committee. Our task now is to go forward with our eyes open to realities. This means that we cannot ignore what is happening in our various countries, but must respect local circumstances while advancing on the path of a common transport policy which is a true response to the economic facts and the human conditions prevailing in our countries.

(Applause)

President. — I am well aware that the job of the President of this meeting is a very unpleasant one because the problem that Mr Martin described to us on his point of order affects a large number of us — in fact, I think, all of us here now. But there is nothing we can do about it. We shall just have to get on with it, and I have a duty to proceed in accordance with the organizational guidelines established by the House itself. I would therefore ask you to go along with this, otherwise we shall never get our work done.

Mr Vandewiele (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I shall bear in mind Mr Martin's friendly words and endeavour to be as brief as possible.

In 1981, the House approved an own-initiative report from Mr De Keersmaecker, enumerating the many advantages of a Channel crossing in the form of a tunnel, and stressing how important such a link was in terms of the creation of a coherent Community transport network. Last year, Parliament thought fit, on the basis of two resolutions, for the Community to make a contribution too, given the Community dimensions of the proposed link. Mr Contogeorgis will be speaking on this point in due course, having presented an important report on the subject in the Committee on Transport.

While preparing my report, I had meetings with representatives of a number of organizations, as well as with Mr Martin and Mr Fiterman, the French Transport Minister, and Mr Howell, his counterpart in the UK. We discussed ways in which the Community could provide practical financial assistance for the project, and I was able draw on valuable support from the Committee's excellent report.

Vandewiele

As the Commission has pointed out in a report drawn up at our request, the three instruments available to us are the European Investment Bank, the New Community Instrument — the 'Ortoli facility' — and, as far as the Nord-Pas-de-Calais region is concerned, the European Regional Development Fund.

There is also a possibility of Community aid for transport infrastructure projects of Community importance, provided that the Council implements the 1976 draft regulation, to which we long ago gave our approval, but on which the Council of Ministers have still not reached agreement. Perhaps Mr Contogeorgis could use his influence to see that a decision is taken at long last.

Before the scope, conditions and modalities of Community support for a fixed link across the Channel can be decided on, the first priority is for the authorities directly affected — in particular the UK and French Governments — to take a decision of principle to build the fixed link.

The situation is that both national governments will now take a decision of principle in the light of the results of a financial feasibility study involving a consortium of British and French banks, and the Community has earmarked significant sums of money to help finance the study.

I cannot conceal my disappointment at the fact that the study has not yet been completed despite having taken an inordinate time. Hence our determination that the report should urge that a decision be taken quickly, especially as we know that Mrs Thatcher and Mr Mitterand expressed the wish at the time that a Franco-British working party should produce its report quickly — and this incidentally is what happened, the conclusions being attached as an annex to my report.

I was told in London and Paris that, in order to finance a project for a fixed channel link, the authorities would call on the international capital market, which would mean that no government subsidies as such would be made available. Neither of the governments is prepared to give a financial guarantee, which is an important element in the debate, and the Committee on Transport attaches great importance to a clear and unambiguous political guarantee to ensure that, once work has started, it will be brought to a successful conclusion. Any such guarantee must be given a very firm legal footing in the form of something like a contract signed by the two countries with Community involvement.

As regards the nature of the project, the committee endorses the preference of the Franco-British working party, i.e. a double railway tunnel to be laid in phases with provision for a vehicle shuttle.

I am sure that Mr Berkhouwer will be giving us the benefit of his suggestions with his customary *élan* and enthusiasm. For years now, he has been a protagonist

of the idea of a channel tunnel and other forms of a direct link. I shall therefore conclude at that point in the sure knowledge that I can rely on his support.

It is not up to us to decide exactly how this project should go ahead. That is up to the technicians and the study group. But we wish to take the opportunity of this report today to express the hope that the resolution we adopted earlier will now at last result in practical decisions, and I know that in this respect I am in good company. I am quite sure that the Commission will leave us in no doubt that, if the French and UK Governments accept the study group's recommendations, it too will be prepared to make substantial Community resources available for the project.

Mr Protopapadakis (PPE), *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Budgets.* — (GR) Mr President, the Committee on Budgets also supports the programme of transport infrastructure projects with the same unanimity as the Committee on Transport for the precise reason that it is of definite Community interest. As well as expressing our satisfaction, we should also like to thank the Commission, especially the Commissioner responsible who is here today, Mr Contogeorgis, and his colleagues, because it has been a veritable race to get this programme to the stage of being debated by Parliament.

There is, of course, the problem of financing, and this is a point which we, as the Committee on Budgets, must stress. Even if we limit ourselves to the 1 500 million ECU to which Mr Martin referred as the contribution to carrying out the entire project, it is still difficult for this contribution to be covered by our budget. This raises the problem of increasing the Community's resources. I am sure that the unanimous support for the programme which was shown both by the Committee on Budgets and by the Committee on Transport will also be demonstrated by its adoption by this House. Parliament will thus be committing itself to support every action taken by the Commission and the Council in order to increase resources so that such projects of considerable Community interest can be carried out.

How much the Community will earn as a result of this initiative is a question which has yet to be answered. Naturally this question does not arise only in the area under discussion. It is a general short-coming of ours that when Community activities are being planned we do not examine thoroughly the question of how much we are going to earn from any interventions or expenses we undertake.

Various proposals for expenditure and aid are made without the profit which the Community will derive being calculated so that we can judge, by comparing it with the cost, whether the economic outcome is significant or, where it is negative, whether it is still worth the trouble as long as we manage to obtain political or social benefits.

Protopapadakis

This is, as it were, an illness of the Community, and when we see the important experts which the Commission has at its disposal, I think it is easy for it to cure itself of this illness and find out, when it submits programmes — and I am not referring only to this particular programme — to inform us at the same time of what return the Community will get on the expenditure it has undertaken.

Despite the problems of financing and despite the last problem to which I referred, the Committee on Budgets is satisfied with this programme and recommends that Parliament vote for it.

Mr Gabert (S). — *(DE)* Ladies and gentlemen, I should like to deal with one point only, as Mr Lagakos will be speaking on Mr Martin's report. I shall be dealing only with Mr Vandewiele's report, and I should like to say to him that the question of the Channel Tunnel is a very important European issue as well as being imbued with great symbolic value for Europe. That is something I should like to stress on behalf of the Socialist Group too.

Like you, I should like to underline the importance of first of all getting a political decision from the two governments which are mainly involved. Talks have already taken place between the President of the French Republic and the UK Prime Minister, and I believe that it is at this level that the political decision has to be taken, but this presupposes clarification of the way in which a consortium of banks will arrange the financing. As we all know, the European Community cannot possibly finance a project on this kind of scale, and what we really need is a genuine willingness to cooperate on the part of private sources of capital as well as political will on the part of the two governments. So long as these two conditions are fulfilled, I believe that work can commence on what will be one of the major works of the 20th century, a project which, as far as the Socialist Group is concerned, is of major practical, symbolical and European significance.

Mr Baudis (PPE). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is, in my view an excellent opportunity that we have had of discussing together the project for a tunnel under the Channel and at the same time of examining the problems of Community aid for transport infrastructures, since both of these offer an interesting and vital — in the case of the Channel Tunnel — basis in the battle against unemployment in the Community. In fact, as Mr Martin so rightly pointed out a short while ago, these projects really ought to have been discussed during the session in Brussels on the general campaign against unemployment. To this end, the Commission is proposing the granting of funds to finance subsidies and interest rebates for infrastructure projects.

The aim of my amendment is to bring to mind the situation of airports, which have always been the poor

relation of European projects whose purpose is to improve transport infrastructures. If we examine major Community projects, particularly in a report of November 1979, entitled 'The role of the Community in the development of transport infrastructures', there is practically no reference to air transport. The same applies to the June 1980 report on bottlenecks. The policy of some governments has always been to show great reservations whenever it comes to initiatives which touch on the area of air transport, taking as their basis a highly rigid and extremely restrictive interpretation of Article 75 of the Treaty of Rome.

Ever since it was directly elected, the European Parliament has, on several occasions, reiterated the need not to forget airport infrastructures, when it has approved reports submitted on behalf of the Committee on Transport.

What is more, the importance attributed by Community authorities to the development of air transport leads one to think that this form of transportation must be taken into account as one of the priority methods of avoiding bottlenecks. It is not good enough just to say that this must be a priority, proof must be shown in the granting of financial subsidies and aid.

That is why, on behalf of the PPE Group, I hope that my amendment will be adopted, just to complete the excellent report presented by Mr Martin, because making air transport easier — and I am concluding now — is to give a new boost to the European aeronautical construction industry which, with the Airbus, represents success, a model for Community action and a symbol of hope for the development of European technology.

Mrs von Alemann (L). — *(DE)* Mr President, I shall be speaking only on Mr Martin's report. The Vandewiele Report will be dealt with by Mr Berkhouter, who has been following this subject a great deal longer than I and knows a lot more about it than I do. First of all, I should like to congratulate Mr Martin on his report; I sympathize with him on the fact that he was allowed so little speaking time. It is really very sad and deplorable that a subject as important as the problem of investment in traffic infrastructure should be dealt with in this way. I would make the point that Mr Martin was of course not speaking for the first time on this subject, and that consequently we do not have anything entirely new to say. However, Mr Martin has reiterated precisely and expertly what the Committee on Transport has been thinking for a long time.

The fact that we welcome the Commission's communication to the Council does not mean that we think all the problems have now been solved. That is most certainly not the case. We welcome the fact that a step has now been taken in the right direction — a first

von Alemann

small step, a start, which we must now use as a foundation on which to build further stages of European infrastructure policy.

Frequent reference has been made here in the past to the effects of transport policy measures, their positive influence on the process of European integration and their macro-economic importance. There is no need for me to repeat all that; we have already heard all the arguments from previous speakers. The importance of this report lies partly in its timing — i.e. the fact that it was tabled in the debate on employment policy. That is one aspect we should not ignore; too little heed has been paid to it in previous debates on the employment issue. We should view the employment issue as an important aspect, and not just as a by-product of transport infra-structure measures. For these reasons, the Liberal and Democratic Group welcomes and supports this report. The measures proposed therein will have a wide range of beneficial effects, touching on transport policy, regional policy, macro-economic developments and — something particularly close to our hearts at the moment — the level of employment in the Community. But however encouraging the proposed measures may be, they are no more than a first step, and must be followed up.

(Applause)

Mr Moreland (ED). — Mr President, first of all may I congratulate the two rapporteurs and say that my group supports both their reports.

First, if I may turn to Mr Martin, I think that his report is excellent and makes a significant contribution not only in transport terms but, as he rightly suggested, also in terms of employment, particularly in the areas affected by the projects. It is, of course, an interesting alignment that the French Communist Party and the British Conservative Party seem to be acting on the same track. As regards Mr Vandewiele's report, I am looking forward to, shall we say, the Fiterman/Howell bridge or whatever it is going to be called. I do think that he has made a useful contribution.

Obviously, if we are talking about transport in the context of economics, which was what we were supposed to be doing two months ago, as he rightly said, we consider Mr Martin's report as a valuable contribution to the removal of bottlenecks at frontiers and the removal of frontier controls. Of course, the Commission's original report on this subject is designed to do the same. We would hope that the Council will give support to that and that we can be talking in 1984 of a realistic transport infrastructure fund amounting to a very large sum, not just the 15 m ECU that we had this year?

If I can turn to Mr Vandewiele's report, I have to say one thing. I am an unapologetic wholehearted supporter of a Channel link. I do not, in fact, come from anywhere near where the Channel link would

be. I come from about 400 kilometres away, but I regard it as a project that is important for the whole of Europe — first of all, I have to confess, from a political point of view. I think that it would have a psychological impact on the whole of Europe if the United Kingdom had a *physical* link with the continent of Europe. Naturally, I am hoping what I am going to hear in about an hour and a half means the end of any nonsense about my country leaving the European Common Market and that we can discuss the whole issue in the future on its merits.

The next step will be — and I hope that we will have an announcement before too long — that at long last this link — I have got to use the word 'link' — will come to pass. I believe the link is extremely important. I believe that what Mr Vandewiele has done in presenting to us the financial options is important. You notice that I am carefully using the word 'link'. My colleague, Mr Purvis, is a very strong supporter of the Euro-route scheme, others of my colleagues are supporters of other schemes, so I have to be a little delicate here! However, I do emphasize that it has considerable importance politically, economically and for the transport links of Europe. Therefore, I would hope that this Parliament would give it strong support. I would hope that we are at the end of studies and that at last we are going to have action on this particular proposal. We have got the financial study and the report coming soon, and hopefully in two or three months we will get the action.

Mr Lagakos (S). — *(GR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad that at a time of international recession the House is at last dealing with the report by Mr Martin, which I am pleased to be able to support. Unemployment has reached proportions which are reminiscent of pre-war days, and many people in this House must surely remember the grim consequences of unemployment in the thirties. I am particularly pleased to be able to draw your attention in this official European forum to the extremely important role which transport plays in the very existence of the Common Market and, especially now, in combating unemployment.

In the Treaty of Rome it is, after agriculture, transport for which special provisions were made, and after 26 years of the Community's existence these have not been put fully into practice. We shall vote for the motion, but I should like to make some comments on certain views expressed by Mr Martin in his explanatory statement.

The approach taken by the Commission in its communication on a transport infrastructure experimental programme is actually positive about the prospects for Community transport policy. We would, however, point out that the measures which it is intended to take over the first two years of the experimental programme mainly concern Member States which

Lagakos

have already reached a stage of development which makes them eligible for specific aid. But Community intervention must not be selective in this direction only. In any case, the projects selected for aid must be of Community interest and be intended to promote the improvement of transport between the Member States. Community intervention must, however, operate in a balanced way and, taking account of the economic and geographic inequalities between Member States, must aim to reduce the differences between the various Community transport networks, to improve the infrastructure of the less developed regions and to support economic links between the outer regions of the Community and its centre.

As regards the programme's particular effects on employment, we would agree that the regions directly concerned will undoubtedly benefit. However, we must see this marginal benefit in its proper dimension and not use this argument to justify selecting regions on the basis of underemployment as the main criterion rather than the objective need to improve transport infrastructure mainly in regions suffering from serious structural weaknesses in this field.

(Applause)

Mr O'Donnell (PPE). — Mr President, like others who have spoken before me I would like to congratulate very sincerely our two rapporteurs on the production of two most important reports. In my opinion these reports, taken together, represent an important and very significant contribution to Community thinking on the evolution and development of a Community transport policy. Because of the very limited time at my disposal, I must confine my remarks to the Martin report. However, in passing, may I sincerely congratulate my colleague, Mr Vandewiele, on his excellent report, to which I am pleased to lend my personal endorsement.

In relation to the Martin report, I want as a representative of a peripheral island country, to welcome this report and to welcome the Community initiative contained in the recent communication on the development of transport infrastructure I believe that there are many regions in this Community where there is urgent need for substantial Community financial assistance for transport infrastructure. This type of assistance can contribute greatly towards reducing the disparities between the peripheral regions and other Member States in the matter of transport networks. Assistance towards the development of transport infrastructure can likewise contribute significantly to the ultimate achievement of one of the most important objectives of our Treaty of Rome, that is, the promotion of economic convergence between the Member States of this Community.

As is pointed out in the Martin report, and as Mr Martin himself said in the course of his opening

speech, the development of transport infrastructure can also contribute greatly to the creation of new employment and to the generation of new jobs, both directly and indirectly, in engineering, in construction and in the services sector. In selecting projects for Community assistance under the proposed transport infrastructural development programme, special priority must be given to the most remote and peripheral regions of this Community which suffer very severely, as Ireland does, as a consequence of their relatively poor internal and external transport systems and their remoteness from the heart of the European mainland.

In conclusion, I want again to compliment very sincerely Mr Martin and Mr Vandewiele on their reports and I sincerely hope that these reports will provoke the necessary response from the Commission and from the Council.

(Applause)

Mr Berkhouwer (L). — *(NL)* Mr President, my oral question with debate has now been combined with the Vandewiele Report. For as long as I have been a Member of the House, I have been agitating for — indeed, you might say that it is one of my European hobby-horses — the construction of a tunnel under the Channel. When President Mitterand and Mrs Thatcher came to power, we really thought things would get moving following the abandonment of the project in 1975. Geography alone says that the tunnel will simply have to come some time. It is, after all, a link between two of our Member States, the United Kingdom and France, but, Mr President, I should like to stress for the umpteenth time that it is of course far more than just that, it is a European issue *par excellence*. It would be marvellous if in the near future we could get from Paris to London in four hours using the tunnel, and if there were to be a rail link between Rotterdam and Hamburg and the western borders of the Community via Lille to the United Kingdom.

It is a European Issue, as I should like to point out to the Greek Member of the Commission. It is time he got down to doing something because, Mr President, the Commission in Brussels has so far been far too unenergetic on this matter. In fact, the Commission has done next to nothing and it is time it did something. Goodness knows who has not produced a report on the subject — there must have been twenty or thirty reports, and now Mr Vandewiele has gone and produced another one on the financial aspects.

(Laughter)

Is it not terrible that, with so many hundreds of thousands of people unemployed, we cannot give a few thousand — or even a hundred thousand, who knows? — work by building the tunnel? That is the employment aspect.

Berkhouwer

And I have not referred to the environmental aspect yet. What is more, financial experts have told us that financing the project is no problem at all. If the users pay a small toll as they go into the tunnel, it would soon pay for itself. At the moment, we are paying hundreds of guilders to be allowed to drive through France! Finance is certainly no problem. After all, the European Investment Bank managed to finance a bridge over the Bosphorus, thus linking Europe with Asia.

(Laughter)

It is quite true — it is almost incredible in the circumstances that we are not capable of building a tunnel between France and the United Kingdom. We are way behind the times. Why — as I have suggested before — cannot the European Investment Bank float a loan by issuing small investors' certificates valued at 100, 25 or even 10 guilders? Our ancestors were ruined by the railways in Russia — let the people now make a bit out of it, let them get involved in Europe by giving them the chance to buy small shares in the financing of a tunnel under the Channel.

Does the Commission not agree that it is now time it did something about the tunnel? Get things moving! Talk things over with the Investment Bank! Finance is really no problem at all. Let those using the tunnel pay a small toll, and the tunnel will have paid for itself in ten years. Go and have a talk with Mrs Thatcher — assuming of course that she is re-elected. Go and have a talk with Mitterand. We have an amendment tabled by Mr Delorozoy calling for a mixed structure. Anything is possible. Just do not behave like a civil servant and try to find ways of making the possible impossible; try for once to see to it that something that is possible is actually put into effect. Who knows, the Greek Member of the Commission may even join me in the hereafter.

(Applause)

Mr Wedekind (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I can only congratulate Mr Berkhouwer on his speech. It seems to me quite ridiculous that such an important project as this should be assessed solely by reference to cost, benefit and profitability without any regard to the political impact of this kind of structure. We must bring Great Britain and Little Britain closer together — that is to say Normandy and the country the Normans conquered, Great Britain. We must bring the Saxons and the Anglo-Saxons together again, something which the tunnel would achieve.

This is one of the major, bold ideas which have dominated European transport policy for two centuries now — for other motives, to some extent political motives, but let us not forget that Great Britain has been part of Europe since the time of Caesar, Hadrian and even

earlier. It was only then that the ways of the British and the continental Europeans parted, the former retreating to their island, becoming insular and ignoring the continent.

We need this kind of umbilical cord to join Great Britain up to Europe, as part of a European transport system which would extend to far more than just a tunnel. It would include the coordination of road and railway networks throughout Europe. In other words, what we need is not just a tunnel, but also fast rail connections to enable us to travel from Paris, Brussels, Cologne, Frankfurt and Antwerp to London and back in a time which is both technically feasible and economically and financially viable.

Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission. — *(GR)* Mr President, first of all I shall refer to Mr Martin's report. I should like to thank the Parliament and in my turn thank Mr Martin for his excellent report and for the support he gives to the Commission's communication on an experimental programme for transport infrastructure projects.

When the Commission drew up this programme, Mr President, it chose to approach the problem with realism so that it could achieve effective and sound results. The choice of the projects which are included in the Commission's communication was made on the basis of high efficiency and with the aim of supporting the economic activities of the Community. They involve investments which will help to eliminate traffic bottlenecks and improve communication between the regions of the Community in order to facilitate trade. It is a significant factor that the less developed regions of the Community are the ones which need this aid most of all.

The Commission will make every effort, Mr President, to achieve this objective, but we must not forget that the amount of success we have will depend on the level of the appropriations and other financing facilities which are made available to the Commission. As you know, Mr President, 1 500 million ECU are entered in this year's budget. Of course we cannot expect a great deal with such a sum. For next year's budget the Commission will propose 10 500 million ECU. Let us hope that this amount will not be reduced between now and the time the budget is finally adopted.

There is no doubt, Mr President — and the Commission also took this into account in selecting the programmes — that these infrastructure projects will help to absorb unemployment and will have a favourable effect on the employment market both directly, since many industries will be working to supply the material needed to carry out the proposed infrastructure projects, and indirectly, since these industries will be able to employ many people from the ranks of the unemployed.

Contogeorgis

The Community, Mr President, needs to participate in supporting these projects. However, we must understand that it is not the Community which will carry out the projects but the Member States which will be principally responsible for selecting them and carrying them out. But it happens frequently that projects of Community interest are not encouraged by the Member States since they prefer — given that they also have limited means at their disposal — other projects which are of greater national interest. This is why the Commission's philosophy is that this financial intervention will enable projects to be carried out which have a pronounced Community character and serve broader Community interests.

