

Annex

Official Journal

of the
European Communities

No 187
March 1975

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1974-1975 Session
Report of Proceedings
of 10 March 1975
Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Sitting of Monday, 10 March 1975	1
Resumption of the session, p. 2 — Tribute, p. 2 — Apology for absence, p. 2 — Verification of credentials, p. 2 — Membership of committees, p. 3 — Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council, p. 3 — Reference to committee, p. 3 — Forwarding of draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Com- munities for 1975, p. 3 — Documents submitted, p. 3 — Order of business, p. 5 — Limit on speaking time, p. 6 — Presentation and consideration by urgent procedure of a motion for a resolution, p. 6 — Computer Centre, p. 9 — Petition No 3/74: Protection of the Mediterranean, p. 15 — Approval of the minutes, p. 27 — Closure of the session, p. 27.	

NOTE TO READER

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

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

SITTING OF MONDAY, 10 MARCH 1975

Contents

1. Resumption of the session	2		
2. Tribute	2	Adoption of amendment No 1 replacing the original text of the motion for a resolution	8
3. Apology	2	13. Computer Centre — Debate on a report drawn up by Mr Pêtre on behalf of the Committee on Budgets (Doc. 486/74):	
4. Verification of credentials	2	Mr Pêtre, rapporteur	9
5. Membership of committees	3	Mr Aigner, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group; Mr Gerlach, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Noè; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Pêtre	11
6. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council	3	Adoption of resolution	15
7. Reference to committee	3	14. Petition No 3/74: Protection of the Mediterranean — Debate on a report drawn up by Mr Premoli on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment (Doc. 386/74):	
8. Forwarding of draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Communities for 1975	3	Mr Premoli, rapporteur	15
9. Documents submitted	3	Mr Lemoine, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Cifarelli; Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli; Lord Reay; Mr Della Briotta; Mr Noè; Mr Corona; Mr Noè; Mr Concas; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Premoli	17
10. Order of business:		Adoption of resolution	27
Mr de la Malène	5	15. Approval of the minutes	27
11. Limit on speaking time	6	16. Closure of the session	27
12. Presentation and consideration by urgent procedure of a motion for a resolution (Doc. 523/74):			
Procedural motion:			
Mr Kirk; Mr Lücker	6		
Mr Lücker; Mr Kirk; Mr Schulz; Mr Fellermaier	6		

IN THE CHAIR: MR BERKHOUWER

President

(The sitting was opened at 4.40 p.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Resumption of the Session*

President. I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 21 February 1975.

2. *Tribute*

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, now that the construction of Europe is at an important turning point and its horizons have considerably widened and the powers of its parliamentary institution are progressively increasing, one of the signatories of the three Treaties establishing the European Communities, namely the ECSC Treaty and then the EEC and the EAEC Treaty, has recently died at the end of a long life entirely devoted to the construction of Europe, the place which his country held in it, and the defence of democracy.

On Saturday evening, at the age of 88, the last surviving signatory of the three Treaties of the European Communities passed away in Luxembourg: Joseph Bech.

Born on 17 February 1887, Joseph Bech who was a great democrat and a great European, spent a very long political life in an area situated in the heart of Europe, which underwent all the vicissitudes which led to the noble impulse to achieve reconciliation of all the states and peoples of Europe.

On behalf of the Grand Duchy he signed many agreements and treaties, including the Benelux Treaty, the North Atlantic Treaty, the Brussels Pact and then what has been called the Schuman plan, the Western European Union Treaty and the EEC and Euratom Treaties.

At international level and at world level Joseph Bech carried out a very active policy for many years. At the national level he was a Luxembourg politician for fifty years. Appointed minister for the first time in 1921, he remained in the government of the Grand Duchy without interruption until March 1959, that is, for thirty-eight years. And it was as President of the Chamber of Deputies that he completed his political career in 1964.

Joseph Bech was also an honorary doctor of the University of Louvain, and was a holder of the Charlemagne prize and the Robert Schuman prize.

We should like to pay solemn tribute to that defender of democracy, that great Luxembourg statesman, and the pioneer of a united Europe, and, more simply, to that wise man Joseph Bech. May all his work serve as an example to us.

Ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the European Parliament I have sent a message of sincere sympathy to the family of Joseph Bech, the Luxembourg government, and the Chamber of Deputies.

Let us now observe a minute's silence in memory of Joseph Bech.

(The Assembly stood for one minute's silence)

3. *Apology*

President. — Mr Amendola, chairman of the Communist and Allies Group, is unable to attend this part-session because of sickness. On behalf of you all, I wish him a speedy and complete recovery.

4. *Verification of credentials*

President. — The next item is the verification of credentials.

At its meeting of 21 February 1975 the Danish Folketing appointed to the European Parliament:

Mr Ove Guldberg, to replace Mr Nørgaard.

At its meeting of 28 February 1975, the British House of Commons appointed the following to the European Parliament:

Mr John Corrie, Mrs Elaine Kellett-Bowman, Mr John Osborn and Mr Jim Spicer, to replace Mr Brewis, Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker, Mrs Fenner and Mr Hill.

At its meeting of 4 March 1975 the Bureau, pursuant to Rule 3(1) of the rules of procedure examined these appointments and made sure that they comply with the provisions of the Treaties.

I therefore ask you to ratify these appointments.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

I heartily welcome the new Members.

(Applause)

5. *Membership of Committees*

President. — I have a request from the European Conservative Group for the appointment of Mr John Corrie, and Mrs Kellett-Bowman as members of the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport, the latter to replace Lord Mansfield.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

6. *Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council*

President. — I have received from the Council of the European Communities certified true copies of the following documents:

— two agreements in the form of exchanges of letters concerning Articles 2 and 3 of Protocol No 8 to the agreement between the European Economic Community and the Portuguese Republic.

These documents will be placed in the archives of the European Parliament.

7. *Reference to committee*

President. — The communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council on the programme of pilot schemes and studies to combat poverty, drawn up in accordance with the resolution of the Council of 21 January 1974, concerning a social action programme, (Doc. 466/74), which was referred on 17 February 1975 to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment as the committee responsible, and to the Committee on Budgets for its opinion, has now also been referred to the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth for its opinion.

8. *Forwarding of draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Communities for 1975*

President. — I have received the draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the European Communities for the financial year 1975 (Doc. 530/74) as established by the Council of the European Communities.

This document has been referred to the Committee on Budgets.

The time limit for tabling draft amendments and proposals for modifications to this amend-

ing budget has been fixed as Tuesday 11 March 1975 at 4.00 p.m.

9. *Documents submitted*

President. — Since the session was adjourned, I have received the following documents:

(a) from the Council of the European Communities, requests for an opinion on:

— the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the collection, regeneration and/or destruction of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB's) (Doc. 510/74).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Public Health and the Environment as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs for its opinion;

— the communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council on equality of treatment between men and women workers (access to employment, to vocational training, to promotion, and as regards working conditions) (Doc. 520/74).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment;

— the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation laying down rules for the purchase of sugar beets (Doc. 527/74).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture;

— the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for

I. a regulation establishing a European Regional Development Fund

II. a decision setting up a regional policy committee

III. a financial regulation supplementing the Financial Regulation of 25 April 1973 applicable to the general budget of the European Communities

(Doc. 528/74).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Regional Policy and

President

Transport as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets and to the Committee on Agriculture for their opinions;

- the communication from the Commission of the European Communities: Stock-taking of the common agricultural policy (Doc. 529/74).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets and to the Committee on External Economic Relations for their opinions.