Mr President, bearing in mind the spirit in which we work in the Commission, we are called upon to work in this area in the immediate future to make sure that all the financial means which are essential to promote this experimental programme of transport infrastructure projects are provided. For the success of this undertaking the full support of Parliament is decisive.

I come now to the report by Mr Vandewiele and the oral question by Mr Berkhouwer on a fixed link between the United Kingdom and Europe across the Channel. I should like to state that Mr Vandewiele's report is excellent and an important contribution to the action taken by Parliament over the last 10 years, and headed by Mr Berkhouwer, to encourage the governments concerned to carry out this very important technical project. Both the report and the resolution which Parliament is to issue come at a crucial time in the development of this subject, since we have reached a point at which the two governments directly concerned already have to take certain fundamental decisions.

In the opinion of the Commission — and we have stated this repeatedly — the plan to construct a permanent link between the United Kingdom and continental Europe is a typical example of a project of definite Community interest. A study made some years ago leaves no doubt at all as to the truth of this. But if there is to be any advance, the two governments need first to agree on the type of project and then on the procedure and the way in which it is to be financed.

Mr President, an agreement is due to be signed with a group of banks which has undertaken to study the project and propose methods of financing it. The final decision and the agreement of the French and British Governments are needed, and we hope and expect that this will happen very soon. One of the two governments has in practice already given its agreement. This is the only way we can examine how to mobilize the appropriate funds so that we can promote this scheme. I repeat that this scheme cannot progress unless decisions are taken by the two governments within whose sole competence the execu-

tion of this project falls, as both Mr Vandewiele and Mr Berkhouwer have rightly stressed.

President. — The debate is closed. The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

14. *EAGGF appropriations*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-271/83), drawn up by Mr Gabert on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the utilization of appropriations under the fruit and vegetables sector of the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund.

Mr Gabert (S), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it goes without saying that the Committee on Budgetary Control has concerned itself not with issues basic to the common agricultural policy, but with its proper function, which is to keep a check on the implementation of this aspect of the CAP.

The report lists a number of facts which indicate that budgetary expenditure on the fruit and vegetable sector has increased sixfold since 1975, the financial burden on the Community budget over the last three financial years being 66 million ECU, 103 million ECU and 111 million ECU. A third of the produce brought into intervention was spoilt or was subsequently destroyed.

To be fair, I should like to stress that the report shows that, in the crop 1979/1980, withdrawals accounted for 2.4 % of the total fruit and vegetable harvest, and only 2 % in 1981/1982, representing 0.98 % of the total expenditure in the guarantee section of the EAGGF.

Nonetheless, the amount involved — almost DM 250 million — is repeatedly quoted in public discussion of the subject, and there is a temptation among certain groups to indulge in this kind of fraud and irregularities which undoubtedly do harm the Community's reputation.

The report calls on the Commission to propose solutions to ensure that the quantities withdrawn from the market are used as cost-effectively as possible, giving consideration to ways in which the Member States and the producers' organizations could assume greater responsibility and for the risk connected with produce brought into intervention. The Commission and the Council are requested, with regard to the incipient structural surpluses, to adopt provisions and measures which would make intervention superfluous, and to examine the extent to which marketing could be orientated to certain high-quality categories of goods and high-quality processed products so as to adapt production to consumers' needs and thereby save budgetary appropriations.

Gabert

The Committee on Budgetary Control expressed its alarm at the growing number of irregularities in this area in certain regions of the Community and at the inadequacy of supervision, and calls on the Commission to ensure that the conditions governing withdrawals from the market actually obtain at the time of such withdrawals, that the stipulated means of disposal is respected and that irregularities are avoided at all costs. The Committee also considers it essential that there be stricter control of the activities of producers' organizations and processing companies as well as unannounced spot-checks by Commission officials, especially with a view to monitoring the quantities and quality of produce for which intervention has been authorized by the national authorities.

I would point out that this item has been included in the report because there has been a large number of definite cases of fraud which have induced anger among the public at large and brought the Community into disrepute.

The Commission is further requested by the Committee to review the cost-effectiveness of production aids for processed products, particularly tomato-based products. An appeal is also addressed to the Commission and the Member States to do all in their power so that the measures initiated some time ago to improve the production of tomatoes and citrus fruit can be put into effect at last.

In my capacity as rapporteur, I should like to make it quite clear that the Committee on Budgetary Control is of course duty-bound to concentrate in the first instance on means of monitoring and combating fraud and irregularities, and on expenditure which, in the Committee's opinion, does not comply with the stated aims and therefore leads to the wastage of resources. The Committee cannot be expected to make detailed statements on the substantive issues of European agricultural policy. The Committee on Budgetary Control is perfectly well aware of the importance of the CAP, and its comments are in no way directed at the agricultural population.

The Committee on Budgetary Control has also taken a very serious look at the opinion delivered by Mr Maffre-Baugé on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, and has made its remarks its own to the extent to which they come within the remit of the Committee on Budgetary Control.

As rapporteur, I am in a rather unpleasant situation in that, at tomorrow's vote, I myself will be voting after a meeting which has drawn up recommendations, and at which more deputy members were present than first-line members of the Committee on Budgetary Control. Clearly, the stand-in members have — quite understandably — put the emphasis on other aspects. Of course, at tomorrow's vote, I shall have to draw the House's attention to certain matters, but I shall adhere

strictly to our rules of procedure ; I shall of course go along with whatever decisions are taken, but I shall also make it clear how they came to be taken.

(Applause)

Mr M. Martin (COM). — *(FR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my colleague and friend Mr Emmanuel Maffre-Bauge should have been here as the draftsman of an opinion on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, but since he is unable to attend he asked me to apologize to you all on his behalf, which I do gladly. In my capacity as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I am therefore speaking in his stead.

The report by the Committee on Budgetary Control criticizes expenditure on the fruit and vegetable sector. The Committee on Agriculture, which has given me the task of presenting its opinion, is not opposed to better utilization of agricultural expenditure, quite the contrary. But it cannot accept that the basic mechanisms of the CAP can be threatened on the pretext of budgetary manoeuvres. Our committee is not afraid to quote figures openly. I would suggest to the Committee on Budgetary Control that they give us a list of the costs entailed by numerous exceptions to Community principles.

What is actually going on in the fruit and vegetable sector? It is true that expenditure has increased sixfold since 1975, but that merely, and quite justifiably, accounts for catching up with rising costs, and in a way which is still not quite adequate. As this expenditure accounts for only 6.4 % of the EAGGF 'Guarantee section', it is hardly excessive given the size of its production : 11 % of the total. It is acknowledged that fruit and vegetable producers have not benefited under the CAP from the guaranteed levels of revenue and development opportunities which they had a right to expect, when they are compared with other sectors of production.

The motion for a resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 16 June 1982, based on the report by Mr Maffre-Bauge, had the precise intention of correcting these injustices and inequalities by improving Community regulations and also by using the available funds more effectively.

I will mention a few pointed examples. The extension of the preventive withdrawal system, easing distortions of the market at an early stage, makes it possible to avoid high intervention expenditure. Experience shows that limiting the list of products which benefit from guarantees has led farmers to transfer to products which do benefit from intervention, with the result that recourse is had to this procedure more often costing the Community budget dearly. That is why we should like to see the extension of guarantees to new products as this will promote diversification of products and cut down on budgetary costs.

M. Martin

Mr Gabert's report also tackles the question of product destruction and fraudulent practices. I will speak only briefly about this. The destruction of fruit and vegetables is regrettable and should be avoided as far as possible, but such acts are in fact not very common and are often provoked by the arrival of imports in periods when Community produce would be enough to satisfy the market.

To limit destruction and wastage, we propose that the distribution of fruit and vegetables to underprivileged social groups be streamlined and we urge Member States to make better use of this procedure.

We are also anxious to avoid fraudulent practices and we should like to see inspection methods reinforced for their detection. But we must express disquiet at the orchestrated campaigns which seek to make people believe that some producers in the Mediterranean regions are potential cheaters.

The reality is that irregularities and fraudulent practices have been noted in all the Member States and in a number of sectors of production, as proved by the tables published in the Opinion which are extracted from reports by the Court of Auditors.

Those are the points and suggestions I wanted to make on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture. They can be found in the form of amendments, of which a large proportion have, moreover, already been accepted by the Committee on Budgetary Control, I am glad to say. And I am also glad, Mr President, to be able to make you a present of 30 seconds.

Mr von der Vring (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my Group gives its unstinting support to Mr Gabert's report and calls on this House to resist the temptation to water it down in the interests of finding a merely temporary solution to the problem.

In my view, Mr Martin's attitude is far too defeatist. European fruit and vegetables are high-quality products which we should defend in the interests of consumers and producers alike. While supporting the basic principles of the common organization of the market in fruit and vegetables, we are concerned about certain abuses which have resulted from some of the intervention provisions. For instance, there is in some sectors a trend towards increasing production, using the withdrawal guarantee as a kind of risk insurance policy, the net result being systematic overproduction. The trade bemoans trends which are tending to concentrate production on lower-quality produce, the result being a lack of motivation to gear production to consumers' wishes, with as a side-effect the tendency to weaken demand for home-grown produce and favour imported citrus fruit. Good-quality produce — for instance, apples — has a very good chance of increased sales.

Finally, we deplore the tendency to relegate taste as a criterion in favour of such factors as ease of transport

and storage. Just to illustrate the point, one criterion used in the USA by growers developing new strains of tomatoes is that they should be able to withstand a collision impact equivalent to 25 km/h. But who is supposed to actually eat that kind of thing?

The oft-cited negative effects of intervention on producers' supply behaviour should be carefully examined by the Commission, and it also worth paying heed to the fact that the long intervention time-lags encourage dubious speculating in futures. For instance, apples are kept in storage for too long so as to qualify for the higher prices paid for fresh fruit from the new harvest — or the withdrawal prices — in the following spring.

Moving on to the vexed question of the destruction of fruit and vegetables, which is regarded by millions of people throughout the Community as a major stain on the Community's reputation, I think we are all agreed on the principle here. Let me also stress, however, that, in the fruit and vegetable sector, we shall never be able to do entirely without some withdrawal mechanism if we want to ensure that our farmers are paid fair and stable prices; nor will passive destruction ever be done away with entirely. The point is that withdrawal should apply only to above-average harvests, and be restricted to certain fixed quantities. Accordingly, the intervention price must never exceed the marginal costs which, as every farmer knows, are not a permissible norm.

In legal terms, the withdrawal mechanism applies only to fresh, marketable produce, and the report is very cautious in its criticism of repeated violations of this principle. Mr Bocklet claimed some time ago that withdrawal of spoiled produce had almost become the rule. The Commission must adhere strictly to the principle that the withdrawal of fruit and vegetables which are not fresh constitutes fraud. We must do everything in our power to ensure that the intervention mechanism is not misused as a source of finance 'or spoiled, unmarketable produce.

The Commission must be urged to show more flexibility in the utilization of bought-in produce. What I have in mind is not just gifts to charitable institutions or the value-lowering utilization of produce as animal feed. What the Commission should be doing is cooperating with the major trading chains with a view to selling brought-in fruit at cut-price rates to those regions and consumer sectors in which demand is slack. The trade takes the view that sales campaigns of this kind could be conducted on a major scale without doing any damage to normal sales.

(Applause)

Mr Marck (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, the subject we are discussing at this late hour would normally be accompanied by the glare of television lights, as the

Marck

destruction of fruit and vegetables has always been eagerly seized on as good copy for the sensational press.

The Court of Auditors' sober report clearly brings out the point at issue, i.e. what we are talking about here is less than 1 % of the total production of fruit and vegetables in Europe. I should like to ask Mr von der Vring — bearing in mind that European fruit and vegetable producers used to leave their unmarketable produce lying on their fields or in their orchards, whereas now they get a small amount of compensation which certainly does not cover the cost of production — whether intervention should not in fact be seen as a social form of compensation. From the purely economic point of view, withdrawals of the produce from the market is the only effective means of restoring a modicum of balance to an imbalanced market.

I should like to ask the Commission to improve the procedure. Complicated and costly destruction procedures are an odious thing, and more particularly there is a need for the system of premiums to be modified. All too often, it is the processor who get the premium when it really belongs to the producer. We shall be giving our support to Mr Gabert's proposals because he has tackled the problem in a knowledgeable way.

Mr G Fuchs (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am speaking instead of Mr Eyraud, who unfortunately had to return to his constituency this evening.

I believe that the first thing we have to do is to situate the question of using the EAGGF funding for the fruit and vegetable sector at its rightful level. It is true that expenditure on this sector has gone up sixfold since 1975. But the rapporteur rightly points out that this expenditure still only represents 0.98 % of expenditure under the EAGGF 'Guarantee Section'.

These figures show clearly that the sums appropriated to Mediterranean products are always very small in comparison to those for other agricultural products. If we examine more closely the reasons behind the increase alluded to by the rapporteur, we can see that it is essentially linked to supporting processed fruit and vegetables and that this is so owing to the new regulations adopted in this field. The increase has of course also contributed to financing withdrawals from the market. But all we can do in this respect is to share the indignation felt by producers who see the fruits of their labour destroyed because of the lack of organization engendered by unacceptable imports, unacceptable because they come at times when Community production would be sufficient on its own to meet the demands of the European market.

Having said that, when such withdrawals take place as part of a social programme, it is vital for the Commis-

sion to intervene as quickly as it can, because it must not be forgotten that the foodstuffs in question are nearly always highly perishable, and that calls for quick action. That is the meaning behind Amendment No 10 that we have tabled.

The destruction is regrettable, as I have already said. It should be avoided as far as possible. However, since it is the consequence of trade concessions permitted by the Community, it should be compensated for, as such, by the Community budget.

Like every one here, we also deplore fraudulent practices which may exist, but we disagree with the rapporteur over the methods to be used to remedy the situation. In the last analysis, it is essential that we are logical and consistent, which means that we must refer to the proposals contained in Mr Maffre-Baugé's report, more particularly those concerning Community preference and the need to plan production. If Amendment No 9, which serves to remind those present of the existence of this report is accepted, this House can count on our support for the present motion for a resolution.

Mrs Nikolaou (S). — (GR) Mr President, the support mechanism for the fruit and vegetable market in the Community is extremely complicated and needs continuous monitoring if it is to be correct and effective. I should like to give you a typical example of inefficient supervision of the market which, apart from the problems it has caused the market, has also incurred for the Community budget extra expenditure which could have been avoided.

The expenditure in question is that which will be required for the distillation of 55 000 tonnes of grapes which would not have existed if the Commission had, on the one hand, fixed the marketing price for grapes in time and, on the other hand, been more efficient in following market developments. The result, as we all know, was the creation of Community stocks which are a burden on the Community budget through no fault of either the producers or the market.

The report by Mr Gabert contains a typical remark in paragraph 1 to the effect that budgetary expenditure in the fruit and vegetable sector increased sixfold between 1975 and 1981. However, the reference to this large increase is misleading because 1981 was the year of Greek accession, and Greece, as you know, is a country with large amounts of Mediterranean produce, especially fruit and vegetables. Furthermore, the lack of Community preference as a result of preferential agreements with non-member countries means that large quantities of these perishable and non-storable products are used for costly distillation. No one denies that an efficient mechanism for monitoring the management of funds would automatically lead to considerable savings, which would permit the development of other Community policies.

Nikolaou

Mr President, we fully agree with the need to improve fruit and vegetable production and trade, as mentioned in the Gabert report. We do not agree, however, with the use of the term 'waste' as applied to perishable products for which there is no solution other than the restructuring of those holdings for which there are no specific proposals. The way we PASOK Members of this House will vote depends on what happens both to the amendments we have tabled and to those tabled by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DE) At the beginning of his speech, the rapporteur highlighted the growing financial importance of this sector, in which expenditure increased from 101 million ECU in 1978 to 443 million ECU in 1979. Inevitably, the amount of money involved has increased as a result of the accession of Greece to the Community; another contributing factor has been a 'Mediterranean package' approved by the Council in 1977, since when various kinds of fruit have gradually been incorporated into the processing aid system. On the question of withdrawals from the market, the rapporteur has set out the facts objectively. Surpluses in this sector are, generally speaking, not of a structural nature but are often the result of natural seasonal fluctuations. The main problem in organizing the market is the fact that amounts withdrawn from the market are liable to change during the harvest season, which exacerbates the problem of disposing of the produce in question without disrupting the market still further. Of course, the Commission agrees with the European Parliament that withdrawn produce should be disposed of as cheaply as possible, and destruction is often the cheapest way of getting rid of the resultant surpluses. On the other hand, no one would deny the problems which are bound to ensue from destroying foodstuffs at great cost while being aware of the problem of world hunger and social need. The optimum solution would be to distribute the surplus produce free of charge to those in need, although we would then have to ensure that this did not hamper the normal sales process and thus bring further disruption to the market. Above all, we must ensure that the goods in question are not fraudulently reintroduced into the normal pattern of trade, which means in turn that we must be extremely cautious in deciding who should benefit from the free distribution of produce.

The Commission shares the view expressed in point 6 of the motion for a resolution to the effect that encouragement should be given to the production of high-quality goods, and in fact the Commission took steps in this direction a number of years ago. Allow me to point out, though, that there are certain limitations here. The less well-off consumer wants lower-quality goods because they are cheaper. Others prefer to do

the processing in their own home — for instance, by making home-made jam — and have no intention of buying top-quality and expensive produce for the purpose. The Commission shares the rapporteur's concern at the growing number of irregularities, but a system of checks thorough enough to eliminate all such irregularities would be so cumbersome that it would violate the other aim of cost-effectiveness. The Member States themselves are primarily responsible for ensuring that the Community legislation is put into effect. The Commission has neither sufficient resources nor sufficient staff to carry out checks itself on all instances of market withdrawal. It is easier in every respect for officials from the Member States to carry out the regular checks, although the Commission will of course do everything in its power to improve the situation.

The spot-checks mentioned in point 9 of the motion for a resolution are already in operation. Commission inspectors accompanied national inspectors on their tours of inspection in March, April, May and June of this year, and we also have the power to demand that spot-checks be carried out if we suspect that Member States are not implementing the Community regulations properly. We intend to make use of these powers.

The Commission goes along with the rapporteur's appeal expressed in point 10 for the Council to adopt the Commission's proposals on the implementation of Community rules on agricultural products as soon as possible. The review of production aids for processed products called for in point 11 has already taken place and, as we pointed out in the agricultural price proposals, the Commission attaches great importance to the guarantee threshold for processed tomatoes. Work is in progress on this question. Proposals for improving the citrus fruit provisions were adopted by the Council next year; they are mainly of a structural nature, and we hope that the planned improvements will soon come into effect. Finally, the report mentioned in point 14 is currently being drafted, and will be submitted in the near future.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

15. Automobile industry

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-235/83), drawn up by Mr Veronesi on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on basic technological research in the automobile industry.

The rapporteur does not want to introduce his report at this point but if need be will express an opinion at the end of the debate.

Mr Van Rompuy (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, the EPP Group supports the conclusions and recommendations set out in the Veronesi Report. International competition is forcing European producers to update their products and production processes constantly, and technical research is of fundamental importance in this innovation process. The automobile industry in the Community is now making a come-back, with rising production figures in 1982 and 1983 following a decline in the period 1977-1981. But the structural problems are still immense, and I can only express my pleasure at the fact that the report contains a plea for cooperation between the European automobile industries and for cooperation also between governments, public institutions, universities and industry with a view to carrying out fundamental research. We therefore support the question formulated in the report to the Commission regarding the drafting of a detailed proposal committing the Community to make financial aid available for this fundamental research.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, I must admit that we were a little concerned when this subject first came up that we might fall into the all too easy trap of thinking that the EEC, the Commission and the Community could solve all the motor car industry's problems for it. But I think Mr Veronesi is to be congratulated, and the committee along with him, that we have got the balance about right — that it is, in fact, up to the industry to solve its problems, including most of the research and development that can be applied.

We at the EEC level can only provide the environment which will enable the companies to help themselves. We can encourage cooperation; perhaps we should encourage more joint ventures and mergers in the industry so that they can maximize their potential. The potential is available in the industry, in the Community. It has to be mobilized.

Can I cast a fly perhaps in front of the Commissioner and ask if there is any relationship between the proposals on ESPRIT and the motor car industry, for example where the possible use of robotics in production; of microprocessors in the motor cars themselves or in informatics in new traffic systems for the future are concerned?

Can I just mention one regret I have to Mr Veronesi? I think it was agreed in committee that paragraph 16 which refers to paragraph 6 of Mr Barbagli's resolution, should be replaced by a specific reference to the subject-matter rather than just a reference to a paragraph number. I think this refers to the matter of industrial rights and property rights and I think it is regrettable that this correction which was undertaken in committee has not been made. In fact, so long as it stays as it is, this group will have to vote against that particular paragraph. Perhaps in the meantime Mr Veronesi can suggest some corrigendum, if it is not too late.

Mr Pininfarina (L). — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to state the Liberal and Democratic Group's approval of Mr Veronesi's motion for a resolution. We are in agreement with its underlying purpose and with the way the problem is presented. We see a real willingness to implement, in the specific field of research, one of the aspects of Community policy in the automobile sector which Parliament has considered urgent and necessary for some time and which has, and fortunately, still not been systematically pursued at Community level.

The approach is thus right and we acknowledge this willingly even if the Rapporteur's report covers only one aspect of a wider-ranging Community policy in this sector. There are in fact many other urgent and serious problems still unresolved.

On this point, I should like to go back to the discussion a few months ago on the relationships between the Community and Japan. I would remind you, for example, of the need to define the concept of local production in order to lay down rules on cooperation which would help the development of this industrial sector — a sector which is so important in our Community.

As for the terms of the motion, it seems to me that they are being presented at a most opportune moment when some countries, though not all, intend to take similar support measures. Not in all countries, I repeat, and it is well to stress this to point out that it is precisely Community-level action which can make the efforts required of national industries in this field more uniform and more widespread. It is for the same reason that I would insist in particular on Community action not being made conditional on the existence of similar national action. On this point, the Veronesi report is not so explicit. It seems to me essential, if we really want to have a Community policy on basic technological research, to promote all the necessary action irrespective of the idea of national co-financing.

In my opinion, this action should thus take the form of financing research contracts and it should take account of national experience in the field: in France, the Groupement d'Intérêts scientifiques, in Great Britain the Research Association and at international level the Joint Research Committee in Europe, and in the United States the Cooperative Automotive Research Program. The Community must define the priorities of the research topics, taking into account some of the points which are recognized as essential such as energy savings, cost reduction, improvements in quality and reliability, and better environmental conditions.

The results which can be obtained are all highly positive. Basic technological research can indeed facilitate cooperation and participation in projects and the results, achieved on the basis of equal footing, still allow the participants to remain competitors outside the field covered by the research. It is equally neces-

Pininfarina

sary to promote industrial know-how in the long term by applying the technological innovations which would ensue, and, finally, to stimulate inter-sectoral cooperation, bringing efforts by various sectors together on specific subjects and thus promoting exchange of the experience already gained by universities, industry and public research institutes. The Veronesi report, albeit with some reserves, and I conclude now, seems to us to meet these requirements and I thus give notice of the vote in favour on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Veronesi (COM), rapporteur. — *(IT)* Mr President, I should like first of all to define the exact context of this report in order to pinpoint the research problem.

The point raised by Mr Purvis was submitted to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs which is preparing a report on the more general subjects concerning the automobile industry — economic and trading aspects and international relationships. This is why the shortcoming noted by Mr Purvis was deliberate on the part of the Committee on Research which adopted the resolution unanimously. The Economic and Monetary Committee, although asked to give an opinion, reserved the right to study this question in more detail in the near future.

Finally, I should like to point out that the request for independence of research, or that there should be no conditions placed on research carried out by individual countries with respect to that at Community level, was turned down by the Commission which did not wish to see duplication of effort; this would lead to a waste of energies and resources when what is required is exactly the contrary — a concentration of effort.

Since no amendments have been tabled, I should like to ask the President to have the vote tomorrow morning by 11 a.m. as I have to return to my country where the campaign is under way for the forthcoming elections.

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(FR)* Mr President, the unanimity of the comments that have greeted Mr Veronesi's report shows clearly that Parliament has concentrated on the essentials and what needs to be done now, and the Commission shares these sentiments. In a programme approved yesterday on basic technological research, the Commission already included a number of aspects featuring in this report which was approved a few weeks ago in committee and from which we have extracted a number of elements. The implementation of this programme will therefore be to put to your committees for examination in the very near future.

We endorse the general message of this report, which is that human labour should be assisted, not replaced. I can tell Mr Purvis that computer-assisted construc-

tion or the use of robots fits quite naturally into the context of his report, which presents a general approach where these two aspects are covered.

Since we are in agreement, Mr President, I do not need to speak at length. We do not deny the importance of this report, but we are already in the process of implementing some of the ideas it formulates. I should just like to thank Parliament for having created the conditions which give us the go ahead to act as soon as possible.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

16. FAST

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-379/83), drawn up by Mr Normanton on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-1182/82 — COM(82) 855 final) for a decision adopting a research programme of the European Economic Community on forecasting and assessment in science and technology (FAST).

Mrs Walz, Chairman of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, because of election commitments Mr Normanton is not able to be here today, and so I should like to present his report — which the Committee adopted unanimously — and at the same time thank him for his thoughtful and critical work. The rapporteur's thoughts are set out in the explanatory statement, and there is no need for me to repeat them here. I should just like to make a few political points, because the question is after all not whether we should concern ourselves with research and technology, but rather with which technologies and at what level, always bearing in mind their repercussions on the labour and employment situation.

As you will know, the main subjects of FAST 1 were work and employment, information technology and the biological sciences, and there can be no doubt that FAST 1 gave an important boost to the essential long-term research effort in Europe, and encouraged new forms of collaboration on research in Europe. In particular it highlighted the idea of concentrating on establishing connections between the various specialist disciplines — i.e. thinking in system-orientated terms rather than concentrating too much on individual research.

One example of this inter-disciplinary approach is the agrochemical energy sector. As a result of progress in the biotechnology field, there could — over the long term — be a major change and an entirely new relationship between the agricultural, chemical and

Walz

energy industries as viewed in conventional terms, something which would be particularly significant from the point of view of the Third World. Those responsible for FAST take the view that microelectronics the information technologies — we have only to think of the ESPRIT programme — and the more rational use of energy will become the driving force behind economic developments in the 1980s and 1990s.

In terms of information technology, the Community had a balance-of-trade deficit of 10 000 million dollars in 1982, and this despite the fact that an annual growth rate of between 8 and 10 % is anticipated in this sector up to 1990. It is also anticipated that the new information technologies could create something between four and five million new jobs in the 10 Member States by 1995. Even if only half this number were actually to materialize, it would require a joint effort on a major scale, major industry being involved to a reasonable extent too. In the 1990s, the results of materials research, biotechnology and new service industries could generate both quantitative and qualitative growth, and would also create a large number of new jobs.

Our watchword should therefore be not to live in fear of the new technologies; our main concern must be to safeguard workers in social terms from the effects of structural change in our economy and to make available a wide range of occupational training and on-going training facilities which will enable us to make the most of the new opportunities open to us. In the intervening, difficult period, we should be able to reach a sensible compromise on questions of working time and new forms of work. In this respect, it is up to those who are in work to show a sense of solidarity with those out of a job.

Mr Petersen (S). — *(DA)* Mr President, I was away for a fortnight and when I came home there was a pile of post a metre high waiting for me. Now this is a lot of post but one of the things it included was an extra copy of the FAST report which I was already familiar with. I should like to say, particularly for the benefit of Commissioner Davignon, that I think the Commission deserves a congratulations on this initiative, i.e. the FAST Programme — though this is not to say I am uncritical of the Commission's work. There can be no doubt however, that this will leave its mark and I also hope it will influence the Commission's research programme in the future.

As Mrs Walz has just pointed out, those of us who have read the report, the FAST programme which has been completed — i.e. FAST I — contains some very exciting things. I am not thinking so much of the predictions concerning unemployment in the next 10 years, the use of information technology and the 'bio society'. I am thinking more in particular of statements to the effect that 'employment' as it has been understood from the 1960s and onwards is a thing of the past. Even if FAST is a relatively independent

research group working under the aegis of the Commission, I think these points are worthy of note. As Mrs Walz also stressed, in the new agro-chemical energy sector it is not products but systems we will have to think about. This is something I have learned from the FAST programme, which also teaches us to consider this question in the context of our relations with the Third World, and in the light of the fact that traditional European industries, such as textiles, have now disappeared and established themselves in Singapore or Hong Kong. I will not enter into any lengthy discussion at this point, but, as is stated in the FAST programme, these industries might possibly return to us if we manage to apply the new information technology in these sectors.

I have really learned a great deal from FAST I and am very pleased, therefore, to be able to warmly recommend, on behalf of the Socialist Group, FAST II for the period 1983-1987 during which it is planned to study new forms of growth, new industrial systems, new living and career patterns, new technology and, last but not least, new types of qualitative growth, and here I should like to sound a warning, since people often think of qualitative growth in terms of going to the National Theatre to see a ballet or reading Goethe. Naturally, qualitative growth includes things of this nature too, but it is first and foremost a question of bringing about a system whereby qualitative considerations play an intrinsic role in our production machinery and of recognizing that production can in some cases be of a higher quality than in others, for example if it saves resources, if it uses energy sensibly and if it does not entail a danger to human health. The prospects opened up by the FAST II programme are I think quite fascinating.

I will not go into Mr Normanton's report in detail, mainly because he is currently engaged in the noble fight at home — i.e. his election campaign — but I would merely point out, that, as I see it, he is perhaps a little over-critical in his explanatory note when he talks about intellectual flights into the realms of fancy and crystal balls. All I want to say is that he is thinking too much in terms of industrial undertakings. The important thing is that the rest of us should learn from it too.

I recommend you to adopt the two amendments and should like to conclude by making one criticism addressed to the Commissioner. Why should this report have only a limited circulation? Why should it be available in only two languages? Why should not all the Members of this Parliament and anyone else who is interested in constructive developments have access to it? This situation should, I think be changed in the future. On the whole, I think that if the FAST programme is to be continued, better information should be provided not only to the Committee on Energy and Research but to all the Members of this Parliament, the national research organizations and the national parliaments.

Petersen

Finally, I should like to thank the Commissioner and ask him to congratulate, at least on behalf of the Socialist Group, Professor Petralla who took charge of the FAST programme so outstandingly.

Mr Rinsche (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Thomas Aquinas, the great European philosopher, pointed out as long as 750 years ago that political responsibility presupposes foresight and the ability to differentiate, and his ideas are just as important today as they were in the Middle Ages. Without the virtue of foresight, there is a risk that only tomorrow will we get round to dealing with the problems of today using the methods of yesterday. And whoever is incapable of differentiating between what is important and what is less important will make scant use of his limited resources and opportunities. So it is under these aspects too that the research programme on forecasting and assessment in science and technology takes on a major significance.

We are in effect faced with three main trends: the problem of work and employment in the 1980s, with new developments — the 'information society' — over the next 20 years and the opportunities and dangers of the biological sciences over the next 30 years. It is important that the possible repercussions of a profound change in science and technology be highlighted as far in advance as possible. Clearly, what we are faced with here is a challenge of vital importance to us in Europe; not least, though, it still remains true that the important thing is to bring Europe's great potential in terms of intellectual effort and creativity to bear to help us solve the problems facing us in Europe. If the FAST programme can help in this respect, it will have been worthwhile. The Group of the European People's Party supports the report and would like to thank Mr Normanton and the Commission for their sterling work.

(Applause)

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, the very nature of the programme makes it difficult to assess whether or not FAST is a success. That is true of FAST I and no doubt it will also be true of FAST II. Indeed, our approval of FAST II is a considerable act of faith. By their very nature these programmes are long-term and speculative. But they can be very useful and as Mr Petersen has said, there is a lot of very interesting and useful material beginning to emerge from FAST I, and I have no doubt it will be true of FAST II as well. Nonetheless, we must be prepared to act on the predictions that come out of it in our policy decisions.

It is all very well having lots of wonderful studies. The question is whether we are actually making use of them. The Commission itself has the job of making sure that it is using them in the relationships between its various Directorates-General, that is not just ending up in a cubby hole in one Directorate-General, while all others are unaware of what is happening.

We consider that a degree of scepticism is no bad thing as it helps to prevent the development of ivory towers and to ensure that their relevance to the real world is constantly tested. However, we are prepared in this group to support the continuation and we must be prepared to look well ahead and to consider all the technical, economic and social implications of the technological developments that are taking place and will take place in the foreseeable future.

We would stress just one point concerning the Third World that comes out in paragraph 13. It is not just a matter of getting back at the Third World, but the Third World's impact on us, how it will compete with us in industrial areas and its role as a valuable customer for our products.

Mr Veronesi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I shall be very brief in pointing out my voting intentions. I am pleased to announce the support, already stated in Committee, for the initiative taken by the Commission in presenting the FAST programme.

I was surprised by a certain scepticism on the part of Mr Normanton, though it was expressed in a lively and humorous way. I am surprised because I thought he considered the Commission's initiative absolutely original and without parallel on the international level. I should like to point out here that the United Nations, a long time ago now, asked a notable group of research workers, headed up by the Nobel Prize winner Leontiev, to make a prospective study of the economic problems in the Third World up to the year 2000. I should like to point out all the study attempts made by the Energy Agency in Paris, the other studies on the same lines in more specific sectors by the OECD, etc. There is in the modern world this general requirement to try and detect trends and forecast the future.

Since we believe that this is a valid requirement, and since the Commission's presentation is methodologically and scientifically correct and beyond reproach, we shall support this Commission initiative.

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(FR)* I find it rather sad, Mr President, that we have to wait till a quarter to midnight before anybody has a good word to say about the Commission!

It is interesting to note, Mr President, that the Commission is taking full responsibility for its role by opening paths towards the future which, of course, carries with it a certain amount of uncertainty.

I am very struck by the fact that we were the first — in our work on FAST I — to highlight connections between activities which up to then had been considered separate, and by how much we will have to take into consideration — as Mr Petersen said — new systems. I think that is the basic issue of this question.

Davignon

Mr President, I do not intend to dwell at length on a point which meets with such whole-hearted agreement on the part of both the Commission and the Parliament. Firstly, the Commission accepts the amendments which will be voted on tomorrow. Secondly, the Commission agrees that FAST II should play a coordinating role in our activities. In this way, the FAST II team will be involved in all the new programmes that the Commission will be putting forward both in the field of research and that of innovation.

We have heeded this request, which figures in the motion for a resolution, without modifying the present role of FAST, which is one of research and reflection.

Mr Petersen asked what we are doing to broadcast the results. A shortened version is in the process of being published in all Community languages and will be widely available. We are counting on you to tell us to whom we can send it. That was a point made, Mr President, by the Committee on Energy and Research, and which we could examine together. What is the best way of disseminating this information

We balked at distributing the document such as it is because it is too big and not everyone has Mr Petersen's courage to digest such a text. We are therefore seeking a more accessible and less off-putting presentation.

The hope remains that in its June session, the Council will approve of the FAST II programme and that there will therefore be no break in continuity. If we have a network of correspondents and researchers throughout the Member States, we are entitled to hope that we can bring a new dimension to scientific thinking, which we need if we do not want our solutions for the future to be confined purely and simply to yesterday's methods which are certainly not — and there is no reason to be sceptical about this — always the right ones. If we do not always know what we ought to do, we do at least know what we ought not to do, which is already a successful conclusion derived from our previous efforts.

President. — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

Mr Beazley (ED). — Mr President, I am very grateful tonight for your keeping speakers to their time as far as possible, because last part-session we still had left over reports which were prepared but were not debated by 2.30 p.m. on the Friday.

We have one debate, for which I am rapporteur, on Regulation 67/67, which, if it is not debated tomorrow, will be entirely useless. So I just want to ensure that arrangements can be made, even if it does mean changing the order of debates, to debate that without fail tomorrow morning.

President. — Allow me to reassure you, Mr Beazley, since I am sure that your report will be dealt with tomorrow.

17. *European scientific and technical strategy*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-382/83), drawn up by Mr Salzer on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, on the

communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-57/83 — COM(82) 865 final) containing proposals for a European scientific and technical strategy framework programme 1984-1987.

Mr Sälzer (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the four-year framework research programme for 1984-1987 opens up new opportunities for a more effective European research policy — something we urgently need. After all, Europe will only have the resources necessary for a forward-looking and humane policy if we remain competitive or regain our competitiveness with regard to the products which are likely to be important in the future. That applies particularly to the information technologies, new energy sources and the whole field of molecular biology. Leaving aside expenditure on defence research, Europe spends something like twice as much on research as Japan and only 27 % less than the USA; but despite this effort, we have lost the lead we once had in important areas of future-oriented technology, and are now something like 2-3 years behind the leaders.

The framework programme gives us the chance, by spending something like 3 750 million ECU, to close up with the front-runners and to join the world leaders within a period of four years. The programme identifies seven key areas for European research policy, and the Committee recommends the adoption of precise criteria to enable us to decide objectively what subjects should fall within the scope of Community research policy. In doing so, we must pay particular attention to all the vital questions, the causes of which do not stop at national frontiers, and whose solution will undoubtedly require cooperation at European level at least. What I have in mind are important environmental issues, in particular the pressing problem of acid rain and the attendant phenomenon of the destruction of woodland, as well as the many problems facing us in terms of our long-term water supplies and climatic developments in Europe. The framework programme is itself a turning-point in European research policy, and we hope that, when it comes to discuss the matter in June, the Council will see and take the opportunities offered.

(Applause)

Mr Gautier (S), *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture*. — (DE) Mr President, this is the first time I have presented an opinion on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture. I can give it my wholehearted support, and I should like simply to concentrate on one point which was highlighted by the committee — the point mentioned in paragraph 11 of Mr Sälzer's motion for a resolution and in paragraph 6 of the committee's opinion. The point at issue here is the conclusion reached by the committee that there may be a conflict of interests between the Commission's calls for encouragement to be given to certain areas of research — in particular the chemical and biotechnological industries — and the policy we espouse in the agricultural sector. As you will all know, the common agricultural policy is subject to certain market organizations designed to increase farmers' incomes, and for this reason we have always had high prices for agricultural raw materials. This principle applies to the entire starch sector and to our policy on sugar, and as both starch and sugar are raw materials from the point of view of the chemical and biotechnological industry, the result has been such a drastic increase in the prices paid for these products that the industry has got into serious trouble.

The Committee on Agriculture is aware of the problems and calls on the Commission to make proposals at long last for a reform of the Community's policy on starch and sugar, because it is simply not on for the European Community — to give you just one example — to *double* its price for maize compared with its competitors on the world market and then expect our chemical industry to remain competitive *vis-à-vis* producers from third countries.

Let me just give you one small example of what I mean. The biotechnology industry uses a wide range of agricultural raw materials, most of them based on sugar or starch products. These raw materials are subject to market organization provisions, whereas the

finished products — antibiotics like penicillin — are subject only to the general GATT provisions. It is absolutely absurd for the raw materials to be subject to quota restrictions which double the price of the materials in question, while the finished product based on that very same raw material is subject only to a customs levy of between 5 and 8 %. And then the Commission has the nerve to submit proposals for furthering biotechnology! As I said, that is an absurd situation. What is the point in encouraging research in biotechnology, and at the same time allowing the common agricultural policy to prevent the results of research from being put into practice because the raw materials are too expensive?

That is why the committee has requested the Commission, in paragraph 6 of its conclusions, to submit without delay — and I say 'without delay' because the Commission is now two years behind — constructive proposals making it possible for the chemico-biotechnological industry to purchase agricultural raw materials at world market prices.

Perhaps I could encourage Mr Davignon — as the Member of the Commission responsible for Directorate-General XII — to force the pace on this discussion within the Commission and to give his backing to those of his officials in the research division who take a similar view of the problems so as to put an end to this idiotic situation whereby the common agricultural policy is standing in the way of advanced technologies.

President. — The debate on the Sälzer report will now be adjourned and will be resumed tomorrow ¹

(The sitting was closed at 12 midnight)

¹ Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.

ANNEX

Votes

The Annex to the Report of Proceedings contains the rapporteur's opinion on the various amendments and the explanations of vote. For a detailed account of the voting, see Minutes.

ADDITIONAL PART-SESSION (DECISION)

- AMENDMENT No 1, BY MR COTTRELL : REJECTED
- AMENDMENT No 3, BY MR DE LA MALENE : FELL
- AMENDMENT No 4 BY MR DE LA MALENE : REJECTED
- AMENDMENT No 5 BY MR DE LA MALENE : FELL

* * *

MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'EUROPEAN COUNCIL'

- IRMER (Doc. 1-397/83)
- BARBI (Doc. 1-407/83/Corr.)

replaced by

AMENDMENT 1-397/1 WHICH WAS ADOPTED

- BARBI (Doc. 1-410/83) : ADOPTED
- VON WOGAU (Doc. 1-405/83 : ADOPTED

* * *

DE PASQUALE MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-401/83 'ERDF') :
ADOPTED

* * *

DELEAU MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-399/83 'Commerce and craft
industries') : ADOPTED

* * *

BARBI MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-402/83 'Palestinian refugees')

replaced by

AMENDMENT No 1 WHICH WAS ADOPTED

* * *

**BARBI MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-403/83 'EEC-Israel'):
ADOPTED**

* * *

**SEELER MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-417/83 'Law of the sea'):
ADOPTED**

* * *

MOTIONS FOR RESOLUTIONS 'NATURAL DISASTERS'

— **PEDINI (Doc. 1-392/83)**

— **SQUARCIALUPI (Doc. 1-393/83)**

replaced by

AMENDMENT No 1 WHICH WAS ADOPTED

— **GAUTHIER (Doc. 1-398/83): ADOPTED**

— **DALSASS (Doc. 1-400/83): ADOPTED**

— **DE MARCH (Doc. 1-409/83): ADOPTED**

* * *

**EPHREMIDIS MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-418/83 'Red Cross'):
ADOPTED**

* * *

**DELATTE MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION (Doc. 1-394/83 'Blocking of appro-
priations'): ADOPTED**

* * *

**MAHER INTERIM REPORT (Doc. 1-1327/82 'Agricultural incomes'):
ADOPTED**

The rapporteur was :

IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15/rev., 18 and 19 :

AGAINST Amendments Nos 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 20, 21 and 22.

Explanations of vote

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) The Maher report and the resolution proposed by the Committee on Agriculture quite rightly note a substantial reduction in agricultural incomes as a result of the high level of inflation. The Commission, however, thinks that agricultural incomes are not linked with the increase in inflation. You see, its technocratic leaders cannot see the way of life and the fate of millions of farmers because they are blinded by figures and because they have been transformed, so it seems, from human beings into calculating machines. But who can seriously maintain that the sudden increase in the price of fertilizers, plant health products, machinery and indeed of all agricultural supplies, as well as the sudden rise in the cost of living in respect of food, clothing, rents and medical care caused by the speculation of the monopolies and resulting in more and more inflation, do not lead to a drastic fall in purchasing power?

Particularly for Greece, the situation is becoming more and more difficult day by day because of its weak agricultural economy and stiff competition from foreign products on the Greek market itself. Thus neither the devaluation of the drachma nor the readjustment of the green drachma have succeeded in improving the situation of Greek agriculture.