(b) the following oral questions:

- oral question with debate by Mr Durieux on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group to the Council on voting subject to confirmation (Doc. 508/74);
- oral question with debate by Mr Durieux on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group to the Commission on voting subject to confirmation (Doc. 509/74);
- oral question with debate by Mr Cousté on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats to the Commission on participation in the GATT multilateral trade negotiations (Doc. 521/74).
- oral questions by Mr McDonald, Mr Marras, Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Glinne, Mr Seefeld, Mr Radoux, Mr Normanton, Mr Kirk, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Lord Reay, Mr Ansart, Mr Terrenoire, Mrs Goutmann, Mr Gibbons, Mr Yeats, Mr Espersen, Mr Dykes, Mr Della Briotta and Mr Laban pursuant to Rule 47A of the Rules of Procedure for Question Time on 12 March 1975 (Doc. 1/75).

(c) from the committees, the following reports:

- third report by Mr Gerhard Flämig on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology on the progress necessary in Community research: assessment of the activities of the JRC from 1958 to 1972 (Doc. 511/74);
- report by Mr Wolfgang Schwabe on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 407/74) for a regulation modifying Regulation (EEC) No 1107/70 relating to aids granted in the field of transport by railway, road and inland waterway (Doc. 512/74);

- supplementary report by Mr Paul De Keersmaecker on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee on the amended proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a third directive on coordination of safeguards which, for the protection of members and others, are required by Member States of companies within the meaning of the second paragraph of Article 58 of the Treaty, in connection with mergers between *sociétés anonymes* (Doc. 513/74);

- report by Mr Edgar Jahn on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 404/74) for a resolution concerning a revised list of second-category pollutants to be studied as part of the Programme of Action on the Environment (Doc. 514/74);

- report by Mrs Elizabeth Orth on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 405/74) for a decision establishing a common procedure for the reciprocal exchange of information between the surveillance and monitoring networks based on data relating to atmospheric pollution by sulphur compounds and suspended particulates (Doc. 515/74);

- report by Mr Libero Della Briotta on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 471/74) for a decision concluding the European Convention for the protection of international watercourses against pollution (Doc. 516/74);

- report by Mr Karl Mitterdorfer on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council on the removal of technical barriers to trade, in particular a number of proposals for directives on the approximation of the laws of the Member States concerning

- motor vehicles

(Doc. 450/74, Doc. 452/74, Doc. 457/74, Doc. 462/74, Doc. 464/74, Doc. 456/74, Doc. 463/74)

President

— equipment

(Doc. 406/74, Doc. 453/74, Doc. 454/74,
Doc. 459/74)

(Doc. 517/74);

— report by Mr Pierre-Bernard Cousté on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the statement by the Commission of the European Communities on the economic situation in the Community (Doc. 518/74);

— report by Mr Michele Cifarelli on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 504/74) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 804/68 as regards the conditions for the granting of aid for the private storage of Grana Padano and Parmigiano Reggiano cheeses (Doc. 519/74);

— report by Mr Gerhard Flämig on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology on the communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 455/74) containing new proposals concerning the revision of the multi-annual research and training programme of the Joint Research Centre and new activities for the Petten establishment (Doc. 522/74);

— report by Mr Jean-François Pintat on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a resolution on the objectives of a common energy policy (Doc. 524/74);

— report by Lord Bessborough on behalf of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 473/74) for programmes of research and development actions in the field of energy (Doc. 526/74).

(d) a motion for a resolution, tabled by Miss Flesch on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, with request for debate by urgent procedure pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the Convention between the EEC and the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries signed at Lomé on 28 February 1975 (Doc. 525/74).

10. Order of business

President. — The next item is the order of business. In accordance with the instructions given to me by the enlarged Bureau at its meeting of 19 February 1975, I have prepared the draft agenda which has been distributed.

Miss Flesch, chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, has proposed that the motion for a resolution on the Lomé Convention which was originally on today's agenda, should be dealt with at a later sitting. I propose to place it on the agenda for Friday.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I would take this opportunity to inform you that together with Mr Philip Yacé, President of the National Assembly of the Ivory Coast, and chairman of the parliamentary conference of the EEC-AASM Association, I attended the important event of the signing of the Lomé Convention. We are both of the opinion that the signing of this convention can be considered a success; our Parliament can be pleased to have contributed so much towards it.

I would emphasize that a comprehensive report is still to be drawn up on the Lomé Convention and this will be discussed at a date to be determined later.

Mr Bersani's report on the Community's general cooperation policy has not been adopted by the Committee on Development and Cooperation, and has therefore been removed from the agenda.

I call Mr de la Malène.

Mr de la Malène. — (*F*) Mr President, I beg to propose at this stage—even if it means doing it again tomorrow when we establish the order of business for the rest of the week—that the vote on the supplementary budget should be held on Wednesday rather than Thursday since it might be easier to obtain the required quorum of 92 members on that day.

President. — I can only say, Mr Malène, that I shall pass on your request to my successor! (*Laughter*)

There therefore remain on today's agenda:

— the report by Mr Pêtre on the Computer Centre and the report by Mr Premoli on the protection of the Mediterranean.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

11. *Limit on speaking time*

President. — In accordance with the usual practice I propose that speaking time be allocated as follows for all items on the agenda:

- 15 minutes for the rapporteur and one speaker for each political group;
- 10 minutes for other speakers;
- 15 minutes for speakers on amendments.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

12. *Presentation and consideration by urgent procedure of a motion for a resolution*

President. — I have received from

- Mr Lücker, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group;
- Mr Spénale, on behalf of the Socialist Group;
- Mr Hougardy, on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group;
- Mr Amendola, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group;

a motion for a resolution amending the resolution of 11 March 1974 concerning the number and membership of parliamentary committees (Doc. 523/74).

Pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, a request has been made for this motion for a resolution to be dealt with by urgent procedure.

Mr Lücker has also tabled Amendment No 1 on this motion for a resolution.

I call Mr Kirk for a procedural motion.

Mr Kirk. — My name and that of my group should be on this document, but have been omitted.

President. — The error will be corrected.

I therefore consult Parliament on Mr Lücker's request for the adoption of urgent procedure.

Are there any objections?

The adoption of urgent procedure is agreed.

I propose that this motion for a resolution be considered at the end of this afternoon's sitting so that the document can be distributed and Members can take note of it.

I call Mr Lücker for a procedural motion.

Mr Lücker. — (D) I ask the rapporteur who is to speak next to bear with me. In order to save time, might it not be better to deal with this request for urgent procedure straight away, so that the group secretariats can do the preparatory work in time for tomorrow. I assume it will not take long to deal with this matter. Can we not take it first?

President. — I consult the Assembly on Mr Lücker's proposal that the motion for a resolution on the number and membership of parliamentary committees should be considered immediately.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I call Mr Lücker.

Mr Lücker. — (D) Mr President, it might seem strange that, as one of those who presented this motion for a resolution with a request for urgent procedure, I should now be tabling a proposal for an amendment to it. I think I at least owe the House an explanation.

We had this motion for a resolution drawn up by the secretaries-general of the groups. When my group last discussed it, the text we were considering was like the one in my amendment. I now observe that a text has been presented in which the wording of paragraph 1 of the resolution is different. The amendment I am proposing on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group goes somewhat further as regards the scope of the work of the proposed committee and the countries referred to than the official version of the resolution proposed by the five groups in Document 523/74.

Two different conceptions lie behind these texts. In my group we inclined to the view that the future global approach to Mediterranean policy is bound to involve an overlapping of functions and that the activity of this committee should not be confined strictly to the countries that are already associate members and will sooner or later become full members of the Community, but that we should define the scope more broadly.

I think this is an appropriate way to organize Parliament's work, so that one committee is entrusted with the future Mediterranean policy in its entirety.

This is where these two texts differ. I admit that for the moment there may be some differences of opinion with the Committee on External Economic Relations. If anyone wants things more clearly defined, this could be discussed later.

Lücker

We have proceeded from the assumption that it is desirable from the political angle to affirm the comprehensive nature of the Mediterranean policy even at this stage, whereas according to the motion for a resolution as it stands this committee's responsibilities relate only to the countries which later hope to become members of the Community. I imagine it would be better to alter this.

This is why we have tabled our amendment. We want to restore the wording which, for some time at least, was under consideration by the groups. I ask the House to approve this amendment.