The Maher report, however, does not refer at all to a very real scourge of agriculture — the hold up carried out at its expense by large-scale capital, which is squeezing the sectors of agricultural supplies and equipment, processing and marketing of agricultural products, etc. The measures proposed in the resolution, taken as a whole, are positive and we shall vote in favour of them, but with the comment that they are timid and inadequate and that they do not fully tackle the problems. Greek farmers can be saved from the crisis only by an independent national anti-monopolies policy which would really protect their interests.

Mr Maher (L), rapporteur. — I shall, of course, vote for my own report. I would like to say to Mr Adamou that this is an interim report. There will be another one, I hope, later on in the year which will be more complete and perhaps more adventurous than this one. Since I had no opportunity to do so yesterday, I would like to thank all those who made very useful contributions to the debate.

I do want, however, to comment on the contribution by the Commissioner, Mr Dalsager. I was very pleased that he spoke in the debate, but I must express some concern at his statement — and I hope I am not misquoting him — that the Commission does not intend to review its policy in this regard. I hope he will not keep to that, because we are in a rather dynamic situation; the position is changing all the time, particularly in regard to inflation and the relations between the currencies of the various Member States, and it will be necessary for the Commission to review its policy from time to time so as to ensure that the common agricultural policy applies equitably as between the farmers of the various Member States.

Mr Kirkos (COM), in writing. — (GR) I think that both our Parliament and the farmers as a whole are being hoodwinked. The Commission is seeking to persuade us by statistical sleight-of-hand that the economic axiom according to which inflation seriously affects the lowest income groups does not apply to the case of agriculture. Using average figures over long periods for all agricultural products, it reaches the conclusion that there appears to be no link between the highest usual inflation figures and the lowest usual increase in agricultural incomes. The Commission, in reaching this conclusion, contradicts itself. It rejects the data supplied by the Accounts Data Network, which it dreamt up itself and imposed on the Member States, and relies instead on the Sectoral Income Index. By pointing to the increase in added value in agriculture, it seeks to convince us that agricultural income has also increased. It is impossible for us to imagine that the Commission is unaware that the Sectoral Income Index treats in the same way large and small holdings, intensive and extensive crops, fully employed and underemployed farmers, mountain and lowland holdings, industrial-scale production and family holdings. We do not believe that the Commission is unaware that in farming, particularly in Greece, a large part of the land and of agricultural production belongs to people who do not farm the land. It is impossible for us to imagine that the Commission is unaware of the unrestrained increase in prices of capital goods and industrial products for consumption, whereas the increases in prices of agricultural produce are fixed every year by the Commission itself and usually at rather low levels. It fails to notice the fact of the 80 % increase in the price of fertilizers in Greece over the past year. It fails to notice the fact that agricultural holdings have become the prisoners of the banking system and are struggling to meet their debts.

Mr President, I think that Mr Maher's report quite rightly rejects the Commission's conclusions. As it rightly observes, the debate on the matter is just beginning. So Parliament is called upon to work out a new incomes policy for all our farmers, who are faced with more and more inflation every day — a different policy which will distinguish large-scale from small-scale producers, will recognize the differences between lowland and upland farming, the differences between rich and poor countries and the different levels of development in our countries, will abolish monetary compensatory amounts, will give income guarantees to small farmers and upland farmers, and will assist the mechanization of agricultural production through subsidized interest rates and financial guarantees.

We are therefore voting in favour of Mr Maher's report in the hope that the Committee on Agriculture of the European Parliament will immediately start preparing a report on a new policy for the agricultural sector.

* * *

COLLESELLI REPORT (Doc. 1-224/83 'Fruit and vegetables')
ADOPTED

Mr Stella, deputy rapporteur, was :

IN FAVOUR of Amendment No 1 ;

AGAINST Amendment No 2.

Explanations of vote

Mr Stella (PPE), deputy rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, with this motion for a resolution the Committee on Agriculture has approved the amendments put forward by the Commission regarding the present method of calculating the reference price of fruit and vegetables as laid down in Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72. The motion comes with a favourable opinion from the Committee on Budgets.

As you know, fruit and vegetables cannot be imported into the EEC at a price lower than the reference price and if they are countervailing charges are imposed. With this new system the annual reference price adjustments make allowance for increased production costs in the Community, and this is done by subtracting a percentage corresponding to the increase in productivity. This is shown in the table annexed to the report. Apart from improving — albeit slightly — Community preference in the case of these products, this change will also help to restore the balance between the degree of protection afforded northern products and the amount of protection for those from the Mediterranean regions.

The proposal marks a step forward as regards the present situation, especially with regard to checks on the application of countervailing charges and on import restrictions in cases where the reference price is not observed.

The only amendment proposed by the Committee on Agriculture concerns the date of entry into force of the new arrangements. We want the regulation to come into force on the third day after publication in the Official Journal of the Community instead of waiting until 1 June 1985, which is presumably the date when Spain and Portugal will be joining, so that the full effects of the regulation may be felt.

Mr Kirkos (COM), in writing. — (GR) We shall vote for the Colleselli report because the Commission has at last begun to realize that it cannot continue to apply a policy which discriminates against Mediterranean farmers.

The new Commission proposal confirms the justified struggle of all of us in this chamber to ensure that Community preference arrangements for Mediterranean products become more substantial. The fixing of the minimum price and the extension of the regulation to cover other Mediterranean products are the least the Commission could do for the southern farmers.

We shall vote for this measure — despite the fact that it does not provide for guaranteed prices for the products listed — because the level of protection for Mediterranean products is raised and a balance is thus created between the levels of protection for agricultural products in the northern and southern areas of the Community. We also wish to underline the considerable financial and income advantages which this measure will bring for the Community. For this reason we expect the Commission to take supplementary measures to protect the European market from clever importers, who, by falsifying price lists, contravene Community law and flood the market with non-Community products, leading to decline and disaster for European products.

We also wish to draw the attention of the Commission to the calculation of the production cost, which will also determine the relevant minimum price.

There are two things which must be seriously taken into account : the high level of inflation prevailing in the seven countries of the Community, and the distance between the producing countries and the consumer markets of Northern Europe.

For this reason we are waiting for the Commission to make additional proposals for measures which will contribute to reducing the cost of these products and facilitate the promotion of Mediterranean products on Community markets.

Mr Maffre-Baugé (COM), *in writing*. — (FR) The resolution which this Assembly adopted on 16 June 1982, following my report, was concerned about the Commission's plan to abolish the system of import timetables. The resolution asked for them to be retained and asked for the reference price system to be extended to cover other products.

I am pleased to see that the Commission has begun to pay some attention to this in its proposals to the Council. The extension of reference prices to new products and the continuation of import timetables ought to make it easier to control imports and to protect farmers' incomes. The regulation of the fruit and vegetable market is on the right tracks and what we have to do now is to speed things up at the Council level.

I agree entirely with the rapporteur that the new regulation should be applied at once without waiting for any future enlargement. The point is there is an urgent need to put right the injustices and the unfairness which fruit and vegetable producers have had to put up with for such a long time. Consequently, together with the rest of the French Communist Members, I shall be voting in favour of the Colleselli report.

But this is only a first step. At its meeting on 13 and 14 June the Council must note the other ideas in this resolution from the European Parliament. It is not going to do any good to improve this regulation if Spain is going to join the Common Market. That is why I shall go on calling for a stop to the talks on enlargement, although I am in favour of a genuine cooperation policy.

Mrs Théobald-Paoli (S), *in writing*. — (FR) There is an urgent need for the organization of the fruit and vegetable market at Community level. This is the only way we shall be able to ensure that farmers get a decent and stable income and to put an end to the unreasonable spending of the EAGGF. The idea of special conditions in the agricultural sector which are traded against industrial concessions on our side has to come to an end. We have to do away with the discrimination between northern products, which are well protected, and southern products, which are at special risk.

In the meantime, the Commission proposals for Mediterranean products mark a first step with regard to fruit and vegetables, even if it is only provisional and partial in scope since strawberries and carrots, in particular, are not going to have the protection of reference prices.

The Colleselli report recognizes the fact that this first step is only partial and that is why we have to endorse it in its original version. Be that as it may, the essential still needs to be done.

* * *

SCHIELER REPORT (Doc. 1-160/83/rev. 'Community's international frontiers'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was :

IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 2, 3 and 4 ;

AGAINST Amendments Nos 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Explanations of vote

Mr Efremidis (COM). — (GR) We are in favour of simplification of arrangements for border controls, both at intra-Community borders and at the borders between Member States of the Community and third countries. At the same time we support the simplification of checks for subjects of third countries at intra-Community borders.

On the basis of these considerations, we do not agree with two central ideas expressed in the motion for a resolution :

- (a) simplifying controls within the Community to the point of abolition while on the contrary strengthening controls on the frontiers of Member States with third countries ;

- (b) the simplification of controls only for the subjects of Member States, involving the creation of special separate areas and lanes for them. This is a discriminatory and profoundly anti-democratic, even aristocratic, concept which in addition will encourage crime.

Behind these ideas lies the false assumption that citizens of third countries are responsible for crime, drug-smuggling etc, whereas there are well-known criminal circles within the Community, often with highly-placed connections.

Mr Petersen (S), in writing. — (DA) In June 1982 the Commission submitted a draft Council Resolution on the easing of the formalities relating to checks on citizens of Member States of the Community's internal frontiers.

The Political Affairs Committee of the European Parliament has drawn up a report, which supports the Commission's proposal but goes further in that it advocates making border crossing even easier by introducing separate lanes for Community citizens, and also advocates separate desks for Community citizens in airports.

The Committee regards measures of this kind as vital if the European Passport Union is to become a reality.

The Danish Social Democrats can to a certain extent go along with the Commission's draft Council Resolution, but are opposed to the report by the Political Affairs Committee on the grounds that it goes too far. Furthermore, these efforts to establish a European Passport Union might entail problems for Denmark in connection with the Nordic Passport Union. We would therefore call on the Council of Ministers to take account of the changes which Denmark and the other Scandinavian countries feel would be desirable when it comes to discuss this draft resolution. It would also be pertinent in this connection, to consider the question of how the arrangements would work for Scandinavian citizens entering the other European Community Member States via Denmark.

* * *

CASSANMAGNAGO CERRETTI REPORT (Doc. 1-1196/82 'Family policy'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur was :

IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 41 and 43 ;

AGAINST Amendments Nos 3, 4, 5, 13, 19, 32, 35, 37, 38, 40 and 42.

Explanations of vote

Mr Beyer de Ryke (L). — (FR) It is always difficult to say something about society, and here we are dealing with the progress of the family. I said progress but perhaps I should say break-up. Unfortunately industrial civilization encourages this break up, just as there is a development in the legal situation. The events create the law. But nothing says we cannot try to correct one thing by means of another. I do not think I should be doing the right thing, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, by courting the anger of the female Members here in quoting the famous triple K motto in Kaiser Wilhelm's Germany: *Küche, Kinder, Kirche* — or to put it in English : kitchen, kids and kirk. I deserve to be torn to pieces.

Irony apart, society today — which all too often pays little heed to ethical values — has one serious fault if you ask me. It provides no supporting structure for the child, who is often left to his own devices. Perhaps one of the reasons for failure at school is that the parents are not there when the child comes home, and never mind what happens later in life. You know, we have to let woman make up their own minds. But freedom needs resources, and we need a family policy which allows women to make the most of them so that they can, if they want, spread their responsibilities.

If the family were to fade away it would not just be the end of a moral code which often comes in for a lot of stick. It would mean that society had less love and more selfishness and that is why I support Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti's report. That is how I am going to vote.

Mrs Van Hemeldonck (S). — *(NL)* I shall vote for this resolution, although I very much regret the fact that a number of amendments have not been adopted, including those tabled by Mrs Dupont and Mr Eisma, and although I deplore the fact that a dubious element has crept into the debate. It is of course difficult — not to say impossible — to try to safeguard the emotional function of the family in the widest sense of the term on the one hand and to overload it with economic, fiscal and social functions on the other. A social unit based on emotional factors must not be allowed to become a dumping ground for all manner of social problems. We cannot allow the family to be made into an instrument of social or economic or political administration. At times of economic crisis, we cannot make the family — and in a narrower context, women — responsible for all the tasks that society has to perform. We save on crèches, we save on old people's homes, we save on hospitals, and all that work becomes the responsibility of the family. There is even some measure of ambiguity about the role of the family as a place of refuge. Mrs Veil referred to '*la valeur refuge*'. We would prefer to see a society which is open, safe and suffused with a sense of solidarity, and which would then need no such places of refuge.

Mrs Dury (S). — *(FR)* When we refer to family policy, we mean not only the traditional family but also the *de facto* family which exists but is not the result of a legal act.

I would also say that the way people speak about family policy nowadays often amounts to — and we have just had an example of this — an attack on working women. Women staying at home and returning to their traditional role is becoming a constant theme, and it is as if we were going back 25 years. There are also attacks against Community facilities. The number of crèches, day-nurseries and after-school activities has actually fallen in many countries. In the same way, working women are often penalized by tax legislation.

For my part, I consider that a family policy is one which actually enables women to choose what economic, social and political life they wish to lead in society. I would also say that the family is not only the housewife, not only the mother who looks after the children but it is also the man, whether husband or partner.

(Applause from the left)

* * *

DIANA REPORT (Doc. 1-223/83 'Seeds'): ADOPTED

Mr Stella, deputy rapporteur, was :

IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1 and 2.

* * *

CURRY REPORT (Doc. 1-225/83 'Milk and milk products'): ADOPTED

Mr Battersby, deputy rapporteur, was :

IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 and 10 ;

AGAINST Amendments Nos 5 and 7.

Explanations of vote

Mr Adamou (COM). — *(GR)* We have no objection to primary and secondary schoolchildren being supplied free of charge with dairy products at the EEC's expense, and we agree that this system should be extended also to students in tertiary education. However, since the Greek stockbreeding industry is running the risk of disappearing completely, partly because of its weak infrastructure, and mainly because of the stiff competition from similar foreign products, the imports of milk and other dairy products from the EEC will worsen the situation.

We could therefore agree with Mr Curry's report and motion for a resolution, but only if the Community subsidized Greek dairy products for free supply to Greek schoolchildren. We are opposed to the imports of dairy products, which will affect the Greek stockbreeding industry. For that reason we shall abstain from voting.

Mr Kirkos (COM), in writing. — *(GR)* We shall vote in favour of the Curry proposal for the extension of the dairy products supply programme to the pupils of educational establishments. Through our vote we recommend to the Commission :

firstly, that it should ensure the extension of the programme to the whole of Greece and that tertiary education should be included ;

secondly, that it should recognize students' unions as bodies capable of handling the supplies ;

thirdly, that it should extend the period covered by the programme, so as to give the schools — and I refer particularly to Greek schools — the opportunity to set up the necessary infrastructure.

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 10 JUNE 1983

Contents

1. <i>Approval of the minutes</i> <i>Mr Cecovini</i>	271	<i>Alavanos; Mr Ziagas; Mr Halligan; Mr Davignon (Commission)</i>	277
2. <i>Votes</i> <i>Mr G. Fuchs; Mr Notenboom; Mr Prout; Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Mr van Aerssen; Mr G. Fuchs; Mr Purvis; Mr Veronesi</i>	272	6. <i>Oil refining — Report (Doc. 1-90/83) by Mr Caborn</i> <i>Mrs Desouches; Mr Davignon (Commission); Mrs Desouches</i>	283
3. <i>Fruit and vegetables — Report (Doc. 1-422/83) by Mr Barbagli</i> <i>Mr Papaefstratiou; Mr Vgenopoulos; Mr Alavanos; Mr Gautier; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mr Haferkamp (Commission)</i>	273	7. <i>Amendments to Regulation 67/67 — Report (Doc. 1-357/83) by Mr Beazley</i> <i>Mr Beazley; Mrs Desouches; Mr Prout; Mr Halligan; Mr Moreland; Mr O'Mahony; Mr Pearce; Mr Haferkamp (Commission); Mr Moreland; Mr Beazley; Mr Pearce; Mr Haferkamp</i>	284
4. <i>European scientific and technical strategy (Doc. 1-382/83) (continuation)</i> <i>Mrs Phlix; Mr Purvis; Mr Veronesi; Mr Davignon (Commission)</i>	275	8. <i>Adjournment of the session</i>	291
5. <i>Development — Report (Doc. 1-269/83) by Mr Pöttering</i> <i>Mr Pöttering; Mr Papantoniou; Mrs Fullet; Mr O'Donnell; Mr Pearce; Mr</i>		<i>Annex</i> <i>Lord Douro; Mr Purvis; Mr Vandewiele; Mr Protopapadakis; Mr Notenboom; Mrs Théobald-Paoli; Mr Alavanos; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Markopoulos; Mr Skovmand; Mrs Théobald-Paoli; Mr Kallias; Mr Kyrkos</i> . . .	292

IN THE CHAIR : MR DANKERT

President

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

1. *Approval of minutes*

President. — The minutes of yesterday's sitting have been distributed but I would ask you not to adopt them for the moment for the simple reason that, because of a technical error, the English version has been mixed in with the French version. The pages affected are 42, 46, etc. I therefore propose that approval of the minutes be postponed until this error has been corrected in the course of the morning.

Mr Cecovini (L). — *(IT)* Mr President, seeing that the Minutes are in the process of being corrected, I note that my name is missing from the list of those present at yesterday's sitting.

President. — We shall correct that omission as soon as the minutes have been approved, but we shall have to put it off for the moment.¹

2. *Votes*²

REGULATION ON FOOD AID (Doc. 1-60/83)

¹ *Membership of committees — Procedure without report/ Rule 99 of the Rules of Procedure: see Minutes*

² See Annex.

Mr G. Fuchs (S). — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to remind you that we accepted the insertion of this item in Monday's agenda with one reservation. The Council informed us that it sent you a letter setting out its position on the interruption of the conciliation noted by Parliament, and on Monday we stated that we accepted the inclusion on the agenda of this item.

This letter which was sent on Tuesday and received on Wednesday was considered by the chairmen of the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Development and Cooperation who noted with great regret that it clearly failed in every respect to meet our concerns. The two committee chairmen then drew up a letter to the Council of which, with your permission, Mr President, I should like to read the most important paragraph.

The letter from Mr Lange and Mr Poniatoski states: 'We have noted with some surprise the letter from the President of the Council on the consultation of the European Parliament on two proposals for regulations on the application of the framework regulation "Management of food aid".'

This letter does not answer the basic problems which are at the basis of the conflict between our two institutions. The Council is merely sidestepping these problems by stating that it intends to apply simultaneously two contradictory texts, on the one hand the framework regulation 'Management of food aid' which stipulates that it is the Council which fixes the annual and multiannual quantities for each aid product, and on the other the joint statement of 30 June which lays down in particular that the European Parliament has the last word on appropriations and therefore on the quantities for each food aid product.

To put the matter, perhaps, more clearly, ladies and gentlemen, this means that on the one hand the Council recognizes that most food aid expenditure is non-compulsory expenditure on which we, therefore, have the last word while, on the other hand, it claims the right to decide in the last instance how this aid should be allocated.

For these reasons we — I am speaking on behalf of both committee chairmen — propose that this request for urgent procedure be referred to committee accompanied, of course, by a new offer from us to the Council to resume any conciliation procedure it is willing to accept. In our view this conciliation was prematurely interrupted and we are therefore asking, as explicitly as possible, that it be referred back to committee so that the Council can — and this is our fondest wish — make it possible to proceed with a matter which, over and above the principles involved, has become painful for everyone. We are asking the Council to resume the conciliation procedure.

Mr Notenboom (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, the chairman of the Committee on Budgets has urged me

to speak in his place since he cannot be present. He shares the view of Mr Poniatoski, in whose name an intervention has just been made, that the urgency procedure cannot be applied in this case. The condition laid down on Tuesday, namely a letter from the Council to the effect that the Council will not apply this procedure in the future, has not been satisfied. This letter does not meet that condition. I can only endorse what has just been said. The Committee on Budgets also feels that the usual procedure should be followed. It could be started in July, it would not have to last very long, but the usual procedure and not the urgency procedure must be applied.

COLLINS REPORT (Doc. 1-82/83 'AIR POLLUTION')

Mr Prout (ED). — I wish to ask the Commission what it proposes to do with regard to the consultation procedures in this report.

President. — Perhaps you would repeat your question, Mr Prout.

Mr Prout (ED). — I am referring to the Collins report on noxious gases.

President.— Yes, but the Commission did not understand what you were asking.

Mr Prout (ED). — It is in relation to that report that I wish to ask my question. My question is as follows: I understand that the Council has asked for urgency on this report. My group is not opposed to urgency on the substance of the matter. Indeed we understand the reasons for the Council's request. We are, however, rather concerned about a procedural matter which is contained in the draft proposals. Under the proposal, as it stands, this Parliament would be prevented from being consulted in future on certain important changes and amendments to the proposals. We feel that if we agree to it in its present form, we will in effect be depriving ourselves of powers which formerly we had. The position of my group, therefore, is as follows: we support urgency on the substance of the matter, but we would like the Commission to withhold both parts of the directive which refer to consultation until a new agreement has been negotiated between ourselves and the Commission. This does not, in any way, interfere with what the Council wants, because the Council is only concerned with the substance of the question. It is not in any way concerned with what happens once the draft directive has been implemented and once certain changes are put to Parliament in the future. That is the reason for my request.

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, I think a way can be found to

Haferkamp

prevent the decision from being put off longer and at the same time meeting Parliament's wishes. The Commission is always prepared on the basis of periodic reports in agreement with the responsible committees of the European Parliament, to discuss the adjustment of technical norms so as to ensure that matters requiring legislation can be dealt with without bypassing the European Parliament.

BLUMENFELD REPORT (Doc. 1-376/83 — UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES)

Mr van Aerssen (PPE). — (DE) Mr President, yesterday's debate again underlined that this draft regulation is also of great importance for the Stuttgart Summit. I would ask you to determine first whether under Rule 71 a quorum is present for the vote.

(More than 10 Members rose — the President announced that a quorum was not present)

President. — The vote will therefore be held over until the next part-session.

Mr G. Fuchs (S). — (FR) Mr President, applying the same argument which Mr van Aerssen has just used, I request that this vote should be taken at the very beginning of the July part-session, since I believe that this report is extremely important for the Community.

President. — As you are aware, the vote is usually postponed until the beginning of the following part-session. As the next part-session is an extraordinary part-session, I think it will be dealt with at the ordinary part-session in July.

Mr G. Fuchs (S). — (FR) I believe that the additional part-session is scheduled to last two days. Since the vote on this report would only take about 10 minutes, I think it could be taken at the beginning of the extraordinary part-session. I shall, of course, abide by your decision.

President. — Mr Fuchs, we shall discuss that at the Bureau meeting on 21 June 1983.

VERONESI REPORT (Doc. 1-235/83 'AUTOMOBILE SECTOR'): ADOPTED

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, in the debate yesterday I particularly asked Mr Veronesi if he would not do something about this. In committee it was agreed that paragraph 16, which just refers to a paragraph number in the original motion for a resolution put down by Mr Barbagli, should be replaced by the substance of what that paragraph said, if anything. I would like to ask Mr Veronesi to do that or else, I am afraid, we will have to vote against it because I do not think it is acceptable to have just references to paragraph numbers in other working documents of the Parliament. As it was, it was agreed in committee that this should be done and it has not been done.

Mr Veronesi (COM), rapporteur. — (IT) Mr President, although I did not understand Mr Purvis' point yesterday, I do understand it now and I accept it.

3. Fruit and vegetables

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-422/83) by Mr Barbagli, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-211/83 — COM(83) 92 final — Part IV) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 516/77 on the common organization of the market in products processed from fruit and vegetables.

Mr Papaefstratiou (PPE), deputy-rapporteur. — (GR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, following the accession of Greece to the European Community the Council of Ministers introduced for the marketing periods 1981-82 and 1982-83 a product support system for grapes and figs and certain products covered by the system in force for products processed from fruit and vegetables. Recently the Commission put forward a proposal for amending the regulations governing processed fruit and vegetables and the system in operation for grapes and figs.

The European Parliament has been asked to deliver an opinion during the coming months on the whole set of proposals for amending the basic regulations. The problem Parliament is being asked to decide upon today concerns an entirely special matter. We have, in fact, to decide what is to happen to the 55 thousand tonnes of dried grapes and the 3,5 thousand tonnes of dried figs that are in storage in Greece. The costs of storage amount to approximately one million ECU per month and there is a danger as time goes by of this fruit becoming totally ruined. This is a special matter because the 1981 crop in Greece was very large and while about half of it was placed on the market the large quantities referred to are still in store two years later.

To relieve the burden on the Community, taking into account that it is impossible to find ways of selling these stocks, the Commission is proposing that the stocks still in store at the end of the marketing period be sent for distillation or be used for purposes other than human consumption.

I sense that some colleagues are wondering if perhaps this will cost money. Of course it will, Mr President, but I must remind the House that such measures do apply for stocks of other products such as cereals, milk and butter, etc. Indeed, in these cases the quantities involved are much larger and entail a much heavier financial burden. It is necessary, while there is still time, to find ways of disposing of a product which is deteriorating day by day, and which may, in even a short space of time, become completely ruined, with the most adverse financial consequences.

Papaefstratiou

At this point I would like to point out that this situation must be regarded as exceptional and of the utmost urgency and must be dealt with accordingly. Furthermore, I remind the House that certain third countries are implementing dumping policies in these products, and I would request the Commission to look into this matter and take the appropriate steps.

These products were of very good quality when harvested but, of course, due to dumping policies it was very difficult to find outlets for them because, as we know, the system of Community preference is not always applied successfully.

Finally, Mr President, I think that the European Parliament should give firm endorsement to the Commission's proposal to the Council which is the culmination of a study of the factors relating to this truly urgent need which requires, as a consequence, the taking of correspondingly urgent measures.

Mr Vgenopoulos (S). — *(GR)* Mr President, on 20 October 1982 three representatives of the Commission went to Greece to discuss the common organization of the market in dried grapes and figs with the Ministry of Agriculture. They wanted to learn the real reasons why the dried grapes we are discussing had remained unsold. After visiting the warehouses and grape factories of the Peloponnese and Crete they ascertained that the non-disposal of these products was in no way attributable to their quality but was due to the wrong application of Regulation 2194/1981. Community production of dried grapes suffices to meet only 50 % of the Community's needs. This means that to cover its needs the Community is obliged to import the other 50 %. In the period 1981-82 the Community imported 90 % of its requirements with the result that the greater part of the Community's own production remained unsold. As a result of this the producers were forced to put their crop into intervention. But who is to blame for this situation? The Commission has admitted that the price it fixed for the Community product was high and so Turkish dried grapes, which were 200 or 300 dollars cheaper, flooded the market. And this because there was no tariff barrier on imports. Despite repeated warnings and protests from the Greek producers and processors, and in spite of appeals by the Greek Government for the price to be lowered so that the Community's own production could be sold the management committee at the Commission, under pressure from the British who objected, failed to take immediate steps. When last October, faced with complete deadlock in the situation, the Commission was forced to fix a minimum price of 1 000 dollars a tonne, the worst had already happened. The Community market had already been saturated, and I inform you that in the 1982-83 period there is no problem in disposing of the crop because, unlike in the first instance, the Commission's measures were adopted without too much fuss.

I would also like to comment on the cost of the distillation proposed by the Commission. Nothing comes free, Mr President. In any case it is the responsibility of the common agricultural policy and of the Community generally to protect Community products and to ensure that the markets are properly organized.

It is also the responsibility of the Community to convert stocks of milk into powder for animal feed. In the rough draft of the Commission's budget for 1984 it is envisaged that 500 000 ECU will be provided to produce 400 000 tonnes of animal milk feed. Should this not be paid out, and should the milk producers not be protected?

For precisely these reasons, Mr President, and to relieve the Community of having to pay 1 000 000 ECU every month to keep the dried grapes in store, and to restore market stability, this uncertainty must be ended as soon as possible, and we shall therefore vote in favour of Mr Barbagli's report.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, we have some reservations which are set out in Amendment 9 which we have tabled. We fear that with regard to Greek dried grape production we are up against, one could say, a three stage conspiracy.

First stage: Delay by the Commission in announcing prices and delay in the taking of measures for the protection of the Community's own production, that is, essentially, Greek production. Dumping prices by the United States and Turkey, etc., resulting in — as the rapporteur and Mr Vgenopoulos have said — 90 % of the Community market being taken up by dried grapes from outside the Community.

Second stage: Along comes the Commission and, expecting us to thank it perhaps, proposes the distillation into alcohol of the dried grapes that are presently in storage.

Third stage: It is natural for a product that ends up being distilled to be ranked with the products which are in surplus and for this to lead to measures discouraging its production. As we see, these measures are contained in the other part of the proposed amendment of Regulation 516/77 which envisages a production quota of 80 000 tonnes for sultanas and a series of other price measures aimed at discouraging the production of certain products. From this point of view we have substantial reservations about distillation. The stocks of dried grapes are from last year's crop — the 1981 crop — and despite the anxieties expressed about deterioration we believe, as the experience of previous years has shown, that they are saleable as such.

From this standpoint the Communist Party of Greece has substantial reservations about distillation, and these are expressed in Amendment 9 which, amongst other things, affirms that this product is saleable.

Alavanos

In addition to this amendment we have tabled four others dealing with production support and the take-up of dried grapes in the Community market. We believe that these amendments will be adopted.

IN THE CHAIR : MR ESTGEN*Vice-President*

Mr Gautier (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the matter we are discussing is a typical example of European agricultural policy, and I can only say that I am opposed to this amendment to the regulation. This morning's papers reported that the current German President-in-Office of the Council of Finance Ministers, Mr Stoltenberg, made a statement on the finances of the European Community in which he said that Community finances should not be increased. I am quite willing to believe that that is his view, but his German Christian-Democrat colleagues and others are cheerfully voting for further expenditure in the order of DM 150 million for — believe it or not — the destruction of raisins! That is the result of the vote in the Committee on Agriculture. It is now being argued here that the raisins are lying in storage because the Community preference cannot be maintained. I have doubts about this, since if one looks at world market prices and the import prices, the import prices give no indication that the Community preference has not been maintained.

Even on the assumption that this is in fact the case I still wonder why it has been stated orally and in writing that the raisins, which according to our Greek colleagues are of excellent quality, must be subsidized at the rate literally of ECU 928, or about 6 000 dollars per tonne, when the world market price is about 1 000 dollars per tonne. That means that we are giving away the raisins which are in storage so that we can then destroy them! If that is not an absurdity of the agricultural policy, then I don't know what would count as absurd.

I have therefore tabled two amendments. The first amendment states that the sale price for dried grapes should not be less than 50 % of the purchase price. Since the intervention price is approximately ECU 1 200, the sale price should not be more than ECU 600. That way we would not be far below the world market price and Community preference could no longer be an issue since it would remain within acceptable limits. I believe that Members will be able to support this amendment since even a 50 % subsidy for very valuable goods is already too high.

My second amendment concerns the argument that the distillation measures should only apply to those stored in 1981. If this only applies to 1981 it can also be argued, when amending the regulation, that the extension of the regulation is only valid for 1983. Hopefully, this would mean that the problem would no longer exist, as everybody is saying, and there is

therefore no reason for voting against it. Finally, I believe that this is also a reason for the Committee on Budgetary Control to take up this problem and to examine how it can happen that 60 000 tonnes of — apparently unsaleable — raisins are in storage and whether the way in which our intervention and storage regulations are framed serves the interests of the citizens and taxpayers of Europe.

Mr Pasmazoglou (NI). — *(GR)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think it is essential for Parliament to bear in mind that for a long time the main volume of Greek dried grape production found an easy outlet in the European Community. However, in recent years this has ceased to be the case because quite manifestly Community preference is not functioning, and it is not functioning, Mr President, because, as we all know, violations take place, either in the form of price undercutting or in the form of refunds agreed between the importers and the producers and exporters in non-Community countries. Community preference must therefore be made effective. This is the key to the problem, so that there can be an end to the build-up of large stocks of dried grapes in Greece. I want to ask the Commissioner responsible for agriculture once again what is being done to make Community preference effective.

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(DE)* Mr President, the reasons for this proposal have been stated on a number of occasions. It concerns storage situations which are primarily due to the unusually rich harvests in 1981. A third of the products of this marketing year is currently stored by the Greek intervention agencies. Because it is continually deteriorating, it must be sold quickly. The Commission therefore propose to dispose of this product as quickly as possible under special conditions. We believe that these special measures should be carried out as the Commission has proposed.

Mr Gautier has introduced a proposal providing for a significantly lower payment. I must point out that there is no chance of disposing of this product outside the normal sales channels at the price suggested in Mr Gautier's proposal. The Commission, however, sees no difficulty in adopting Mr Gautier's Amendment No 5 provided it does not prejudice its right to act.

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote¹***4. European scientific and technical strategy (continuation)**

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the Sälzer report (Doc. 1-382/83).

¹ See Annex.

² See previous day's debate.

Mrs Phlix (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the EPP Group I should like first to heartily thank the Commission for their outline programme which for the first time brings together all plans for scientific and technical research. We have made a substantial effort to increase the research budgets, and even to double it. In fact, the Community budget for 1982 was only 2,2 % of what was invested by the public sector of the Member States in research. In this programme the figure is now 3 %. This is only a slight increase, but we are greatly pleased with every step forward, however small.

The question remains however, whether on our march towards the unification of Europe with its population of 200 million, this increase is not too small, given the importance of research for the solution of the enormous social and economic problems with which our people are confronted. The proposed outline programme contains some very interesting points. There is a risk, however, that through excessive fragmentation what progress is made could have only a marginal effect. We are somewhat disillusioned by the fact that, compared with 1982, both as the percentage and in absolute terms the health research allocation has been reduced and I propose that this matter be looked at afresh on the final adoption of the programmes.

Our Group is especially thankful to Mr Sälzer for the way in which he has handled this delicate question. Research is after all one of the most important functions of European policy and central to the development of our Community. The EPP Group can, therefore, support the Sälzer resolution most enthusiastically.

Mr Purvis (ED). — Mr President, it is now about four years that I have been connected with the Committee on Energy and Research and therefore with research policies of the Community. I must say that one of the main features that emerge from this experience is the lack of any substantial consistency in the objectives of Community research, of any real coordination either within itself or with national research. A second impression you get is the relative lack of significance in budgetary and therefore, I am afraid, in real research terms.

Much of this unsatisfactory state is due to the lack of any real framework in which the Commission is working and the lack of any political and financial commitment on the part of the Council of Ministers, the Member States and, perhaps one might add, the budgetary authority. When you compare this with the situation in Japan, with Miki, where a highly integrated and organized research campaign is exercised, or the United States, with its enormous expenditure on defence, space and other areas of research, we can see why Europe is perhaps falling behind in competitiveness.

So, we in this group welcome this framework proposal in that it will, we hope, achieve a firm commitment on the part of the Council of Ministers and of the Parliament, combined in the form of the budgetary authority, to enable Community research to progress on a more rational, productive, effective and consistent basis. We therefore support Mr Sälzer's report, which supports in turn the Commission's proposals.

The whole question of our research effort in Europe, which in overall figures may not be insubstantial but in effectiveness seems to be less than one might expect, is of critical importance for our future competitiveness and our economic prosperity. God speed to the framework proposals!

Mr Veronesi (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, I should like to thank my colleague for the balance he has shown in his handling of the subject before us and for having drawn up a resolution which we can readily adopt.

Might I also point out that Mr Sälzer has been fortunate in having so excellent, not to say outstanding, a basis on which to work. I congratulate the Commissioner and his assistants for providing such a valuable general background. Last night Mr Davignon mentioned that such praise was being given at midnight in a deserted Chamber. This morning, when the attendance is a little better, I have no difficulty in reiterating our appreciation. Here we have no insignificant 'opening of appropriations', but the signs of a change, this report being well drafted, coherent and comprehensive, opening up broad perspectives.

This is to be seen alongside the FAST programme, which we adopted yesterday, and also in the context of initiatives already adopted and others under discussion whose aim is to monitor, exploit and encourage the transfer of research information to industrial production. We thus have a complex but coherent set of initiatives which augur well for the future.

On the debit side, I must also point out the doubts and difficulties we are faced with: the limited character of the budget, the dilatoriness and indecisiveness of the Council of Ministers which often frustrate useful initiatives that could prove extremely advantageous to the Community.

Notwithstanding these reservations we shall vote in favour of the Sälzer resolution and the programme presented by the Commission.

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — *(FR)* Mr President, I should like to begin by expressing the Commission's thanks to the rapporteur, Mr Sälzer, and for the work done by the Committee on Energy and research. I believe that the introduction of the concept of a framework programme in

Davignon

research represents a startling change when compared with the practices hitherto current in this area. The formal motion for a resolution presented to the European Parliament will make it possible to define what will now be the goals. Indeed the motion for a resolution, which has our support, is not simply a practical procedure but implies the definition of a certain number of precise goals and the interconnections which exist between them. It also defines the means for attaining these goals. If at some point it becomes necessary to make a choice between the means and the goals, the Council and Parliament will have to decide to change the goals in function of the means and not simply cut back the means. In any language that is called arbitration. Arbitration must be carried out on the basis of the goals and not simply be mathematical arbitration. This, I think, is an important change.

Secondly, the framework programme makes possible a precise assessment of the relationship between national action and action taken at Community level. It should be borne in mind that there is nothing to be gained by carrying out a number of actions at Community level unless they are more effective, certain and better-structured than national actions. The simple transfer to the Community level is in itself neither a goal nor a result.

Some of the remarks which I have heard call for two comments. Yesterday Mr Gautier spoke of the relationship which exists between the difficult Community policies. It is quite clear — as the document on biotechnology which has been or which shortly will be submitted to Parliament and which we have drawn on with a view to the European Council supports this — that the Commission will propose to the Council the necessary adjustments in the agricultural policy to ensure that where biotechnology is concerned, the raw materials will be made available to users under the same conditions as to their competitors. That is a practical example of the way the different policies interlock once a framework programme exists.

The Commission willingly and gratefully accepts, as I said a moment ago, the rapporteur's proposals. With regard to the Committee on Budgets' amendments I have some difficulty in accepting Amendment No 2 which states that European research is somewhat ineffective because of overlapping resulting from the absence of coordination within the Community and of cooperation with other international research organizations. I fully accept that there is no coordination within the Community; and that is, indeed, the reason why we set up this framework programme. I do not think that one can say that one regrets something when the motion is precisely intended to set up a dynamic structure. I, therefore, must say in all sincerity that cooperation with other international research organizations is not a problem where we are concerned.

Mr President, that is what I wish to say in thanking most sincerely Parliament for the support it has given to this framework programme which is the very instrument which we lack to achieve at Community level recognition for the Community dimension in the development of research and, as we all know, research is the indispensable instrument for influencing our future. If the purpose of the Community is not to influence our future it has no reason to exist.

President. — The debate is closed ¹.

Vote ²

5. Development

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-269/83) by Mr Pottering, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning on

the proposals from the Commission to the Council COM(82) 658 final (Doc. 1-103/82) for regulations concerning a second series of specific Community regional development measures under Article 13 of the Fund Regulation (non-quota section).

Mr Pöttering (PPE), rapporteur. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission of the European Communities has submitted proposals for a second series of specific Community measures under Article 13, that is to say the non-quota section, of the European Regional Development Fund. Parliament has always hoped that this latter would one day become the real European instrument of regional policy. For the years 1983-1987 they entail a total of 710 million ECU in financial resources. If we add to this the first series of measures, which have until 1987 to run, this programme accounts for a grand total of 836 million ECU.

What these proposals for regulations are actually designed to do is to see to it that certain regions in the Mezzogiorno, the South of France and now also Greece, now that Greece has become a member of the Community, are prepared for the enlargement of the European Community. Secondly, they embrace measures for the improvement of energy supplies and the development of new technologies and thirdly, they are to do away with restrictions on new economic initiatives in certain branches of industry that have been hard hit by structural crises, notably iron and steel, shipbuilding and textiles.

The Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning welcomes the fact that these proposals constitute an overall framework for Community policy. Textiles in particular have been very hard hit by Community measures — one has only to think of the World Textile Agreement. This is even more true of the restructuring of the entire steel sector. We are

¹ Approval of the Minutes: see Minutes.

² See Annex.

Pöttering

very happy therefore that the Commission has taken this initiative. As for the third matter, the problems raised by the prospect of enlargement, we all hope that, once these problems have been solved, Portugal and Spain will soon be members of our Community.

We are glad to see that these proposals envisage special investment subsidies for crafts and for small and medium-sized businesses. This we see as a practical contribution to the Year of the Craft Industry, proposed by the European Parliament for 1983. We are also glad to see provision being made for interest rebates on global Community loans for small and medium-sized businesses through the European Investment Bank, the New Community Instrument and the ECSC Treaty, and finally we welcome the support being given to advisory agencies and the encouragement of entrepreneurial activities.

So, these then are some favourable comments directed to the Commission. At the same time we must point out that the experience gained from the first series, the previous series of measures under the so-called non-quota section — this 5 % — has not yet been very impressive. We would also like to make it quite clear that as far as the industrial sectors are concerned, i.e. steel and textiles, the aids in question are not maintenance subsidies but aid intended for the creation of alternative jobs outside the steel and textiles sectors. This is all very welcome, of course, but it does not release us from our obligation to address some very critical remarks to the Commission on how we in the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning see the whole situation.

Our committee deplores the fact that the criteria for the allocation of financial aids are extremely vague and unclear. This is true of steel, but even more so of the textile sector which gets a large slice of the cake, even more than does the steel sector. In the case of textiles no criteria whatever are set out in the proposals for regulations. All they do is to list the regions that are to get aid for the creation of alternative jobs, but these regions will have no idea of exactly why they are getting it. In my view this is a fundamental problem in regard to regional policy. It should be in the interests of both Parliament and Commission to see to it that clear criteria are set out for the allocation of resources, so that there can be no question of any manipulation or any political pressures being put on the Commission. We need transparency, so that the citizen can rest assured that the monies handed out in a spirit of solidarity with the poorer regions will be spent sensibly in the way that he wants them spent when he pays his taxes, not in any unaccountable ways. That is why we call on the Commission to adopt the criteria we propose — I don't intend to give details of them here; they are all to be found in the report — so that the man in the street can see for himself why the aids are being given.

We also demand that these monies should not simply be swallowed up by the national exchequers in such a

way that the man in the street has no idea that it is the European Community that provides the aids. We want to see them going directly to the investors and to local organizations, albeit, of course, on the basis of programmes put forward by the Member States, because this is essential if anything worthwhile is to be achieved.

We would point out that the success of this second series depends on the size of the so-called non-quota section. Up to now this has been 5 %, but in future it will be 7 % if, as we expect, the Council of Ministers decides to increase the non-quota section. As was made very clear in yesterday's debate, we deeply deplore the fact that the Council has not yet felt itself to be in a position finally to adopt the Regional Fund regulation. We are severely critical of it for its failure in this regard and we look to it finally to shoulder its responsibilities in the days and weeks ahead.