President. — I call Mr Kirk.

Mr Kirk. — As I said earlier, I am prepared, on behalf of my group, to support this resolution and will vote for it. I should, however, make it plain, as think I did in the discussions which we had before this was brought forward, that we see this as a temporary measure with a view to reviewing the general functions of both the committees which at present deal with the external relations of the Community—the Committee on Development and Cooperation and the Committee on External Economic Relations. Obviously the point which Mr Lücker has made comes very timely into that review.

Therefore, although we are not putting down an amendment to it, we hope this will be limited for one year and that in the course of this year it will be possible to carry out a review of the functions of the various committees in this regard.

President. — I call Mr Schulz.

Mr Schulz. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to reject this motion for a resolution. I shall, if I may, make three remarks.

The first really concerns procedure. I do not quite see why, at this time, late in the afternoon of 10 March, we should be obliged at all costs to deal with, I might say, rush through, a resolution which has such far-reaching implications.

For after all today marks the end of one parliamentary session. This proposal, however, concerns the European Parliament's new term of office. And, even if there is a majority in favour of it today, it is conceivable that tomorrow, on the threshold of the new term of office, it will be discussed anew. Whatever we may decide today may—and possibly will—be disputed.

My second point: as far as I can judge, it would appear that this proposal, which has such important implications for the future, has not been properly discussed either in the different committees or in the groups. For this reason too I would deplore it if we now set up this committee since, as Mr Kirk has said, it would be only a temporary measure.

I think that such a committee would represent not a temporary measure, but the starting point for a political initiative for which, however, it is still too early. I have heard from many colleagues that they regard the setting up of a new committee with these functions and tasks as politically premature. Some colleagues have put it even more bluntly. Parliamentary decorum prevents me from quoting them here.

For myself, during our discussions I have made no bones about my belief that, in the present circumstances, such a committee would be a kind of higher committee and would not be able to function, because its terms of reference are not and cannot yet be defined. The intention was of course—and personally I have always agreed with this, Mr President—to create in addition to the twelve existing committees a 13th and a 14th committee which would be responsible for the Association with Greece and with Turkey. This would be a provisional solution; these two committees would, in fact—here I agree with Mr Kirk—be a temporary measure. Under present political and economic conditions they could at most prepare the ground for such a higher committee. In my view the political preconditions for this just do not exist at present. I think it possible that we shall be able to discuss this matter in a year's time or at the beginning of the session after next, in 1977, in much more favourable conditions than at present.

If we decide today—under urgent procedure—to set up such a committee, we shall not be making our work in the near future any easier, despite all good intentions. I therefore ask the House once again, for the reasons I have given, to reject this motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mr Fellermaier.

Mr Fellermaier. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, whatever our colleague, Mr Schulz, may say, we may naturally all have different views about the expediency of setting up new committees or abolishing old ones or altering committees' terms of reference.

The fact is, however, that for many weeks there have been consultations between the groups on the new prospects for reviving, as a subcom-

Fellermaier

mittee of the Committee on External Economic Relations, the Committee on Greece, which once existed independently, so that it would work alongside the EEC-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee. It then occurred to us here, in Parliament, that, since we had once had an Associations committee which was responsible for Greece as well as Turkey, we could resurrect it for political reasons.

It should be understood that, apart from the question of Greece's and Turkey's right to equal treatment by the European Community and the relations to be fostered between the European Parliament and the Parliaments in Ankara and Athens, there is the further question: what is the best arrangement in this Parliament for achieving this? Certainly not by two separate delegations, each of which, knowing hardly anything about the other, will believe it is acting for the best as far as the special relations with the one country are concerned without being able to see this Eastern Mediterranean area with all its delicate interactions as a whole.

Now, by its proposal for an amendment, the Christian-Democratic Group hopes to extend the scope of the committee's work to cover all associated Mediterranean countries. I do not think it is worth spelling out exactly what this means just now, but I wish to state explicitly that I agree with the view expressed by Mr Kirk on behalf of his group that we shall have to review the positions with regard to the Mediterranean and also the ACP countries now that the Convention with the ACP countries has been signed.

I do not think, however, that this can be done here, in the House. The experts in the different groups will have to be asked to consider the matter. If, however, we were to say, here and now, we reject this idea of an Associations Committee, this would mean that with the opening of the new session and appointment of committees tomorrow the Greek/Turkish question will not be settled. It would look bad politically if we were to appear to be lumping the relations with Greece and Turkey together with a whole lot of other questions to be dealt with in one committee—as has been the case up to now in the Committee on External Economic Relations.

We must realize—I can say this as chairman of the EEC-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee—that the Grand Turkish National Assembly has delegated the best people from its political groups from every field and profession to sit on this committee. Now we do not wish to suggest that the groups have not appointed good people to the EEC-Turkey Committee. It is just that their hands have been tied. They could send representatives only from the Committee on

External Economic Relations, but not from the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment or the Committee on Agriculture. No-one will wish to deny that agricultural questions play an extremely important part in the relations with these two countries. It is clear, too, that the question of immigrant workers occupies a much more important place in relations with Turkey, for instance, than customs and trade issues. It is perfectly right that responsibilities for these matters should no longer be narrowly confined within the Committee on External Economic Relations and that instead there should be an independent committee for the whole Mediterranean area; and it would be only fair for its functions to be defined in discussion with the chairman and vice-chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations, which is responsible primarily for questions concerning Greece and Turkey and the other association issues.

I therefore ask the House to reject Mr Schulz's proposal and give the groups a chance today to consider which people from the different committees to nominate tomorrow for this special committee, which will have to bear very special responsibility for the Mediterranean policy.

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

I have Amendment No 1 tabled by Mr Lücker on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group and worded as follows:

The motion for a resolution to read as follows:

The European Parliament,

- having regard to Rule 37 of its Rules of Procedure,
- considering that in the present circumstances it would be useful to strengthen the parliamentary bodies responsible for questions connected with the associated Mediterranean countries,

Has decided:

1. To set up an Associations Committee, with 35 members, which will be responsible for all relations with all associated Mediterranean countries and which will appoint from among its members delegations to the Joint Parliamentary Committees;
2. To amend the resolution of 11 March 1974 accordingly, with effect from 11 March 1975.

Mr Lücker has already spoken to this amendment.

I put this amendment to the vote.

The amendment is adopted.

The resolution as amended is therefore adopted¹.

¹ OJ No C 76 of 7. 4. 1975.

13. *Computer Centre*

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Pêtre on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the Computer Centre (Doc. 486/74).

I call Mr Pêtre.

Mr Pêtre, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to point out in introducing our report on the functioning of the Computer Centre of the European Communities in Luxembourg that as early as 1969 some of our colleagues put written questions to the Commission on the difficulties the Centre was at that time experiencing in properly carrying out the tasks assigned to it.

The same questions were also raised in the press. Some articles even went as far as to criticize the standard of administration at the Centre. Moreover, in the Audit Board's report for the financial year 1970, we noted that these problems had been discussed in the 1968 report and since 1968 the situation had deteriorated still further. The 1970 report claimed that there had been negligence in the administration of the Centre and that its work had been organized in too pragmatic a fashion.

The European Parliament, concerned at this situation, decided, when adopting its decision to give a discharge on 9 May 1973, to set up a committee of enquiry to investigate this matter and seek a constructive solution in collaboration with the Commission. On 13 July 1973 the Committee on Budgets made the sub-committee on the budget of the Communities (control of implementation) responsible for carrying out this enquiry.

My task as rapporteur was, first of all, to collect the necessary information, examine it and divide it up into a number of main themes, to enable the sub-committee to assess the chief aspects of the Computer Centre's organization and working methods. We were thus able, at the beginning of the enquiry, to provide our colleagues with various documents, including two working documents describing the background to the enquiry, two summaries of our initial findings and a document in the form of a questionnaire addressed to the authorities at the Centre.