I should now like to make a few particular comments on some aspects of the development measures as proposed by the Commission and backed by and large by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning. Let me take the steel sector first. I am very glad to see Commissioners Davignon and Haferkamp here today. Our committee is very keenly aware that we give the Commission a kind of blank cheque, as it were, in recognition of its good will. Under the first phase of the second series of measures for steel it did indicate which regions were to be developed, but the bulk of the resources are to go into the second phase, and we have as yet been given no information as to where these latter measures are to be directed to. We are not asking the Commission to come up with a new regulation for this second phase. We do not want any further time and energy wasted on a bureaucratic exercise of this kind. We do, however, ask the Commission — and I make this point of policy in all seriousness — to keep our committee acquainted informally with its plans for the second phase, so that everything may be done on the basis of the criteria we would like to see applied. If these criteria are applied, then all the Community's steel regions that are hard hit by restructuring must be taken into consideration. We do not want to abort the whole procedure and have therefore promised to adopt this report today in Parliament, so that the Commission can get on with the work it has to do in order to live up to our expectations.

Let me say one further word about textiles. It seems to the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning that by comparison with steel the textile sector is getting too large a share of the financial goodies. It is very difficult for the committee to say which regions should be included in this programme. Some countries, for example, are left out altogether, though this is not necessarily a disadvantage. We cannot do the member governments' jobs for them! If they themselves do not want to be included in the programme, Parliament cannot do anything about it. The Commission's task is to work together with the governments.

Pöttering

One final comment on the measures for the enlargement of the Community. We have discussed this question also at some length. We see, for example, that one member government — by no means the least in order of importance — is getting 55 million ECU for some of its regions. Now we get the distinct impression that it is this very member government that is dragging its heels in promoting the negotiations for accession; at the same time it can get in its demand for aid before the accession of Spain and Portugal. We feel that we ought to be consistent. If Member States are already asking for this money, then they should be doing their best to help along the negotiations on accession, so that Spain and Portugal can soon become members of the Community.

It is in the interests of the Community that we should do our utmost to make European regional policy transparent and readily understandable. If we do this, the citizens of Europe will become ever more willing in a spirit of solidarity to lend their support to the poorer and structurally weaker regions of the Community.

(Applause)

Mr Papantoniou (S), *draftsman of the opinion of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs*. — (GR) Mr President, first of all I would like to stress that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs attaches great importance to the non-quota section of the Regional Fund and for this reason is favourable to the Commission's proposals for a second series of specific Community measures. These measures are clearly designed to combat specific regional problems due to infrastructural weaknesses and lack of natural resources and to the sudden collapse of industrial sectors. They are also intended to alleviate the adverse social consequences of certain Community policies, such as the job losses brought about by Community policy in the steel sector.

The main observations of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs concerning the Commission's proposals are as follows:

Firstly, with regard to the selection of projects and regions we commend the extension of the measures to Greece and likewise the inclusion of areas affected by the crisis in the textile industry, and, lastly, the linking of measures on steel to the granting of Community loans in this sector. We believe, however, that the allocation of funds in the context of enlargement does not reflect existing economic and social differences among the regions involved, particularly as regards the generous treatment of south-west France relative to the much poorer regions of southern Italy and Greece. We also point out that the criteria applied by the Commission for the selection of areas meriting assistance are inadequate and restrictive, with the result that regions lacking an adequate statistical base, especially in the field of unemployment, are in practical terms excluded.

For this reason I think that the selection system should be improved and broadened as a matter of urgency, and this is something Mr Pöttering touched on in the introduction he has just delivered.

Secondly, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs would like to refer to the nature and manner of implementation of the measures advocated. We agree, Mr President, with the new notion of providing stimulating assistance — 'pump-priming' — aimed at improving the liaison of economic firms with their environment. We also commend the extension of the measures in favour of small and medium-sized undertakings to cover areas affected by the crises in the textile, steel and shipbuilding industries. Lastly, we agree with and welcome the strengthening of additionality between Community aid and national aid through the provision of supplementary financial incentives and the linking of applications for measures to be taken in areas affected by the steel crisis with Community policy in this sector.

To sum up, Mr President, in spite of the reservations I have mentioned the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs supports the Commission's proposals on the non-quota section of the Regional Fund.

Mrs Fullet (S). — (FR) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I feel that I should begin by expressing our satisfaction with the new regulations for the non-quota section proposed by the Commission.

Regional policy should not operate solely in favour of regions that are structurally less favoured; it should also take into consideration areas that have been hard hit by the industrial recession. It must adopt this two-pronged approach if we are to tackle in a realistic manner the problems raised for the European regions by the recession, the enlargement of the Community and the development of the less favoured regions.

These new proposals from the Commission complement the first series of measures adopted in 1980. They are aimed at stepping up the measures to be taken in favour of regions in industrial decline, particularly in the iron and steel, textiles and shipbuilding sectors.

We are also happy that a programme has been elaborated for the development of certain regions in the context of enlargement and for the extension of that development to include the matter of energy supplies. These programmes take into account the need to keep the undertakings informed, and this is something that applies to every form of undertaking, whether private, public or cooperative.

On the other hand we can only deplore the meagre financial endowment that is to back up these programmes. The delay in adopting the new regulations for the European Regional Development Fund shows only too clearly how divided the Council is on

Fuillet

this whole matter. However, it is virtually certain that we shall see an increase in the non-quota section of the ERDF, and this is why we feel that the severe restrictions on specific projects to be carried out cannot be maintained in the future. These restrictions are understandable at the moment in view of the meagre financial endowment we have to work with. In the medium and long term, however, there can be no question of these kind of restrictions if we are to get a genuine Community regional policy off the ground.

The Commission is making certain efforts to coordinate national and Community instruments. The principle whereby these instruments are to be harnessed to a jointly financed programme is very new and highly commendable. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that difficulties can be caused by making procedures, particularly in the financial sphere, more cumbersome and unwieldy, since bureaucratic constraints are a fact of life — and what a tedious one! — in our Community.

Furthermore, I should like to remind the House of the insistence with which I have been pointing out for a long time now the fallibility of the basic statistics used by the Commission in assessing the economic situation and making its selection of the regions eligible for aid. In spite of certain shortcomings in the Commission's proposal, admittedly minor ones, Mr Pöttering has painted quite a satisfactory picture for us of the new regulations. We shall therefore wholeheartedly support his excellent report.

Mr O'Donnell (PPE). — Mr President, I would like very sincerely to congratulate my esteemed friend and colleague, Mr Pöttering, on his excellent report on the non-quota section of the ERDF.

I think it is well to recall that the establishment of a non-quota section of the European Regional Development Fund was regarded at the time of its implementation as the first significant step towards the implementation of a coherent Community regional policy. However, in practice the operation of the non-quota section has produced mixed results. The most extraordinary situation revealed in the Pöttering report is the fact that some member countries have not taken up their entire allocations and, indeed, my country is one of the countries in question. In the case of Ireland, our allocation from the non-quota section was committed to the development and promotion of cross-border projects. Mr Pöttering in his report refers to the disappointing results in this particular area, and on page 35 of his report he refers, in particular, to this problem. He states that 'in view of the present political obstacles to this specific Community measure for which the Commission is not responsible, the Commission should submit proposals immediately to ensure that the funds available can be put to their intended use.'

The failure of the non-quota section of the ERDF to make any significant impact in the cross-border areas of Ireland is a source of great disappointment, as there is no doubt whatsoever that the promotion of practical cross-border cooperation would be a major factor in creating an atmosphere of good will, thereby relieving some of the political and other tensions which underlie the continuing tragedy which partition has brought to our small island country on the periphery of Europe.

Mr President, I would suggest that the Commission should take up the suggestion made by Mr Pöttering and submit proposals to ensure that the funds available can be put to their intended use. But on a practical note, I believe sincerely that what is necessary to encourage this type of cross-border cooperation in my country is the establishment of a new organizational structure. I would particularly draw the Commission's attention to the feasibility study, that was carried out some years ago, into the possibility of establishing a North-West development corporation. I, therefore, appeal to the Commission to take a new initiative now in consultation with the authorities on both sides and to formulate a new strategy. I particularly recommend the establishment of a cross-border development agency.

Finally, Mr President, I welcome the extension of the non-quota section to the textile sector. I particularly welcome the fact that Donegal and the western regions of Ireland have been included, because these regions, for over a century, have had a textile sector.

My time is up. I congratulate once again Mr Pöttering and hope that the second series of specific Community measures under the non-quota section of the ERDF will meet with more success than the first series has.

IN THE CHAIR : MR PFLIMLIN*Vice-President*

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, I also welcome the report by Mr Pöttering and the Commission's proposals for the non-quota section.

This measure is an interesting kind of direct Community involvement in the affairs of our people and a useful link between our spending policies on the one hand and other types of Community policy on the other. In some areas it can and does make an essential contribution towards relieving the problems caused by declining industries such as shipbuilding, steel and textiles.

I would like to draw attention particularly to the amendment introduced by my colleague, Mr Hutton — 'Amendment No 1' — in which he is talking about the definition of areas to be used for determining the application of these funds. The different

Pearce

areas used have some strange results. In my own area, funds are allocated to the County of Merseyside although only part of that, in fact, ever had ship-building in it. In another part of my area, the city of Chester, which is about 3 or 4 kilometres from a major steelworks that has been closed, does not qualify for such funds although large areas of a neighbouring administrative area do. I think that this sort of situation which is probably mirrored in all the Member States establishes that we want a better way of determining the areas to which these funds should be applied.

I would like to support what Mr O'Donnell said about the use of funds. The United Kingdom is one of the countries that has not used the whole of its allocation for the border areas, a problem which also affects the Republic of Ireland. It really is extraordinary that Community funds should be available to Member States and then not taken up. I hope that some of my friends back home in my own country will note this sort of situation when talking about the net return that Britain gets out of the budget of the European Communities.

My final point concerns information about the use of funds under the non-quota section. I find it just about impossible to pinpoint what the money is actually spent on. I do not know whether this is the fault of the Commission or the fault of the authorities in the locality. But I do believe that the public have a right to know what this money is spent on. I believe it would do a power of good in our claim to increase the non-quota section and increase the ERDF if there was better publicity and better public recognition of what the money is being spent on.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — *(GR)* Mr President, on behalf of the Communist Party of Greece I have the following comments to make.

Firstly, as a result of the proposals in question the need for certain regulations to be extended to cover Greece is being overlooked. Take for example Regulation 2615/80 (EEC) on the development of certain Mediterranean regions in view of the enlargement of the Community. Is not Greece confronted with problems, and indeed of the most serious kind, given the prospect of enlargement? A similar problem exists with Regulation 2618/80 (EEC) on alternative energy sources and also with the draft regulation on areas facing problems in the textile sector.

Secondly, the problems for our country are accentuated by the fact that industrial decline and the repercussions of Community policies are taken as criteria for the specific measures. Under this formulation regions that are relatively backward and permanently under-developed — and this applies to many regions of my country — are not included, except in the case

of those which have been adversely affected by the implementation of Community policies as such.

Thirdly, as long as the unemployment criterion remains absolute it may lead, and is leading, to serious discrimination against the less-developed regions. For example, the number of unemployed Greeks in the textile sector cannot be compared with the corresponding number in the United Kingdom. Is this adequate reason, however, for our country to be downgraded in the allocation of funds from the non-quota section of the Regional Fund? Over and above the unemployment statistic, should not the overall role played by a specific sector in the industrial structure and future prospects of each country be taken into consideration? If the textile sector is considered important for the United Kingdom, for Greece it is vital. One could say the same thing about the shipbuilding industry as well. However, the whole allocation is given to the United Kingdom. But is not our country considered the largest maritime power in the Community, with about one-third of the Community fleet? Is there not recognition of the need for expansion and modernization of the shipbuilding sector? Do not these ideas apply equally in the case of the steel industry where because of fierce competition the only remaining blast furnace in our country has shut down?

Fourthly, as a result of these factors and a series of others the lion's share of funds allocated from the non-quota section of the Regional Fund will go to three of the strongest countries in the Community, the United Kingdom, France and Italy which have, when all is said and done, greater national potential to cover their own needs. Another result is that despite its great needs, our country has an entirely marginal role in the non-quota section of the Regional Fund; a problem exacerbated by the situation obtaining with regard to the quota section of the Fund. Thus despite the major problems of a regional nature faced by our country which, to a large extent, are aggravated by its membership of the Community, it is the victim of substantial discrimination in the allocation of funds from the non-quota section of the Regional Fund.

For these reasons the Members belonging to the Communist Party of Greece will abstain from voting on the Pöttering report.

Mr Ziagas (S). — *(GR)* Mr President, on behalf of the Greek Socialists I would like to congratulate Mr Pöttering and to stress that despite our differences on the points to which I shall refer we consider his report helpful, and this for two reasons.

Firstly, it recognizes the need, in periods of economic crisis, such as at present, for the Community to take special measures to assist the regions and sectors of the economy worst hit by the problems of the crisis.

Ziagas

Secondly, it recognizes that the Community has a duty to intervene in support of regions and sectors of industry which are suffering as a result of the harmful consequences of several of the Community's policies.

We consider it particularly noteworthy that Greece has been brought within the scope of the measures on energy and of those taken in the context of enlargement. This does not mean, of course, that the measures involved measure up to the needs of the Greek economy in the light of the accession of Portugal and Spain to the Community.

We also consider the Commission's decision to continue and extend the existing measures in the iron and steel sector and the textile and shipbuilding industries, and likewise the measures for assisting small and medium-sized undertakings, to be positive steps.

We want to stress, however, that in the case of textiles and the clothing industry the Commission must establish new criteria for the assistance given in this sector.

The lack of recent statistical studies does not make it easy for Greece to be included in the new measures, whereas it is a known fact that its textile sector — a traditional branch of Greek industry — is at present faced with severe problems. We also point out that the amendments to Regulation 2615/80 refer only to southern France and Italy without including Greece.

Finally, we believe that the reinforcement of the role of the non-quota section of the Regional Fund may in many cases make it easier for the Community to intervene directly — always in conjunction, of course, with the initiatives undertaken by the Member States nationally — in regions and branches of industry where serious problems arise. However, this fact must not put in doubt the percentages of the Fund which are set aside for regions with long-term and structural problems of under-development. And this because we believe that the basic role of the Fund is to assist the under-developed regions of the Community so as to secure the convergence and not the divergence of the economies of the Member States of the Community.

In concluding, Mr President, I want to remark on a point that Mr Pöttering accepts. The measures taken by the Community should not be exclusively of a fire fighting character, implemented — that is — only when the crisis has become manifest. They should, on the contrary, be preventive in character, providing for early specific steps to be taken to help stricken regions, and help to reduce the economic and social cost of the crisis.

Mr Halligan (S). — Mr President, the creation of the non-quota section of the European Regional Fund was potentially of great significance for regions or industrial sectors which were suffering from economic

decline. However, Mr Pottering's report — and I must commend him for the excellence of the report — raises very serious doubts as to whether the Commission or the various national governments have any clear idea as to how these regions or sectors should be identified and, having been identified, how in fact they are to be helped.

The basic problem — and it has been reiterated many times here this morning in this debate — is that the Commission's criteria for identifying regions and sectors which have special problems are seriously deficient and, in any event, are based on out-of-date data, particularly regarding unemployment levels. The second main problem — and Mr Pöttering referred to this — is that some national governments evidently do not know how to use the money which is earmarked for them. All in all, Mr President, this report does not paint a very convincing picture of the way in which the Community works.

I very much regret that in the proposals before us for a second series of specific regional development measures nothing has been put forward for the declining clothing and textile industry in Ireland. This has almost been wiped out as a direct result of Community competition policy, particularly in Dublin, which was once the centre of a thriving clothing industry.

Neither, is there anything in these proposals to deal with the redundancy problems in the motor assembly industry in Ireland, which has all but disappeared as a consequence of Irish membership of the Community. Thousands of skilled jobs have been lost, all of them directly attributable to Community policies. Yet nothing is proposed here, despite the fact that Dublin, once the centre of this industry, has one of the highest unemployment rates in the Community, some parts of the city, in fact, having unemployment rates as high as 40%. Quite evidently, Mr President, Dublin is the forgotten city for both the Commission and the Irish Government.

These regulations were, in fact, tailor-made for dealing with the industrial sectors which I have mentioned, clothing and in particular motor assembly. Both of them have suffered grievously from Community policy. The regulations are supposedly to deal with this, yet both have been ignored as far as Dublin is concerned. Hopefully, Mr President, that oversight will be corrected and remedied when the third series of special aids is being presented to this House.

In conclusion, I would like to add my voice to that of Mr Pöttering by suggesting that the increase from 5% to 7% for the non-quota section of the Regional Fund is a very necessary step forward in making it meaningful to the peoples of Europe and the declining regions.

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) Mr President, I too wish to congratulate Mr Pöttering on the quality of his report and to say, on behalf of my institution, how happy we are to have received so much support, both in committee and here in plenary sitting, for this idea of the non-quota section, which, as Parliament is aware, provides the wherewithal for Community regional policy and everything that that implies.

First of all, a few remarks on the questions that have been raised. The first concerns the choice of subject and of financial resources. There is no need to dwell at length on the financial resources, since we all agree on the need to reinforce actions already in operation by further actions, and this implies a need to strengthen the financial resources. I would merely add that these resources and these actions should naturally be extended to Greece, and this has already been done. My colleague, Mr Giolitti, is in Athens to discuss these matters.

The real question is whether we shall be in a position to foresee the possible course of events. Someone has said — and we agree — that our function should not be that of firemen who have to put out the blaze. There is no point at all in conducting a policy to which, one after the other, criteria are added which we find undesirable, and so we have decided to carry on studying the problems of other sectors or other regions where the present stage of development enables us to consider the situation before making decisions. Of course, all this might well lose all connection with reality if, as Mr Pöttering said just now, the Council failed to take decisions or adopted a decision in which there was no sensible relation between the goal adopted and the resources allocated to it. If this were to happen, I think we should — Commission and Parliament — take great care to avoid a situation in which false appearances won the day over real and fundamental necessities.

As regards the choice of areas of intervention, I think one or two misunderstandings have to be cleared up. We have chosen our field of action on the basis of two types of criteria, which have to be met cumulatively. The first of these is the socio-economic criterion, which has to be met by the general economic situation in the region where there is a problem. On the other hand, there are a number of criteria of a sectorial nature: the extent to which industrial employment depends on the sector that is threatened, the number of jobs lost in this sector, etc. So far, these criteria have not been embodied in the regulations, but you want us to do so in order to make sure that the situation is perfectly clear and there is enhanced transparency. We are quite prepared to do this and to accept the amendments that pursue this object — that is to say, I believe Amendments Nos 12, 13, 21 and 22. We shall adapt their form to our technical conditions, but we agree on the essential points. Our versions will also take account of appropriate prece-

dents. This I say simply to avoid misunderstandings. On the other hand, it is not easy to change the situation retroactively, and so we cannot agree to Amendments Nos 6, 7, 17 and 18, because that is a subject on which both Council and Parliament have already had their say. It is therefore not so much the substance as the retroactive effect that we find difficult.

There are then amendments modifying the criteria which define the regions: an amendment by Mr Van Miert and another by Mrs Kellett-Bowman. These fail to meet the two criteria I mentioned just now, and so it will be clear that we cannot take them over.

As regards procedure, we agree to submit to Parliament a final report on each programme explaining all the elements that are important — jobs created, progress or lack of progress. With programmes of this kind, there can be no guarantee of the results; objectives have been laid down, and we shall have to see how far they can be achieved. As regards the second phase in the steel industry, on which Mr Pöttering has put a precise question to the Commission, I can say that when the Commission has taken its decisions on 30 June on the restructuring of the steel industry, it will be easier for us to fix the sectorial criterion. This we shall do during the course of July. Since this is a field whose management devolves upon the Commission, we cannot consult the Parliament formally, since that would mean modifying the balance between the two institutions. On the other hand, we are quite prepared to discuss in some detail with the Regional Policy Committee the way we envisage putting these things into practice, and that, I think, meets the basic wish expressed by Mr Pöttering.

For the rest, we are, I repeat, gratified to find the Parliament taking up a clear stand in favour of a truly Community structure in a limited regional field which does not affect the character of regional concentration. This attitude of the Parliament does not come as a surprise to us. We have two instruments, and I think we are making a step in the right direction.

President. — The debate is closed.

*Vote*¹

6. Oil refining

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-90/83) by Mr Caborn, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on problems of the oil refining industry.

Mrs Desouches (S). — (FR) Mr President, I wanted, under Rule 87, to ask that this report be deferred to a later part-session. There are several reasons for this: first, the subject is not particularly urgent; secondly, for reasons that are well known and which he has in common with many other Members, Mr Caborn

¹ See Annex.

Desouches

cannot be here today; finally, the Commission also seems to take the view that this report should be deferred.

Mr Davignon, Vice-President of the Commission. — (FR) I should like to thank Mrs Desouches for her proposal. I am in a slightly awkward position inasmuch as, a week ago, the Commission submitted a second report on the situation in this sector, from which it follows that certain statistical data — and this is not the Parliament's fault — are not entirely in line with the present situation. The Commission would therefore be only too happy to contribute to an improvement along the lines of the collaboration we have already had, and this, I think, would also be of benefit to the work of Parliament.

President. — Madam Desouches you have just heard Mr Davignon's statement. In view of this statement, do you maintain your request that it be held over until the next part-session? Do you not think it would be preferable to request referral back to committee?

Mrs Desouches (S.) — (FR) I think it is for the House to decide. Perhaps it would be better to refer the matter to committee if further information is available which might be of use to the committee.