Since then, we have studied the provisional report by the Directorate-General for Personnel and Administration on the development of data-processing work in the Commission.

I must now inform Parliament of the outcome of the work assigned to us following the talks with the appropriate authorities in the Audit

Board, the Computer Centre and the Statistical Office. As a result of these meetings and the Commission's report received in mid-July last year, on the functioning of the Computer Centre, we have been able to prepare a summary report on the Centre's main problems. This is the report submitted to you today.

In the first two parts of this report, we explain the circumstances which led to the establishment of a committee of enquiry. We describe how we carried out our task, with reference to the Commission's report, which outlines the position at the Centre before 1973 and the improvements introduced since. We also describe the work in progress at the moment and the prospects for the Centre, because obviously it is important to establish what happened in the past — and it is this that interested us initially; but what the chairman of the Committee on Budgets and the members of the committee of enquiry are mainly concerned with is the future, and how the Computer Centre will operate then.

I should like to point out, in passing, that the last part of the Commission's report contains a number of annexes relating in particular to the staff employed at the Centre, its equipment, establishment plan, financial appropriations and expenditure.

The last part of the present report is on behalf of the committee of enquiry and consists of a detailed analysis of the main inferences your sub-committee drew as regards the Centre's equipment problems, staff, administrative structure, work, external contracts, internal management and budget.

I apologize, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, for the complex and technical nature of the subject, but this is always the case with computers and I shall try to be as concise as possible.

You will have noticed that the committee of enquiry has stressed the multiplicity of the problems involved in the Centre's functioning. Although these problems sometimes overlap, we have established six main areas of difficulty: staff, administration, the work of the Centre, current problems, improvements introduced, and future prospects. My comments will be based on the findings of the committee of enquiry and the Commission's report. We hope to give an idea not only of the Centre's past difficulties but also the improvements we have recently put into practice and possible ways in which the Centre could develop.

Our investigations have led us to the conclusion that the Centre's operational difficulties were largely due to its equipment. For example it was decided in 1969 to rent a computer to replace the two inherited from the ECSC and the EEC,

Pêtre

but it took much longer than expected to install this and put it into operation. In fact, we found that this computer did not become fully operational until the end of 1973. It should also be pointed out that the Commission's data-processing requirements, both as regards quantity and quality, have long since exceeded the capacity of the Centre's equipment. It seems that this equipment is based on two computers. One of these does about 40% of the Centre's work and deals mainly with data from the Directorate-General for Personnel and Administration. The other normally does the rest of the work, including work commissioned by the Statistical Office.

This computer thus handles the teleprocessing work which, according to the Commission's report, is gradually replacing the more traditional applications.

A further comment on computer problems: the expenditure involved in renting the equipment has increased considerably in recent years.

Between 1968 and 1974, the annual expenditure averaged 900 000 u.a. In 1974 it was 1 000 000 u.a. In addition, there are rental costs and related expenditure such as technical assistance, which varies according to the way in which the equipment is used.

As far as future prospects are concerned, we must point out that in our view the Commission cannot at the moment—and this is very important—give an exact assessment of its future requirements in regard to computers or data-processing equipment in general.

It has been confirmed that studies are being carried out with a view to drawing up a development plan for the Centre for the next five years. This plan will take account of the extremely rapid growth—20% per year has been mentioned—in the requirements of those using the Centre's facilities and the need for it to take over some of the data processing currently done outside the Centre. In other words it will enable new types of data-processing work to be developed, in particular teleprocessing and time-sharing. The replacement of the Centre's equipment is particularly urgent because the contract with a company that has leased one of its computers is due to expire in 1976, and this is not far away. Thus, in the coming year, the Centre's authorities will probably have to let manufacturers know their requirements and make a decision on the tenders available. The parliamentary sub-committee, in other words the committee of enquiry, welcomes the Commission's proposal to keep it informed of future developments in replacing equipment.

Apart from the problems attributable to the Centre's equipment, other factors played a

crucial part in the difficulties it experienced in the period 1968 to 1973.

As there is no time to analyse them in detail here, Mr President, I shall merely point out that my colleagues on the committee of enquiry and the Committee on Budgets who have read the report will note that pages 10 and 18 give full information on all aspects of data processing equipment—staff, the qualifications of personnel, shiftwork, working conditions, the organization of the Centre and its internal administration.

As regards the budgetary presentation of appropriations for the Commission's data-processing activities, our committee of enquiry has, unfortunately, been unable to obtain precise information on total amount or the breakdown of the appropriations. As the sums involved are in the region of 2.5 million u.a., this is a regrettable shortcoming. The lack of a breakdown in this item makes it impossible to determine the level of certain expenditure such as the cost of leasing the computers, and also, in the opinion of the Audit Board, makes it easier for independent equipment to be set up outside the Centre. Annex H of the Commission's report gives some idea of the disparate nature of the appropriations covered by item 2240.

We will, of course, be told that a slight improvement has been made in the 1975 budget by the creation of a new item 2242 covering the execution of certain data-processing work. This is true, but the improvement still does not provide a full picture of the various types of expenditure. As we have stated to the Committee on Budgets, we realize that the structure of the Community budget is not suited to the accounting peculiarities of an industrial unit such as the Computer Centre, but we nevertheless feel that there is a need for a greater diversification of budgetary items within Article 224.

We agree with the proposal by the management of the Centre that it should be provided with an annual breakdown of appropriations under item 2240 similar to that given in Annex H of the Commission's report.

After these few observations on the problems involved in the operation of the Centre and their consequences, may I turn for a few minutes to the recommendations the committee of enquiry makes in its report in regard to centralization at the Centre, unity of command and the development plan?

As far as centralization is concerned, the committee of enquiry feels that, in the light of the conclusions drawn, the efforts of the Commission should be directed towards preserving as far as possible the centralization of its data-processing

Pêtre

activities, both at departmental level and in its relations with private firms. We consider that the rule ought to be for data-processing work to be concentrated at the Computer Centre which would be responsible for the design, implementation and use of programmes.

Exceptions to this rule should be permitted only occasionally and in clearly defined cases.

We hope that the development plan will be concerned mainly with the future of the Centre. As I stressed earlier, the object should be to rectify the mistakes of the past and to avert further criticism; but the main point is whether the Computer Centre at the service of the Commission can really carry out its task and fulfil its responsibilities, without jeopardizing the administrative and data-processing activities of the Community Institutions.

The Centre's main problems in the next two years would appear to be the introduction of a shiftwork system and the configuration of the computer equipment. At a more general level, the Centre will have to deal with the problems that will inevitably result from the rapid increase in data-processing requirements—possibly as much as 20% in the next few months alone.

We know that the Commission drew up a development plan in 1973, but this has not been forwarded to us. It is to be supplemented in the near future by a further study, necessitated by the trend towards teleprocessing in the Centre's work, which has been enforced rather than planned.

The sub-committee hopes to be notified of the revised plan, and any changes, in the next few months. In our view, to be fully effective, the plan should deal in detail with each of the questions raised in the Committee on Budgets' discussions—in the presence of Commission representatives—i.e. staff, equipment, organization, management and centralization, as I mentioned earlier.

We also intend to keep a close watch, because of its importance to the future of the Centre, on the progress of the procedure for renewal of the equipment, which should begin in 1976.

Now that I have presented the main points in my report, I should add that the members of the committee of enquiry have tried to carry out the task entrusted to them and take into account Parliament's responsibilities in regard to the control of expenditure, which were confirmed and extended by the Treaty of 22 April 1970.

This Treaty confers upon the Assembly, together with the Council, the right to give a discharge

to the Commission in respect of the implementation of the annual budget and the report of the Audit Board.

Within its terms of reference, Parliament has various means of carrying out checks on the regularity, advisability and correct use of Community expenditure. Thus although a committee of enquiry may seem a somewhat exceptional measure, it is justified when required by the seriousness of the errors and irregularities discovered.

Finally, I must say that the committee of enquiry's experience of the Centre's problems has shown that the effectiveness of this method of control depends on the cooperation of the controlling bodies and the assistance of the Audit Board. I am pleased to say, on behalf of the committee of enquiry, that the Commission, the Audit Board and the authorities of the Computer Centre gave us the utmost cooperation and assistance. I should like to thank them, personally and on behalf of the committee of enquiry.

Now that the enquiry is over, your sub-committee's task will be confined to taking note of a number of technical documents still to be forwarded by the Commission, ensuring that the promised improvements are carried out and following the progress of particularly important matters such as the renewal of data-processing equipment.

The resolution that we are proposing, voted for unanimously by the members of the Committee on Budgets and the committee of enquiry, is based on the considerations I have set out, which the committee of enquiry feels will lead to the constructive solution it must find.

It is with particular satisfaction that we put this outline solution to Parliament, in the hope that it will form a basis for the operation of the Centre in the future.

Mr President, all that remains is for me to thank you for allowing me to exceed my speaking time and to express my gratitude to the chairman and members of the Committee on Budgets, my colleagues on the committee of enquiry and the secretariat of the Committee on Budgets, without whom my task would have been impossible.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Aigner to speak on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group.

Mr Aigner. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, first I should like to thank the rapporteur for his work in what, for this Parliament, is a new field; it was not easy and he has shown great industry, thoroughness and—as we

Aigner

have grown to expect from him—great perception.

Mr President, this committee of enquiry was set up in response to criticism and adverse findings made by the Audit Board during the discussions on the budget. I think the mere fact that we have set up a committee of enquiry shows what a parlous plight this Computer Centre was in.

Very great hopes were placed in the Centre when it was set up by the Merger Treaty, but it has not at any time lived up to our expectations. It went badly astray, despite the high I.Q. of the staff available. The reason, Mr President, is undoubtedly that the Commission did not set out its responsibilities clearly and the terms of reference and the tasks and the means to be used were not clearly defined. The Commission is undoubtedly partly to blame for this. It has erred by default. Moreover, no one particular person has felt specially responsible for this Centre. Everyone has tried to pass the buck.

Even during our enquiry and work it was months before we were given an idea of what was required, for all the Commission's good intentions. We still do not know today whether the plans we finally worked out will really achieve the hoped-for results.

But, Mr President, I wish to say quite explicitly on behalf of my group that, not only do we endorse paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the resolution before us, but we particularly want to emphasize them. The Community needs a fully operational data processing system. It is absolutely essential.

Mr President, I can only deal with one set of problems, which are however the most difficult of all. When we try to sort out our ideas on what is needed, the question of Community statistics arises. We know in the agricultural sector that we have to work with statistical material which is not adequate to enable the Commission, the Council and the Member States to reach clear political decisions. The Community's statistics must be developed. For this we need a new, fully integrated data processing system. And, Mr President, if the Commission endorses this view, then we shall of course need capital and staff.

Take, now, the task of this Community statistics system; this itself requires a new approach to the matter of equipment for two reasons: we do not want to build a European system parallel to the new data processing systems being developed in the Member States, we want to coordinate European data processing systems.

I agree with the rapporteur when he says that the question of equipment can only be answered

by reference to the tasks set. What are the tasks, how and with what equipment can they best be accomplished? The first question, then, which we must ask ourselves and which must be answered unambiguously is this: what system is best suited to carry out the tasks required by the Community? Other questions must come later.

Now of course this does not answer the question of a European computer industry, although this concerns us just as much. We know that this problem of the European computer industry cannot be isolated from questions of the size of the market, volume of production, and the necessary exchange of information on research and development.

For this the Commission must create new means of achieving real cooperation in the European computer industry. And how can this be done, unless by financial inducements? We need these to encourage European computer firms to coordinate their activities, not only in order to get unified production, but to be able to serve this market which we wish to create.

This requires, however, in addition to the reform of the Computer Centre, a clear Commission on this industry. My group feels this is of supreme importance, because we must enlist the help of the European Computer industry in the development of a fully operational European data processing system.

The question of staff is bound up with this. Those firms wishing to coordinate their activities must be able to employ top experts. Only those that can develop such expertise can help in this coordination. Therefore, coordination involves mobilizing the top experts.

This means that there must be commensurate remuneration and, still more important—this again is the view of my group—, since electronic data processing is such a new and rapidly developing field, you cannot keep our experts confined in the Computer Centre, you must allow them to take part in new developments, programming operations. This means that the training of our staff, to a greater extent than hitherto, and to a greater extent than in any other fields, must include ongoing training and further training. Here, too, we depend on the Commission to make appropriate proposals.

Mr President, I must unfortunately end here, because the Committee on Budgets is already waiting for me to present my report. I should like to say once again on behalf of my committee that we are very grateful to the Commission for recognizing the task and for providing starting points for a new approach.

Aigner

We should like to be informed of the Commission's work not only during the budgetary discussions, but also in cooperation with the Audit Board and the Auditor. I hope that by mutual exchange of information we may be able to realize our common objectives in this difficult area.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR MARTENS

Vice-President

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

Mr Gerlach. — *(D)* Mr President, first a personal observation: I hope your successor will also give me a chance on Thursday to speak for an extra 15 minutes on my report, for I shall also need to speak at length.

With regard to today's report and motion for a resolution, I should like to take as my starting point the fact that we here in the European Parliament took a very important and, I think, politically important, decision and set up a committee of enquiry—the first such enquiry in the history of Parliament as Mr Pêtre's excellent report has shown.

We should, moreover, for the political record, note that with this committee we have embarked on a new process in line with our main demand regarding the Parliament's budgetary powers in view of the wide ramifications of budgetary procedure in the European Communities.

I have every reason to believe that the setting up of this committee of enquiry in itself will have some effect and the demand submitted by Mr Aigner for an additional 48 members of staff for the Computer Centre for the 1975 financial year on the basis of work and preparations by the committee of enquiry has already confirmed this.

I shall not repeat what has been said here, but for future reference should like to point out and indeed emphasize very strongly what Mr Pêtre has said in his motion for a resolution. This committee of enquiry or Sub-committee on the Budget of the Communities (control of implementation) must in future—and the Commission representative has agreed to this—be kept closely informed about the organization of the Centre, in order to recognize in good time any faults that may occur again. We must moreover receive the plan for the development of the Centre, for in the committee of enquiry we have acquired some understanding of the workings of

the Computer Centre, so that we are now considerably better placed to judge it from this or that angle than previously—and that, let it be said again, is thanks to our colleague, Mr Pêtre's, excellent work.

I should like here to mention a point which was included in the motion for a resolution at my instigation: the need for us to be kept informed of the rate of utilization of the Computer Centre so that we can keep a check on investments. We must bear two things in mind: first, not only are we investing capital in this, but we are also calculating staffing requirements on the assumption that the rate of utilization, or utilization ratio, as I call it, of the Computer Centre is going to increase considerably. To use an expression of Mr Aigner's, the Computer Centre is organized in such a way as to work round the clock and any reduction in this means an increase in overheads and a waste of investments.

The second point which emerged clearly in the committee of enquiry, which the Commission representative also agreed with, is that we must promote coordination of the various activities of the Community Institutions involved with the Computer Centre. We cannot allow them each to carry on separately—as has been the case—so reducing the efficiency of the Computer Centre. Nor can we allow qualified colleagues to be underemployed because of lack of coordination and thus allow their expertise and skills to go to waste.

In conclusion, Mr President, I should like to point out that with this committee of enquiry the request so often made by the Parliament for an auditing committee to be set up to supervise budgetary activities in the Community has been virtually met. We have proved that we can work effectively without a new committee and achieve what we, as the Committee on Budgets, always aim to achieve on behalf of this House, that is to be an efficient supervisory body for the Communities and be able to continue as such; and that we—and particularly the rapporteur, Mr Pêtre—have accomplished the task we were set in a way which I think has been of service to this Parliament.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Noè.