(Parliament decided to refer the matter to committee)

7. Amendments to Regulation 67/67

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-357/83) by Mr Beazley, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the proposed Commission amendments to Regulation 67/67.

Mr Beazley (ED), rapporteur. — Today's debate has great significance for this House for two reasons: firstly, institutional reasons and, secondly, the effect which these amended regulations may have on the Community's trade.

Its institutional significance consists in the absolute powers conferred by the Treaty and by the Council of Ministers on the Commission for the granting of block exemptions from Article 85. The implication of this situation is that the Commission's decisions are final and do not go to the Council of Ministers for approval, to the Parliament for an opinion, nor to the Member States' legislatures for ratification. This puts a heavy responsibility on the Commission and means that Parliament can only give its view informally by means of an own-initiative report under Article 47, which is, of course, what we are doing now.

We consider this to be a very unsatisfactory situation. We naturally support the Community's competition policy and agree that the Commission must have special powers to implement it.

We believe, however, that this Parliament is a suitable and necessary partner for the Commission and has a

vital role to play in this aspect of the competition policy. Firstly, because the Treaty provides for this Parliament to be officially consulted in many cases where the political content is much less than here. Secondly, and more especially, because the Commission's decision will not only bind the Community's trading channels for 15 years but will have a direct impact on the public.

This Parliament was specifically chosen by universal direct suffrage to represent the peoples of the Community in all their activities and, furthermore, can provide the Commission by virtue of the wide experience of its membership in many spheres with no doubt the best sounding-board which the Commission could wish to have.

I would like to say that my committee and myself, as rapporteur, very much appreciate the closeness of the relationship which has been built up with the Commission on the competition policy — it has been a courteous and a frank relationship. But what we want is a formal position.

In this respect I draw attention to the opinion of the Legal Affairs Committee which calls for the Commission to produce a proposal for a regulation amending Article 5 of Regulation 1965 to provide that the Commission before adopting a regulation and before putting the draft thereof should consult the European Parliament.

Now my committee found it most unsatisfactory that the Commission, having spent the best part of 5 years in attempting to revise this regulation, should have had to have a 6-month prolongation and two more advisory committees to make a final decision. Today, 20 days before its enactment, this House and all the trades concerned do not know what awaits them. Naturally, we had expected at this late date at least to be able to debate a final text. However, it is the radical changes which the Commission has proposed in the last 3 drafts since 25 January 1983, when I was appointed rapporteur, which has reduced our confidence most — and, I might say, that of the trade — in the principles and the procedures used in this revision. Maybe the Commission will get it right in the end! I hope our own efforts and those of all sections of the trade and public will have helped in this.

I understand that the Commission will take its final decision next week — some 15 days before the regulation's enactment. I must ask the Commission to take careful note of the points made in this debate and the points made in my report which were unanimously approved by committee in regard to paragraphs 1-7 and paragraphs 24 and 25 of the resolution — in particular, paragraph 7 on expedited procedures and paragraph 24 on the duration of the regulation once published.

I believe that the Commission has taken some note of my report and of the committee's views to date, and for this I thank them.

Beazley

Now to the substance of the resolution. The exclusive distribution regulation has drawn less contentious objections than the purchasing regulation. Nevertheless, it is a most important regulation covering the majority of the Community's businesses. We are concerned about Article 3(b) on non-reciprocal contracts between competing firms and the fact that the combination of Articles 3, 4 and 5 may prove very cumbersome in its application.

I am pleased that I have received amendments to my resolution and I think that they will be a positive help to the ideas that I have put forward. As regards the exclusive purchasing agreements, the choice of special titles for brewers and petrol filling stations has vastly complicated the Commission's work and led it into the danger of producing, with all the best of intentions, bad law. By this I mean law which is so complicated in its attempt to cover all the different circumstances of traditional trade practices and legal situations within Member States that it fails to achieve its purposes and risks being discriminatory.

I know that the Commission has attempted to be subtle and flexible in its legislation, but it has allowed itself to be drawn into a maze from which it has difficulty in extricating itself. This throws up the problem of the principles and the aims on which this purchasing regulation is based. The distinction made in recent drafts between loan contracts and tenancy contracts has proved discriminatory between Member States whose traditions and legal positions differ. Furthermore, it does not overcome other more serious problems of competition where Member States are protected by strong technical barriers to trade. And I sincerely hope that the Commission will find its way to resolve this problem.

Likewise, it was hardly wise of the Commission first to offer and then to withdraw the use of Title 1 plus Title 2 and Title 3 for breweries and filling stations. The next move to provide Title 1 for use of drinks' wholesalers only was discriminatory against those with the main investment in production and distribution in the brewery trade. We must all support the Commission's effort to increase competition and to open up the European dimension of trade in general. However, the Commission must foresee the commercial and the technical problems of individual trades whose affairs it wishes to control. Petrol companies and their filling stations, like breweries, operate in the Community under a great variety of quite different national laws and conditions but fortunately petrol stations do not have to deal with a policy as subtle as taste and no one goes to a petrol filling station for entertainment.

Both breweries and oil companies and filling stations must be allowed to run their businesses efficiently and economically within the constraints of market forces and the interests of the public. The effects of competition policy must not be to increase prices and, in its attempt to increase choice and stimulate trans-frontier sales of products, to force trades into unnatural condi-

tions. Free and fair competition must prevail but we must distinguish between free competition in every pub and *Kneipe* and free competition between pubs and *Kneipen*. We must also not attempt to turn British pubs into French *cafés* or German *Kneipen* and *Lokalen* into Italian bars. The market must be offered a reasonable choice and the market must decide what it wants. Where beer and sausages are concerned, the European legislator is certainly going to be the loser if he looks for uniformity.

The strength of Europe where taste is concerned resides in diversity and the consumer will decide, on the basis of price and quality, what he wants whilst the producer, the distributor and the retailer will have to find what is an economic price and range to hold. Of course special beers and special lubricants must be given proper consideration but furthermore they do require clear definition. Special beers cannot merely consist of different marks of standard products already included in the purchasing contract, but must be basically different products. This also goes for lubricants. Similarly, great care must be taken over the problem of small and medium-sized or even larger breweries. As we all know, the small breweries of one Member State would be medium-sized or even larger breweries in another. More serious a problem is the fact that any dividing line causes advantages on one side of it with disadvantages on the other. No such problems exist with filling stations and my committee is grateful that the Commission has proposed that where oil companies provide buildings or finance for lubricants to be applied to vehicles, these may be tied, while of course competitive lubricants may be supplied in the shops of filling stations. Furthermore, my report recommended that the usual automotive products such as batteries, tyres, etc. might be supplied non-exclusively by oil companies to the shops of their filling stations.

In conclusion, I wish the Commission happy landings when its regulations land on the desk of the European businessmen on 1 July and when the public experiences the results thereafter. I just ask that this Parliament should be given the formal right to help the Commission as a trusted partner and so to help the creation of a common market to look after the interests of the trade and the public which is, I believe, the purpose of having a directly elected Parliament in the first place.

(Applause)

Mrs Desouches (S). — *(FR)* I am deputizing for my colleague, Mr Rogalla. The position I am putting forward on behalf of the Socialist Group is dictated by prudence, since the topic we are discussing is extremely complicated.

Despite the work done by the rapporteur a number of doubts remain concerning this topic which is clearly of great importance from an economic point of view. We do not know at present how the economic situa-

Desouches

tion will develop, but on it depends the way a tradesman, subject to an exclusive distribution or an exclusive purchasing agreement will react. While we recognize that the Commission has great experience in this field, we share the view expressed by the rapporteur in paragraph 4 of his resolution: 'It would have been far better for the Commission to have first issued a discussion paper in which it would have outlined its experience with the original Regulation 67/67, the relevant decisions of the Court of Justice, the need for reform and the Commission's consequent objectives in this respect'.

On the other hand we stress that the Commission's approach, which is to consult Parliament in an area where it is acting on the Council's instructions, is the right approach, despite the highly technical nature of the provisions of Regulation 67/67. It is a matter of basic policy and Parliament should therefore deal with it.

It is a question, for example of introducing greater competitiveness, of easing the economic links which could strangle partners who, although they are legally equal are economically very different. Since by definition the Socialists are concerned with those who are weaker, we accept certain of the efforts undertaken by the Commission in the interests of greater freedom. However, once experience has been gained over a certain period of time, it will be necessary to monitor developments and to obtain precise information on the results. For this reason I wish to refer to the request set out in paragraph 25 of the motion for a resolution and to ask the Commission to submit a background report on the workings of the new regulations and the problems that have arisen in order that it can be debated by Parliament and other interested parties. With regard to beer: this is a beverage which is particularly important for certain countries. The small tradesman must clearly be free to obtain supplies from a third undertaking, where his regular supplier is unable to supply the goods he wants. For this reason we wish to limit Amendment No 14 to this principle, and that is why we are asking for a separate vote on this amendment.

Let me say at once that Amendment No 12 is far from clear since we do not know on what points the Commission's proposals should be improved. Therefore, we cannot accept it. In conclusion, I would say that there is a need for prudence since this is a difficult area in which we are counting on the vigilance of the Commission and its services.

Mr Prout (ED), *draftsman of the opinion of the Legal Affairs committee*. — Mr President, in November 1982 I had the honour to initiate a debate in this House on the executive and supervisory powers of the European Commission. During my speech I said the following:

'In one respect Parliament is not as well equipped as it should be for monitoring the Commission's executive work. In pursuit of its executive responsi-

bilities the Commission has acquired in certain cases, through primary legislation, the authority to adopt delegated legislation without formally consulting either Parliament or the Council of Ministers. In practice Member States are consulted, usually through the network of management or advisory committees that we so much deplore in this House. I believe that we should be consulted on delegated legislation. This would conform both with the Court of Justice's views about institutional balance in the Community legislative process and also with normal practice in the parliaments of Member States'.

Then I went on:

'One approach might be to require that draft delegated legislation be tabled in Parliament, say two months before its proposed date of implementation. It need be debated only if the appropriate committee recommends that a debate take place. At all events we should now take steps to negotiate an appropriate procedure with the Commission'.

Now, Mr President, some 7 months after this speech was delivered, we see the first fruits of our debate in the report of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the Commission's draft Regulation 67/67. I hope that Parliament and the Commission will soon establish an agreed procedure for scrutinizing all Community delegated legislation. We will not, of course, wish to deliver an opinion on the vast majority of such instruments because they will be of no political significance. Failing such a generalized procedure, I see no alternative to adopting the suggestion contained in the oral opinion delivered by the Legal Affairs Committee. In the present circumstances this would require an amendment to Article 5 of Regulation 1965 requiring the Commission, before adopting delegated legislation, to consult Parliament.

I would like now, Mr President, to refer to a separate matter. Commission officials nowadays tend to encourage parties in competition disputes to litigate their differences in national courts rather than by complaint to the Commission. Thus, notwithstanding recital 14, disputes, for example, as to whether or not an agreement is covered by the Regulation, will often come before national courts. Such proceedings pose two problems. First, interpretations may differ from one Member State to another. Second, legal remedies, both substantive and procedural and particularly in relation to injunctive relief and measures of damages, differ as between Member States. Indeed, they do so to such an extent that the differences may themselves lead to a distortion of trading conditions. In short, Mr President, we have little more here than a do-it-yourself regulation. It is essential, in our view, that the Commission both monitor the interpretation of the regulation by national courts and, where appropriate, issue amending regulations in the interests of uniformity, and examine methodically ways of establishing equivalent legal remedies in Member States in respect of competition matters.

Mr Halligan (S). — Mr President, I intend to concentrate on only one aspect of the Beazley report. That is the existence of the tied pub, which I regard as a flagrant violation of the principles of free competition upon which the Community is supposedly built. It is astonishing that the Commission should ever at any time have given block exemption from the rules of free competition to brewers whose only aim is to preserve a monopoly and to keep competitors out of their markets. I think it even more regrettable that the Commission intends now to permit the continuance of these distortions of trade, even though in a slightly modified form.

Mr Beazley's report, which I commend while congratulating him on its excellence, recognizes the danger to fair competition which arises from brewery agreements. In paragraph 14 of the motion for a resolution he specifically draws attention to the fact that the existence of full ties between breweries and tenants could deny access to national markets by brewers in third countries. This is, of course, what happens. In the case of Guinness exports from Ireland to Britain, this danger is a marketing reality, with the result that exports have fallen off substantially with consequent loss of jobs in the Dublin brewery.

In addition, the existence of the tied pub artificially segments national markets themselves and denies independent brewers the same access to the consumer as is enjoyed by producers of practically all other consumer goods. Guinness, for example, is in this invidious position in the UK market as far as its Park Royal production is concerned. The integrated Guinness operation is thus affected by the tied pub situation both in its Irish and its British productions.

These obstacles to free trade are further exacerbated by the inability of independent brewers to set up their own distribution systems in competition, because of legal limitations on the number of new pub licences. Thus the independent brewers are in a Catch 22 situation. They cannot sell into tied pubs except on conditions laid down by their competitors, Mr President. At the same time they cannot set up their own distribution networks. The result is that their competitors can squeeze them out of business in circumstances which the Commission would reject out of hand for any other consumer product.

This report before Parliament is therefore completely correct when it condemns the Commission, as Mr Beazley repeated here this morning, for failing to lay down precise principles upon which this regulation was to be based. For my part the principles are unambiguous. Free competition means precisely that. The tied pub is a crystal-clear violation of that principle. It should therefore be prohibited, and there should be no exemptions. The future of the Guinness brewery is, in fact, tied up with this and is under threat. It is one of the oldest breweries in the world. Some 30 % of its

production is sold into the UK market, but, as I have said, that share of the market is declining because of distorted competition arising out of the tied house.

Jobs are under threat — many jobs. The Commission needs to do two things. Firstly, it should ban tied pubs or, failing that, the definition of special beers in Article 2 of the proposed regulation must be expanded to incorporate draught beer from other breweries such as Guinness. This would permit tied publicans to purchase these beers without limit and at prices fixed by the producers and not by their competitors.

In conclusion, I repeat that the tied pub is in clear violation of the principles of free competition. It represents vertical integration at its worst. It is threatening agricultural based exports from my country and menacing the jobs of skilled industrial workers in my city. For these reasons it should be banned. Otherwise the Commission will be conniving in the continuance of a cartel while theoretically committed to free competition. Its duty, in my view, is clear, no matter how unpopular it may be with the vested interests of the European brewery monopolies, and I hope it will act accordingly.

Mr Moreland (ED). — Mr President, first of all may I say that this particular regulation is closely associated with the name of Mr Andriessen, and in that context I am very surprised that he is not with us today to present his views on it, particularly when it is not a Council decision but a Commission one. He has to take a decision within the next two or three weeks.

My complaint about the proposal before us — and I shall concentrate totally on the beer section — is that this particular proposal is largely geared to national competition in respect of beer rather than intra-Community competition. In fact, if you look at the effects of the proposal they seem to be more directed towards countries such as the United Kingdom where there is a reasonable amount of importation from other Member States, as Mr Halligan stated, but it does not seem to have a great effect on those countries, where there is a certain amount of protectionism. Of course, in this context, the German market, which is the largest market in Europe, immediately comes to mind. If you are to have this proposal, you have equally to do something about the *Reinheitsgebot*.

Now let me turn specifically to the Beazley report. I think the nub of it is paragraph 19. I must say that I am not entirely happy with paragraph 19. First of all, I think we all recognize that there are enormous problems of definition where the phrase 'special beer' is concerned. However, I do not think that the committee has addressed itself properly to this and I do not think that a 15 mile limit or a 20 percent share, as in paragraph 19, is going to be any more helpful than the original proposals from the Commission.

Moreland

Let me come to paragraph 19 (e) which I think is the nub of it. I very much support that the ties should remain within Title 1, and in this context I agree with the Beazley report and, indeed, I agree with the Friedrich amendment which, I think, is slightly better for this. However, I would add one proviso. What I would like to see is the breweries kept within Title 1 but that there should be a system whereby licensed vintners are entitled to buy outside of their breweries if the breweries are unable to supply wines and spirits and ginger beers and so on and so forth at a reasonable price. In other words there must be a lot more flexibility than at present.

My final point is in many ways the most important point because there is one aspect of this that nobody has touched on, namely, the gaming machines. The big revenue to the pubs is not the wines, the spirits or sometimes even the beers, it is the gaming machines. Under the proposal they would fall outside Title 1. I do not think that you can just leave it like that. We have seen in France the situation whereby the French Government has had to remove gaming machines from all the cafes and restaurants because of problems of criminals' influence. I think it has got to be combined with some national protection law so that if the key to the gaming machines is given to the licensed vintners, then you have got to have some third party other than the breweries holding that key. I make this point because I do not think the Commission has really recognized that the battle within the UK over this particular proposal between the licensed vintners and the breweries is over 'who has the key to the gaming machines'.

Finally, Mr President, may I say that I do think that there has to be some movement. As I suggested that paragraph 19 (e) in the Beazley report to some extent goes along this, I happen to believe that there should be some movement because it so happens that the area I represent produces most of the beer that is produced in the United Kingdom. Needless to say, it is by far the best beer in Europe but I cannot get it here. I will show you an example, you cannot get it here. I would like to see it here. I would like to see it in Frankfurt and I would like it in Munich. If this proposal can do that, then I would welcome it but I must say to the Commission that I do not think it is going to.

(Interruptions)

Mr President, before I sit down, I do have an extra point to make. I have a can of beer here which I want to empty before I go so any Members who wish to partake of it are very welcome to do so.

Mr O'Mahony (S). — Mr President, I just wish to speak briefly on one specific point, which has already been referred to by my colleague Mr Halligan.

First of all, of course, I congratulate Mr Beazley on what I consider to be a very fine piece of work on the part of his committee.

In particular, I wish to refer to Amendment No 14 to paragraph 19 of Mr Beazley's motion for a resolution, an amendment which has been tabled by Mr Friedrich and others. It seems to me that this particular amendment is quite outrageous. Its effect, if implemented, would constitute a direct attack on one of my country's largest enterprises — the Guinness Company. The amendment would prevent the development of free trade in draught beer in the Community and particularly on the United Kingdom market.

The Guinness Company has already been adversely affected by the 'tied house' retail network in the United Kingdom which has led to the curtailment of Guinness sales and artificially high price-structures for its products. This company, in fact, suffers gross discrimination under the present UK market system, and Mr Friedrich's amendment would consolidate that discrimination.

Surely, Mr President, a Community which is based fundamentally on the concept of free trade cannot now deliberately throw out that concept when it comes to the matter of draught beer. If we can, indeed, have free trade in bottled, canned and packaged beer, why can we not have free trade in the draught product? Logic suggests that we should, and so too does the commitment to free and fair trade upon which this Community is based.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, my remarks will be confined to the question of breweries.

I am pleased that the Commission has opened up the question of competition and consumer choice and the rights of tenants in public houses and bars for public debate. There is a need for greater competition, there is a need for more consumer choice and there is a need for better protection of the rights of people who work in this trade, and I hope that progress can be made along these lines.

That, Mr President, is all that I can find that is good to say about what the Commission is doing. This is a very important social matter. I do not know whether the Commission has even now quite realized what a minefield it has got itself into. The way alcohol is licensed and controlled in all our countries is fairly fundamental to our respective ways of life; yet, here we are, three weeks from the Commission issuing an independent autonomous *fiat* to change something very fundamental in the law affecting drinking and drinkers, and what do we find three weeks before they do the deed? For a start, we have not got the Commissioner responsible here, the Commissioner who, incidentally, is responsible for parliamentary relations, and I hope that the Commissioner who is present now

Pearce

will convey my deep disquiet that he did not come here. I would like an explanation in due course about why he did not come. Is he not able to defend his proposals? Is that what it is? I think it is a discourtesy to the House on something as important as this.

Three weeks before the deed is to be done, we do not know what the deed is. The Commission is going to make up its mind, we are told, next Wednesday. What a way to run a show, when you in the Commission are going to change something as fundamental as this and you either do not know what you are going to do or you will not tell the people. Three weeks from the deed being done, there has been no proper study of the problem. All that is being done is to follow some obscure legal principle in the Treaty of Rome without ever studying what the problem is or what the people want. It is a measure which will, in fact, reduce competition, because it will provoke breweries who have tenants selling their products to take them over and to crush and exterminate competition altogether. In its present form, it will have precisely the opposite effect to what is wanted. Had one added in a control on the number of pubs that a brewery can own in a given area, that might have been different. But, oh no, the Commission could not spot that.

While all this is going on, there is not a word about the greatest racket of the lot — and I use the word 'racket' advisedly — the *Reinheitsgebot* in Germany, which keeps everybody else's beer out. That is not touched. It is alright for protectionism in one Member State and all wrong in another one — in mine. What a way to run a Commission!

So I say, and I have said this in Amendment No 11, which I commend to the House, let us put the whole thing off till the Commission has got its act in order. Let us have a six-month period in which the Commission can start again as a result of all its researches and considerations to make fresh proposals. Let the Commission, in fact, make up its mind what it wants and tell us and tell the people of Europe what it wants. Then Parliament, the trade, the tenants, the drinkers and the public can judge whether what the Commission is doing is right or wrong. Really, Mr President, what a way to run a piece of legislation! I say, let us have none of it! Let us put it all off and start again, and let the Commission come up with something sensible to say; then we will pronounce on it.

Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DE) Mr President, first of all a reply to the point raised by a number of honourable Members: my colleague Mr Andriessen, who is not here today, can assure you that I have not pushed myself forward to take over this subject, since, generally speaking, I am occupied with other matters — and I say that despite the fact that it is actually an agreeable task to deal with the subject of beer in the midst of this hot

summer weather that we are having. Mr Andriessen would undoubtedly have been only too pleased to deal with this debate himself, but, as you perhaps have noticed in the course of time, the Commission, in the distribution of its work-load, has decided that two Commissioners should be on duty on a Friday. One reason for this is that we have to give our colleagues an opportunity of keeping their appointments. Today it is Mr Davignon and myself that have taken over this task, and that was settled a long time ago. If, in the course of your proceedings, the agenda happens to lay down that such an important item should fall on a Friday and the competent Commissioner is not here, there is little, if anything, that we can do about it. Moreover, as you have repeatedly pointed out in other connections, the Commission is a collegiate body which I represent at this particular moment. It goes without saying that I shall inform Mr Andriessen of the critical debate that has here taken place. It also goes without saying that the Commission, in its deliberations and decisions, takes due account of the proceedings and decisions of this House.

I should now like to make some observations on certain points that have been raised. Today, this Parliament is dealing for the first time in plenary sitting with draft Commission regulations in the sphere of competition policy. That is something new, and it is quite natural that on such an occasion procedural questions should be raised.

The two regulations which are the subject of the motion for a resolution belong to a sphere in which the Commission has legislative powers. In 1965 and 1971, after formal consultation of the European Parliament, the Council authorized the Commission by means of these regulations to issue block exemption regulations for particular agreements, to which the exclusive dealing agreements also belong. Formally speaking, the Council's empowering regulations, which received the Parliament's approval, provide for two consultations with the Advisory Committee on Restrictive Practices and Monopolies, specially created for this purpose. In addition, the draft regulations must be published in the Official Journal. This procedure is an extremely lengthy one. In addition, there is constant consultation with the economic and social groups affected. In this particular case, the Commission has strictly adhered to these rules.

In 1970, the Commission introduced a further informal consultation procedure for the purpose of giving the Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and, in particular, your Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs an opportunity of elaborating opinions on the Commission's intended legislation. Since then, all drafts for block exemption regulations have been transmitted to the European Parliament. In this connection, the idea was voiced during the debate of amending Articles 5 and 6 of Regulation 19/65. A detailed discussion of this subject

Haferkamp

would, I think, be well worthwhile, and the Legal Affairs Committee of this House will certainly be taking this up. Naturally, the Commission will take part in this discussion.

I should like to say a word on the details of this informal consultation procedure. When it was introduced in 1970, the Commission made all necessary information immediately available to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, the rapporteur on the Eleventh Report on Competition Policy and, of course, also the author of the report now before the House. You therefore have at your disposal the whole of the material that is available to us.

Since November 1982 at the latest, there has been a detailed exchange of ideas with the competent parliamentary committee, and I think the Commission cannot be reproached for having altered its position in the course of elaborating its draft. Such changes are necessary to take account of justifiable objections and at the same time to maintain a balance between the interests of the parties concerned. These, in this case, are the producers as well as the middlemen and the consumers.

To conclude my observations on questions of procedure, I would remind you that at the plenary sitting of 5 November 1982 we had a first debate on the question whether the Commission's exercise of its delegated powers should be subject to parliamentary surveillance. On that occasion, it was rightly emphasized that this question, which is of such extreme importance, both politically and legally, requires close examination, and preparations for this discussion, as we have just established, are in progress in the Legal Affairs Committee. The Legal Affairs Committee dealt with this matter on 25 May, when it decided to defer the debate on the rules of procedure.

I am gratified to find that your opinion, by and large, gives the regulations its support. I wish to say that the discussions that have so far taken place have brought valuable contributions to a solution of the problems, and that undoubtedly applies also to today's debate. On this basis, we have been able to draw up regulations which are designed to open up the markets and at the same time are sufficiently flexible to facilitate the necessary adaptations. This is absolutely necessary in view of the varying traditions within the Community. I wish to stress that it is in no way the Commission's intention to prescribe a particular model for the various forms of exclusive dealing agreements.

Another point in your opinion which seems to me to be important is the call for an accelerated procedure. On behalf of the Commission, I can only subscribe to this wish. Here you are raising a question of fundamental importance which occurs in connection with all block exemption regulations and for which a solution must be found. The Commission hopes it will soon be in a position to convey to Parliament the conclusions it reaches in this field.

I wish to thank the Parliament for the help it has given the Commission in carrying out a difficult task, and I assure you once more that Parliament's proposals, including the suggestions made during this debate, will, so far as is at all possible, be taken into account by the Commission in the course of its final deliberations.

President. — The debate is closed.

Mr Moreland (ED). — May I quote Rule 64 (4), Mr President? I am a little surprised that the Commissioner has not answered a number of the points raised in the debate. In particular, I think we are interested to know what the Commission thinks of paragraph 19 in the Beazley report and the views expressed by Members on that and of the amendment tabled by Mr Friedrich, for example. We do not seem to have any guideline at all on these matters. The Commissioner said that he sensed that we all supported the Commission's proposal. I think a lot of us had criticisms.

Mr Beazley (ED), rapporteur. — Mr President, I must say that I am extremely disappointed that these very vital points which have come up have not been answered by the Commission. We have no text. I have been dealing with a series of drafts which, I have had indication from the Commission, are being amended; we will not know what these amendments are when we have concluded the debate. On the other hand, I am most anxious that the House should give its opinion today, so that we do not delay it and find that the Commission has decided on matters without having our report in front of it. I recommend to the House that we vote on the report, because we must have that firmly before the Commission when its College of Cardinals decides next week what it is going to do. But I do think that it is a great pity, when we have spoken about partnership, that these very important points which the House has to decide on have had no light at all shed on them by the Commission. I think it should do that.

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, I would like to concur with what has been said. It is always nice to see Mr Haferkamp with us — he is always more than welcome. But he has not actually said anything at all either about the debate or about the issue. It is a rather empty operation if Commissioners are going to come here and ignore the issues that are at stake. If colleagues opposite are protesting about this, they probably also do not understand what the issues are.

May I therefore, Mr President, ask whether the Commission will inform us when it will be making its decision formally, how it will be communicating that decision to Parliament and whether it will undertake that Mr Andriessen could be available, if the Bureau of Parliament is willing, to make a statement about this and answer questions in the course of the special session which is to be held before this measure comes into force?

Mr Haferkamp, *Vice-President of the Commission*. — (DE) Mr President, I am naturally quite prepared to state my opinion on each of the 15 amendments. If the House so wishes, I am at its disposal.

On the last question: the Commission envisages taking its decision on 22 June. Obviously my colleague Mr Andriessen will be available in the meantime and this will be worked out between him and the Bureau.

Furthermore, I have deliberately refrained from going into details. I have set out the principles and emphasized our readiness to cooperate. I also pointed out our willingness to alter the legal bases. I have not looked at the Guinness Book of Records — but I would guess that no firm has ever before been mentioned so often in a single connection; but if you wish, I can of course check this out.

*Vote*¹

8. *Adjournment of the session*

President. — I declare adjourned the session of the European Parliament.²

(The sitting was closed at 12.50 p.m.)

¹ See Annex.

² Motions for resolution entered in the Register — Rule 49 of the Rules of Procedure — Transmission of resolutions adopted during the sitting — Verification of credentials — Deadline for tabling amendments — Date of next part-session: See Minutes

ANNEX

Votes

The Annex indicates rapporteurs' opinions on amendments and reproduces the texts of explanations of vote. For further details of voting, the reader is referred to the minutes.

REGULATIONS ON FOOD AID (Doc. 1-60/83): REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE

* * *

COLLINS REPORT (Doc. 1-82/83 'Air pollution'): ADOPTED

* * *

HERKLOTZ REPORT (Doc. 1-229/83 'Horses intended for slaughter'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke :

IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8 ;

AGAINST Amendments Nos 3, 6, 7 and 11.

Explanation of vote

Lord Douro (ED), *in writing*. — My Group will be voting in favour of the resolution tabled by Mrs Herklotz. The human consumption of horsemeat hardly exists in Britain. In fact, many British people find it disturbing that horses should be slaughtered for commercial purposes. However, we are aware that in many European countries there is a long tradition of eating horsemeat and this is particularly true in Italy and France. We do not, therefore, think it appropriate to try and dictate to our continental partners on their culinary tastes. On the other hand, we do think it right that the European Community should ensure that the one million horses a year which are imported into Western Europe for slaughter should be transported in a humane way. Many members of parliament have received representations from their constituents about the cruelty to which these animals are subjected. There is wide public awareness of the problem and I am glad that the Committee on Agriculture have prepared this report. My Group has supported all the amendments except those tabled by Mr Moreland. We think it particularly important that the time limit during which a horse can be left without food and water should be reduced from the present twenty-four hours to a maximum of eight hours, as in Amendment No 5 tabled by the rapporteur.

We are, however, not in favour of paragraph 6, which calls for a ban on cross-loading, whereby the animals stand facing the side of the vehicle, because we think that, providing the vehicle is fitted with partitions, as required in paragraph 7, cross-loading is in fact acceptable.

As so many of the horses imported into the European Community come from Eastern Europe and have to go through Germany into France or Italy, thus crossing various frontiers, this is clearly a matter which should be dealt with by the European Community rather than by the individual Member States. We therefore urge the Commission to react quickly and positively on this resolution and to submit proposals to Parliament and the Council as soon as possible.

* *

BLUMENFELD REPORT (Doc. 1-376/83 'Unfair trade practices'): HELD OVER UNTIL A LATER PART-SESSION

* * *

MARTIN REPORT (Doc. 1-85/83 'Transport'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke :

IN FAVOUR of Amendment No 2

* * *

VANDEWIELE INTERIM REPORT (Doc. 1-372/83 'Fixed link across the channel'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke :

IN FAVOUR of Amendment No 1 ;

AGAINST Amendment No 2

Explanations of vote

Mr Purvis (ED) — I am delighted that my amendment was carried and am grateful to those who supported it. It would not have changed my support for the motion as a whole, but it is, I think, important to consider the crossing in its widest possible sense, in particular for through road traffic as much as just for rail traffic. This would have immense benefits : 90 % of goods are already carried by road, the building of a road crossing would be financially more viable and in its implications for the steel and construction industries around Europe would bring much more job creation. I am therefore delighted to support this motion and am particularly pleased that this amendment is included.

Mr Vandewiele (PPE), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I should like to explain that my rejection of the Purvis amendment is motivated purely by my adherence to the discussion in committee, where it was decided not to work out any technical formula and to allow the French-British working party complete freedom to make proposals. So Mr Purvis may have been correct, but I wished to remain true to our decision in committee.

* * *

GABERT REPORT (Doc. 1-271/83 'Fruit and vegetables'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke :

IN FAVOUR OF Amendments Nos 9, 10 and 16 ;

AGAINST Amendments Nos 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6/rev., 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24.

Explanations of vote

Mr Protopapadakis (PPE). — *(GR)* The text of the Gabert report on the control of appropriations in the fruit and vegetables sector is a set back to the unity of the peoples of Europe. While appearing to champion ethical and sound management of the Community budget in essence it cloaks an attempt to bolster the national interests of some member countries of the Community at the expense of others. Also, instead of turning our attention to those who are really responsible it vilifies the fruit and vegetable producers who have no responsibility at all for any failings there may be.

It is regrettable that of late certain groups in Parliament have repeatedly made use of a fine-sounding Community vocabulary to promote their national interests. If we really want ethical and sound management let us impose it in all sectors, not just for olive oil and vegetables. Anyway, since Amendment 12, which in some way reinstates justice, has been adopted, I will vote for the report.

Mr Notenboom (PPE). — *(NL)* This is the first time that I have given an explanation of vote in my own name for almost 12 years. This is no reason to laugh since I shall be voting before the Gabert amendment. Mr Gabert is an 'objective' colleague who has not had it too easy. When he has had to say a number of times: 'From personal conviction I am in favour', this may sound funny, but I assure you it is not. What it means is that Mr Gabert is being manipulated, that five people have been sent to a final meeting of the Committee on Budgetary Control, different people from those who tried, pretty much agreed, to give an opinion on matters of control. This is not good. Mr Protopapadakis is right when he said that national elements are involved here, my respected colleague must give serious thought to this; what he says may well be true, but he must ask himself where the blame lies. If things go on in this way, then our work of control will be seriously impaired. I should therefore like to issue a warning here. We have not as yet had any disasters, but if from now on our supervisory work is not such that we can give opinions on matters of control in an entirely objective manner, safe from the influence of political groups and from national points of view, then something is wrong. Control is important because it is closely connected with our right to refuse discharge and this is the only power that we alone may exercise.

VERONESI REPORT (Doc. 1-235/83 'Automobile sector'): ADOPTED

* * *

NORMANTON REPORT (Doc. 1-379/83 'FAST'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke :

IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1 and 2.

Explanation of vote

Mrs Théobald-Paoli (S) *(in writing)*. — *(FR)* The French Socialists are very much in favour of a new impetus being given to the FAST programme.

Analysis of research activities currently being undertaken in Europe in the matter of scientific and technological forecasting, the establishment of prospects for future years, the setting up of collaboration in this area among the Member States, seem to us to constitute Community activities by their very nature: We have to exploit the resources in each State at the level of a continent, for the greatest benefit of everyone, and hence of each country.

This programme makes up part of the Community's efforts to actively support its industry and agriculture through research and evaluation of options up to the production stage.

It is essential to continue with it. The university approach to analysis which is embodied in FAST must be maintained: an approach of this kind properly enables us to determine our scientific actions according to technological and economic criteria, but also on the basis of the social dimension of the great changes to be made.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to express a reservation about the Commission's requests for additional staff which might be released by the Member States. At this time of budgetary austerity, this would make it possible to reduce by at least 25 % the cost of the programme without in any way impairing its effectiveness.

* * *

BARBAGLI REPORT (Doc. 1-422/83 'Fruit and vegetables'): ADOPTED

Mr Papaefstratiou, deputy rapporteur, spoke:

IN FAVOUR of Amendment No 10;

AGAINST Amendments Nos 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9.

Explanation of vote

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) After the rejection of their essential amendments the Members of the Communist Party of Greece will vote against the Barbagli report.

I would like to use this opportunity, however, to express my astonishment at the position taken by the rapporteur. In Amendment 6 particularly, going beyond the subject of distillation, we raised the point that something must be done about the other amendments to Regulation 516/77 from the moment doubt is cast on the rights of Greek farmers which have been won by long drawn-out struggles, sacrifices and blood, such as state collection of crops and fall-back prices, etc. We are surprised at the position taken by the rapporteur, but also at the way in which the other Greek members cast their votes.

* * *

SÄLZER REPORT (Doc. 1-382/83 'European scientific and technical strategy'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke;

IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6;

AGAINST Amendments Nos 2, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

Explanations of vote

Mrs Viehoff (S). — (NL) It is an extremely important programme, it is the first medium-term programme. There are things in it which very much exercise my Group, myself included. One of the most important things is the aim that only those matters which cannot be examined by the Member States themselves should be examined at Community level. I particularly regret that precisely those two areas which we wanted excluded, namely the fast-breeder reactors and high-temperature reactors, both of which in various Member States can no longer be financed by the Member State itself and which we then had to put up with, have been included in this report. I consider the programme too important to vote against it, but in view of the fact that there are things in it which I am particularly opposed to, I shall abstain.

Mr Markopoulos (S). — *(GR)* The report by Mr Sälzer is beyond doubt a notable and comprehensive piece of work. It covers all the problems affecting the Community in the field of research and technology and lays down a basis for its advancement and development in the future. In particular I wish to applaud those sections which highlight regional development needs with regard to research and technology.

However, despite this, I wish to voice a few reservations about the way the content of the programme is to be put into effect.

Reservations, firstly, to do with the fact that we are voting today for a long-term programme which will be executed in financial years to come without knowing what the budgetary levels will then be, or how they will be allocated, factors which may upset or impose constraints on the objectives of the programme.

Secondly, reservations about the direction given to the seven key areas of the programme in the immediate future. We have repeatedly stressed that if the Community is to increase its effectiveness and competitiveness forthwith it must marshal and exploit all its strengths, and this can be achieved only if the inequalities between Member States are levelled out through the sharing of technology within the Community and if the best use is made of local conditions and of the qualified scientific manpower in all of the member countries. But will the programme be directed along those lines? Despite these reservations, which refer only to the way in which the framework programme is executed, the Greek members of the Socialist Group will vote in favour of this report.

Mr Skovmand (CDI), in writing. — *(DA)* There is a shortage of money for research this year. For lack of funds many talented researchers are being dismissed or are working under unsatisfactory conditions. This situation is being aggravated by the fact that the EEC Member States are required to pay for additional research in the EEC and to enable it to build up an enormous apparatus of spending money. The EEC's research programme is a waste of resources and is therefore an insult to research workers in the individual Member States. The motion for a resolution calls for the Community's research activity to be stepped up. The Popular Movement against the EEC is against this proposal.

Mrs Théobald-Paoli (S) (in writing). — *(FR)* I subscribe quite substantially to the report on the framework programme for research (1984-1987), as presented by the committee responsible.

Indeed I introduced several amendments which have been adopted in committee or which have been agreed

The 7 priorities which the Commission proposes are, on the face of it, sound.

Nevertheless, there are two risks involved here :

1. Like so often in the past, the scattering of appropriations in intervention sectors that are either too numerous or marginal ;
2. An over-rigid planning which does not take account each year of the development of current programmes and the requirements of research in general.

These difficulties must be resolved in concert with the Member States in order that Community research may do more to enhance what is being done in each Member State and carry through what can only be accomplished jointly.

* * *

PÖTTERING REPORT (Doc. 1-269/83 'Development'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke :

IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 ;

AGAINST Amendments Nos 2, 3 and 4

Explanations of vote

Mr Kallias (PPE), in writing. — (GR) Taking into account the statement on Greece by the Vice-President of the Commission, Mr Davignon, I shall vote in favour of the Pöttering report in the hope that Greece will well and truly benefit from the non-quota regional development policy in accordance with its real needs.

Mr Kyrkos (COM), in writing. — (GR) We are in general agreement with the report on the second series of Community regional development measures (non-quota section) by Mr Pöttering.

We think the Commission's decision to bring Greece within the scope of the special measures is a positive step — and something we have been seeking since our first day here — and we would like in particular to highlight the need for support to be given to alternative energy projects, transport technology and the development of island regions. We particularly want to recommend the Commission to make a study of transport problems in the Greek islands and to include provision for these in one of its future financing measures in the non-quota section of the Fund. On the other hand, we cannot do other than express disappointment that our country is not included in the regulation providing for the development of new economic activities in zones adversely affected by the restructuring of the textile and clothing industry. It is well known that Greece has a highly developed textile sector due, chiefly, to the fact that it enjoys the comparative advantages of domestic cotton production and low wage rates, etc. However, membership by Greece of the EEC has already begun to create marketing problems for the country's textile products, mainly because of agreements between the Community and Third World countries. It is certain that the situation will get worse in the future, and therefore we believe that the regulation ought to include provision for Greece. It is not necessary for us to reach the state that certain areas of France and Belgium find themselves in before taking steps. We consider it helpful that the Commission has indicated a willingness to give favourable consideration to Greek applications.

With these observations we shall vote for the Pöttering report because we consider it necessary to strengthen the regional policy and the cooperation between Parliament and the Commission in this direction.

CABORN REPORT (Doc. 1-90/83 'Oil'): REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE

* * *

BEAZLEY REPORT (Doc. 1-357/83 'Regulation 67/67'): ADOPTED

The rapporteur spoke :

IN FAVOUR of Amendments Nos 7 and 12 ;

AGAINST Amendments Nos 11 and 15.

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

BELGIQUE / BELGIË

Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad

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

Sous-dépôts / Agentschappen:

**Librairie européenne /
Europese Boekhandel**

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

CREDOC

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

DANMARK

Schultz Forlag

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

BR DEUTSCHLAND

Verlag Bundesanzeiger

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

GREECE

G.C. Eleftheroudakis SA

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

Sub-agent for Northern Greece:

Molho's Bookstore

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

FRANCE

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

Journal officiel

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

IRELAND

Government Publications Sales Office

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

or by post

Stationery Office

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

ITALIA

Licosa Spa

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

Subagente:

Libreria scientifica Lucio de Biasio - AEIOU

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

GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG

**Office des publications officielles
des Communautés européennes**

5, rue du Commerce
L-2985 Luxembourg
Tél. 49 00 81 - 49 01 91
Télex PUBLOF - Lu 1322
CCP 19190-81
CC bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/300

NEDERLAND

Staatsdrukkerij- en uitgeverijbedrijf

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

UNITED KINGDOM

HM Stationery Office

HMSO Publications Centre
51 Nine Elms Lane
London SW8 5DR
Tel. 01-211 8595

Sub-agent:

Alan Armstrong & Associates

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

ESPAÑA

Mundi-Prensa Libros, S.A.

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

PORTUGAL

Livraria Bertrand, s.a.r.l.

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

SCHWEIZ / SUISSE / SVIZZERA

FOMA

5, avenue de Longemalle
Case postale 367
CH 1020 Renens - Lausanne
Tél. (021) 35 13 61
Télex 25416

Sous-dépôt:

Librairie Payot

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**European Community Information
Service**

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

CANADA

Renouf Publishing Co., Ltd

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

JAPAN

Kinokuniya Company Ltd

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome
Shiniuku-ku
Tokyo 160-91
Tel. (03) 354 0131

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprise

- report of proceedings,
 - annual indexes
-

Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February

Orders may be placed with the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

Payments to be made only to this Office

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg

Annual subscription 1983/1984 ECU 52.59 BFR 2400 IRL 37 UKL 29 USD 49

Single issue price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover

Prices do not include postage

ECU 17.53 BFR 800 IRL 12 UKL 10 USD 17.50



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

L-2985 Luxembourg



AX-AA-83-005-EN-C