Mr Noè. — *(I)* Mr President, I should merely like to make two points, following upon the observations of Mr Pêtre, rapporteur, and the other speakers, which I should like to address chiefly to the Vice-President of the Commission, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

First, in its new research programme, Euratom plans a wider approach to problems through

Noè

systems analysis and data systems; it also plans to farm out work to outside institutes, such as the IASA. To this end, it has thought of setting up a small staff of seven at the Commission, to prepare these data programmes and have them processed by such centres as the IASA or the Battelle Institute. Now, in the Committee on Energy I have fought for an increase in this staff in view of the importance of this field which not only covers matters connected with the administration of the Communities but extends to decision-making aspects of Community policy and while these may have points in common with the others they require the attention of more than seven people. I should therefore like to ask the Vice-President of the Commission—and we shall certainly have occasion to come back to this—whether he can arrange for sufficient staff to be assigned to this new line of approach.

And here I come to my second point. I do not wish to be too dogmatic since various opinions have been expressed on the subject within my group; it is a rather delicate matter, but I feel I must point out that, both at the Computer Centre in Luxembourg—as Mr Pêtre mentioned in his report—and at the Battelle Institute, to which the Committee on Energy has entrusted certain studies, two types of computers are used: the IBM and the French CII. This has certainly caused delays which I find worrying because in questions of critical importance to the Community delays of up to two years for this sort of reason simply cannot be tolerated.

Therefore, while fully mindful of the opportunities offered to Community industries though the use of different types of computer, I should not like to think that, when problems of particular importance and urgency arise, there is only a limited amount of data available to those who take the decisions.

These were the two most important and relevant points I wished to make.

President. — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like, on behalf of the Commission, to express my gratitude to the Committee on Budgets for its initiative and above all to Mr Pêtre for the excellent report he has given us today.

As you know, I am not directly responsible for the Computer Centre, but before coming here today, I made a point of obtaining the detailed information Parliament needed to make a proper assessment.

It is common knowledge—and Mr Pêtre has already made this very clear—that the Commission and the European Communities have had serious problems with the Centre in the past. However, I believe, and the rapporteur has confirmed, that some of the measures already adopted by the Commission have been quite effective. What we must now do is to continue on this path and see that the approved reforms lead to the creation of a high-level unit for the management of the Computer Centre and, consequently, to changes in the data analysis and programming structures.

In discussing the past, Mr Pêtre referred in somewhat dramatic terms to a number of extremely delicate matters, such as those relating to the budget. He also said that work done in the past should look to the future and that all experience must be used to avoid the repetition of mistakes. One of the Centre's prime needs—as was stressed in the discussion—was for sufficient staff. The Commission owes it to the European Parliament that the Centre now has thirty new officials, which means increased capacity and the possibility of shift work.

However—as already stated at this meeting and as the committee of enquiry emphasized in a subsequent survey—the utilization ratio is not yet optimal. Mr Gerlach has alluded to further possibilities, but it has also been stated that the utilization ratio will not be effectively improved unless a system of shift working is introduced. It will obviously be necessary to amend the staff regulations and we hope that, as on other occasions, the European Parliament will give us its support.

I hope that the Council will take account of this technical requirement which has emerged from the enquiry conducted by Parliament and is written into the proposals submitted by the Commission.

In its resolution Parliament requested—and Mr Pêtre has just confirmed this—that the relevant documents be made available. Some of these, concerning the future organization of the Centre, are already being prepared. On the basis of work done so far the Commission will supply information on the development plan, i.e. the necessary measures for developing the Centre's activities, and also on the appropriations and personnel required in the data-processing sector, accompanied by a summary of estimated expenditure on these activities for 1975.

These are the documents which we shall submit to Parliament for consideration and, in particular, to the sub-committee that carried out the studies. I should like to add that Mr Pêtre's

Scarascia Mugnozza

request relating to the spread of expenditure impressed me favourably. Listing expenditure under one or two budgetary headings, without specifying how it is to be spent or showing the corresponding entry, does not provide a clear picture. I therefore feel that, as regards the spread of expenditure, a greater effort must be made to give the European Parliament a clearer idea of precisely how money is spent.

The documents will be drawn up on the basis of a detailed study of requirements for the next few years, on the assumption that the Computer Centre can become a pilot centre. Indeed, it is our intention that the Centre should be directly linked with a number of main sectors.

The first will be the management and administration sector (and here we are thinking of using an integrated system of staff management and administration). The second will be the statistics sector, the importance of which has been emphasized by Mr Aigner and Mr Gerlach. Data banks will be established, such as 'Kronos' which is already in operation, or, in the field of documentary research, 'Celex', which uses a legal data bank.

This will not only meet the requirements of the Commission but will, and indeed already does, take account of the needs of all the Community Institutions; and we hope that this sharing of the Computer Centre by the Institutions will prove to be a positive development.

I should also like to confirm that the Commission will forward to the Sub-Committee on the Budgets of the Communities the documents it has requested and will keep it informed of the process of renewal of the Computer Centre's equipment.

I should like to add two very brief comments. Mr Aigner and Mr Gerlach have spoken of the computer industry and pointed out the importance to Europe of this important market. Linked to this question is the problem of personnel training, which I mentioned earlier in connection with the need to improve the Centre's utilization ratio. I wish to assure the Members that the Commission is particularly conscious of this problem. I should further like to say a word to Mr Noè who, interested as he is in future problems and the possibilities of expanding the Centre's activities, has pointed out how small the staff is that studies these matters. It goes without saying that the Commission will do its best to see that answers are found to the problems of staffing, improved use of the Centre's equipment and software utilization that take maximum account of the interests of all the Community Institutions.

(Applause)

President. — Thank you Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

I call Mr Pêtre.

Mr Pêtre, rapporteur. — (F) On behalf of the Committee on Budgets I should like to thank Mr Scarascia Mugnozza for the reply he has just given and all those colleagues who participated in this debate.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted¹.

Thank you, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

14. *Petition No 3/74:*
Protection of the Mediterranean

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Premoli on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on Petition No 3/74 by Mr Barel on the protection of the Mediterranean (Doc. 386/74).

I call Mr Premoli.

Mr Premoli, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the increasing concern over the ecological safety of the Mediterranean is understandable. The so-called 'mare nostrum' is practically an inland sea and, unless we take immediate action, could become a dead sea, swallowing up along with the animal and plant life an entire civilization thousands of years old: the danger lies in the sea's slow rate of renewal, so much so that it is said that, if a bottle were thrown into the Mediterranean at the Straits of Gibraltar, it would reach the Suez Canal about a century later.

Last September the European Parliament adopted a report on the Paris Convention. In this report it was proposed to combat pollution of the North-East Atlantic. At the same time Parliament requested that the Communities take similar action with regard to the Mediterranean, whose limited size, narrow entrances and slow rate of renewal, owing to its negligible tides, have brought about the dramatic ecological situation I have scarcely begun to describe.

The Mediterranean, you will remember, is now protected against pollution by two conventions: the London Convention of November 1973 against pollution caused by shipping, drawn up within the framework of the intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization and the con-

¹ OJ No C 76 of 7. 4. 1975.

Premoli

vention, also signed in London, in 1972, against pollution caused by dumping in the high sea, under the international convention for the prevention of the pollution of the sea.

However, the problem is not so much the conventions themselves as one of compliance and enforcement; apart from this, the Mediterranean is not protected against pollution from land-based sources, with which I am dealing in this brief report, or against pollution due to exploitation of the sea bed. Action of various kinds has been taken in this field by a number of international organizations, such as the FAO and the World Health Organization, or through bilateral agreements. There was, for example, the agreement regarding the Adriatic between Italy and Yugoslavia and the projected agreement between Italy and France, though this has never gone any further.

Unfortunately, it has not been possible to implement these agreements, either because of difficulties of a general character or because of divergent, if not directly contrasting, interests between the countries concerned.

The difficulties in the way of a general agreement are almost insurmountable, so great in fact that it would seem more reasonable to try to concentrate on solving, at the very least, the problem of one type of pollution. It is for precisely this reason that we are today discussing pollution from land-based sources.

Obviously initial action focussed on a pollution factor must not prejudice any other measures by the European Parliament, for example, aimed at developing public awareness.

What we will have to do, as called for in the Barel petition, is to appeal once more to all the peoples living along the Mediterranean and to the industrialists to put an end to pollution to which these same peoples and industrialists will eventually fall victim.

I recall the Scarlino incident, which was given a lot of publicity by the press, as an example of serious pollution, namely of the Ligurian Sea; this naturally caused resentment among Corsican fishermen who saw in it a threat to their livelihood. Another example is an industrial centre, Marghera, near my home town of Venice. I must make it clear that if the appeals we propose to make prove ineffectual, we shall have to take more active measures, from outright condemnation to boycotting.

The fact is that, as regards the development of the Mediterranean peoples and the safeguarding of that development, the improvements we are calling for (and I believe Parliament is

unanimous on this), should not jeopardize the livelihoods of those peoples. The real problem, in fact, is to strike a fair balance between the needs of industry and those of marine life. This balance, to be perfectly frank, is not an easy one to achieve.

So what do we propose to do? We propose implementing measures to strike this balance, by strengthening, for example, the cooperative spirit of the nations concerned so that they see all of their ecological problems as a single whole. Also, we must place at the disposal of the Mediterranean states all the most recent discoveries made in the campaign against pollution. It is also proposed to set up a special fund to pay for the necessary—and extremely high—costs of conducting this campaign.

Then there is the problem of harmonizing the legislation, hitherto fragmentary, passed by the Member States with a view to promoting, pending an overall agreement which is so much more difficult to achieve, regional agreements e.g. between neighbouring countries, such as France and Spain, or between neighbouring regions, such as Sardinia and Corsica. It will also be necessary to coordinate research programmes and to encourage ecological know-how.

The inter-parliamentary conference of Mediterranean countries, held in Rome last year, proposes—and I cite this proposal because I believe it deserves to be put into effect—the establishment of an international scientific research centre for the collection of research data on the subject.

I feel that both the Community and the United Nations must not underestimate or overlook this initiative but, on the contrary, support and develop it.

We must also avail ourselves of all the possibilities which the modern science of communication places at our disposal: the mass media, education of public opinion, school curricula. Ecology must enter into our schools as part of the curriculum so that the pupils realize that the world must be kept clean, for if we permit ourselves the luxury of despoiling it, through indifference, we shall end up as the victims of an ecological tragedy. Coupled with this is the problem of devising a genuine policy of waste management, even if it goes no further than coordination, involving the establishing of waste disposal plants; the cost of these would certainly be considerable and could perhaps be charged to the special fund I mentioned earlier.

The Barel petition, to which I return, deplors the fact that the directors of Montedison have

Premoli

caused the ecological damage reported in the press. I would mention once again the Scarlino case which seriously threatened employment in Corsica in two sectors—tourism and fishing. The Italian courts recognized that such damage had been done, indeed, in the successful action brought by fishermen from Scarlino and Corsica the Leghorn magistrate reproved the chairman and directors of Montedison for the ecological damage they had done.

By discharging waste, they cause the destruction of plankton, interference with the sea bed, the accumulation of chrome and the disappearance of fish. It is worth noting that in 1972/1973 catches in this sea were down by 470 metric tons compared with the previous year. There are also species of fish that have disappeared altogether from the Mediterranean. I recall, too, the famous lecture given at the Council of Europe by Commander Cousteau, who reported that the bluefish had disappeared and that 80% of the fish which were to be found twenty years ago in the Mediterranean have been destroyed or have migrated elsewhere in search of less-polluted seas. The Mediterranean is in danger of being abandoned to its fate and of being unable to fulfil its role, that of feeding the peoples bordering it. It is intolerable that a sea which represents the principal biological resource of the people living on its shores should continue to be polluted in this irresponsible way.

Here are a few impressive statistics: each day three thousand tons of red mud, that is to say toxic substances constituted by the residues of titanium dioxide (a substance used to colour plastic, enamels and varnishes) are poured into the Ligurian Sea while a ton of white mud is poured into the Adriatic, which is even narrower. All this in the name of employment. And these are not isolated cases. In the Marseilles region, along the bay, enormous quantities (six million tons) of alkaline residue are poured into the sea annually while the Rhone discharges another 50 million metric tons of polluted water into it.

We should therefore note with satisfaction that the Commission is drawing up a directive restricting the discharge of titanium dioxide waste. However, we should like such a measure to be more general and to include harmful and dangerous substances without distinction but without disturbing the conditions of competition between industries or intervening unfairly in favour of one or the other (unless the Community takes it upon itself to correct these imbalances, which seems to me impossible, not to say unfair).

If this fragile competitive balance is to be preserved, uniform rules must be adopted for all seas. I would stress this point since Italy is the only country completely surrounded by the Mediterranean and therefore lacks the advantage of having the fresher and purer water of the Atlantic. If, therefore, ecological standards were more severe for the Mediterranean and less severe for the Atlantic, Italy would be the only country among the Nine to be placed at a disadvantage. It would also create distorted conditions of competition among French industries since a small area of France borders on the Mediterranean, a larger area being washed by the Atlantic.

I should also like to mention, Mr President, the problem of the instruments used to purify sea waters. These consist of diffusers, which cost less but which have to be fitted with sufficiently long pipes and carry the polluted water more than a kilometre from the sea shore and purifiers which, while more expensive, thoroughly purify the water and reclaim the sea in a way that would not be possible with the diffusers. The purifier has another advantage over the diffuser i.e. it processes the chemicals and transforms them into substances which are of particular value today to the economy of our markets.

Mr President, I must not forget to mention a point concerning one of the problems already touched upon. We were pleased to learn that the Italian Montedison, which caused damage at Scarlino and the Marghera region, has launched a programme providing for the spending of 200 000 millions, including 25 for Scarlino and 50 for the reclamation of the Marghera region. This, in our view, is encouraging, since it demonstrates a new awareness that the great industrial problems are of vital importance to our future.

I shall say no more except to conclude with the hope that this report will meet with Parliament's approval.

(Applause)

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

Mr Lemoine. — *(F)* Mr President, Mr Premoli's report and the motion for a resolution on Mr Virgile Barel's petition on the protection of the Mediterranean call for a number of comments from the communists.

I should first like to say that we are pleased to see Parliament taking an interest in this problem; it is to be hoped that our debate will

Lemoine

be constructive and effective and that the Commission will take account of it.

I should also like to stress that Mr Virgile Barel, the oldest member of the French National Assembly and Communist deputy for Nice, was responsible for setting up a parliamentary committee of enquiry on the problem of the coast, beaches, waters and sands of the Mediterranean and the measures to be taken to combat pollution and to ensure the protection of marine life.

A comprehensive report has been prepared and is in the process of publication. This is very informative and complete; in my view the data it contains should be used for the work and decisions necessary at European level.

I shall confine my observations to three points. First, the Mediterranean is a vulnerable sea because it is virtually land-locked and because the rate of change of its waters is very low. Moreover, its tides are restricted, amounting to between 20 and 40 metres.

As a result pollution, which is a problem all over the world, is much more serious in the Mediterranean than, for example, in the Atlantic.

Secondly, pollution takes different forms. These are not all equally serious but the problems increase considerably each year. The main causes are industrial, urban, domestic and hydrocarbon waste; waste from nuclear power stations will in the near future undoubtedly be added to this list. Thus, far from decreasing, pollution with its corollary of deterioration of the marine environment is on the increase and in certain sectors is reaching a very serious level which it would be pointless to try to hide. The French committee of enquiry emphasized that the risks of contamination by mercury were very real in the Mediterranean in view of the considerable amount of waste flowing in to it, in particular from the Rhone; at present there are no provisions to prevent the discharge of untreated effluent into the basin of this river.

The problem of waste from the Montedison company is also well known and has recently been in the news. Mr Premoli mentioned it in his report. My only comment is that this provides a good illustration of the failure, not to mention lack, under the capitalist system, of procedures for restricting pollution arising from industrial development. The failure to purify urban and domestic effluent has also led to a critical situation. For example, 200 000 cubic metres per day come from Marseilles, only 10% treated effluent from Corsica, and 15% treated effluent from the entire Provence-Côte d'Azur region. All this leads to very extensive damage to the marine environment sometimes involving the total destruction of flora and making bath-

ing dangerous or even causing it to be prohibited. In addition, hydrocarbon waste arising from accidents, degasification or tank cleaning operations at sea amounts to 300 000 tons per year in the Mediterranean alone.

Thus, the consequences of this massive pollution, which are already critical, may become catastrophic both for the marine environment itself and for those who use it, causing the destruction of plankton, shellfish and birds not to mention the damage to bathing and tourist resorts representing the livelihood of millions of people.

If we add to this the threat to the future of off-shore oil research it will be evident that Mr Barel's cry of alarm which is now echoed in all quarters is completely justified.

However, although it is relatively easy to identify pollution and its consequences, it is today more difficult, as Mr Premoli rightly stressed in his statement, to decide and take measures to limit and stop this pollution. It has to be admitted that the application of existing legislation, for example in the fight against pollution by hydrocarbons, at best results in sanctions so mild that they have practically no deterrent power. Moreover, no considerable oil slick can, at present, be tackled with the technical and financial means available. The means for tackling industrial and other wastes are derisory. The authorities do not have the necessary funds. The present situation therefore gives justifiable cause for concern and measures must be taken as a matter of urgency. The scientific structures for monitoring pollution are inadequate and badly coordinated.

The situation is no better in the field of international law in view of the complexity of the regulations involved, and there is at present no regional agreement on the Mediterranean.

Existing conventions must therefore be respected and the Convention of London must be ratified. Action must be taken as regards the riparian states and an Institute for the Protection of the Seas must be set up.

It is also necessary to find types of financing by increased state aid from charges and taxes imposed on undertakings.

We must recognize how much blame attaches to the polluters and to the logic of capitalist profit and arouse public opinion to obtain solutions.

We must take steps to ensure that the polluters do as fact pay, otherwise the fight against pollution may well become the source of new wastages and increase the burdens on local authorities.

Lemoine

We support the motion for a resolution, but stress that the formulae are weak, in particular those contained in paragraph 4 and 5. In our view stronger terms could have been used as regards responsibilities and more stringent demands could have been made as regards polluters, in particular large undertakings whether these are situated in France, Italy or other Mediterranean countries.

It would undoubtedly have been useful to ask for an absolute prohibition on the venting of oil tankers, for example, and to stress the need for international agreements and action since all oceans must be protected against polluters for whom profit always takes precedence over human life.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Cifarelli.

Cifarelli. — *(I)* Mr President, when it was heard that a large number of fish in the Rhine had been hit by disease and what disastrous consequences pollution was having for that important river, I remember that many Dutch, French and German Members—as the people most directly concerned—spoke on the seriousness of the problem. It will therefore come as no surprise that, apart from the rapporteur, whom I wish to thank for his clear, precise and interesting report, those who speak on this issue are predominantly those who live in countries bordering on the Mediterranean, in particular my own country Italy, where this problem has reached what I can only call drastic proportions.

Mr Barel's petition therefore comes at a particularly appropriate time; so does the interesting and forceful enquiry carried out by the Commission. But I feel it is nevertheless important to stress certain points.

Of course I do not want to repeat what the rapporteur has already said, I simply wish to emphasize the following: the Mediterranean is in very serious danger and urgent and strict measures must be taken. I think this is quite obvious. The Commission will therefore be carrying out an important task if, at the instance of Parliament, it tries to get specific agreements and specific action from the Mediterranean countries, with the support of all the countries of the Community. The Mediterranean countries of the Community, France and Italy, have already outlined certain agreements. But I believe it is up to us to point out the urgency of the problem to the Commission and, through the Commission, to the Council of Ministers.

Another point I wish to stress is that conventional measures for controlling marine pollution

are not enough. Special measures must be taken. Two causes of pollution have been particularly emphasized: industrial pollution and pollution by effluents from large centres of population.

As regards industry, it is clear that the Commission must call for strict application of the general principles, because if it is right that the polluter should pay, it is also right that aid for the installation of purifying equipment should be equally distributed, to prevent distortions in the equality of conditions for commercial operators, which is a basic free market principle.

I wonder if special regional policy activity should not be encouraged in this connection. I should like to note that the body which deals specifically with regional policy in Italy, the 'Cassa per il Mezzogiorno' has undertaken to carry out a large-scale project comprising multi-sectoral action for the elimination of industrial and other pollution from land-based sources in the Gulf of Naples, where it has reached nearly unbearable levels and constitutes a serious threat to human survival.

I feel that the distinction made by the rapporteur between purifiers and diffusers is extremely important and I believe everything possible must be done to ensure the introduction of purifiers, because in certain regions—I refer to Southern Italy, but what I have to say applies equally well to other regions in other countries bordering on the Mediterranean—which have high consumption due to tourism, a high urban population or seasonal movement, and which often lack sufficient rainfall to maintain a normal water level in rivers and catchment areas, the question of desalination arises. Israel has shown what can be done in this field, but it is clear that desalination becomes more costly and less worthwhile if offshore pollution—and it would be unthinkable to put the desalination installations on the high seas or on ships—reaches very high levels.

A final comment. It is being said that the Commission intends to submit a directive on this issue. I have always preferred regulations to directives. The latter give too much latitude to national authorities, with consequent delays and inadequacies.

I should like to add that man, the supreme polluter, is also destroying fish. The Mediterranean is a sea where hardly anyone can fish any more. Mr Premoli referred to the lagoon of Venice; I wish to refer to Italy's westernmost lagoon, opposite Tunisia, the stagnant pool of Marsala. This is an area of 1 200 hectares of water which used to be full of life but where now only the odd fish is to be found, because most of the area is nothing but polluted mud.

Cifarelli

The problem is enormous. It is a problem of education, above all a problem of supervision and rigorous application of the law. If implementation of the various conventions is not brought forward to the earliest possible date, there will no longer be anything left to apply strict conservation standards to. I again thank the rapporteur and conclude by saying I believe that this House, which has already debated this problem, can contribute to clarifying the urgent, dramatic and vital requirements of certain Community countries and to human civilization and survival in general.

President. — I call Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli.

Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli. — (1) Mr President, honourable members, I agree with Mr Premoli's report but I feel nevertheless that much of what has been said should have been given more emphasis.

There is no doubt that more emphatic comment on the condition of the Mediterranean would have been desirable. The Mediterranean is in serious danger; it is a dying sea and the Scarlino problem—I had the honour of submitting questions on this in this House—is only one of the more obvious signs. Another point which I should like us all to consider in this connection is the so-called false problem of employment. The report is correct in stating that preserving employment in one sector is threatening employment in another, notably fishing. I believe that Parliament, the Council and the Commission must consider these problems very carefully and not be influenced by views which are not always put forward with the best interests of the workers in mind.

On one point I disagree totally with Mr Premoli. I think that under no circumstances whatsoever should part of the aid allocated to Venice be given to Montedison. I do not think this would be possible, either in this particular case (because Montedison must take full responsibility as we all know) or as a general rule, for I believe that action on this problem should on no account be left to private enterprise. The Montedison ecological programme may be an excellent thing itself, but I do not feel that this is the way the problem should be tackled as a whole.

The problem of diffusers and purifiers has already been raised. Diffusers,—let us speak frankly—are at best palliatives; they are useful in certain circumstances but they do not solve the problem. If, as has been suggested, we consider the problem of purifiers together with the problem of desalination—I refer to the state-

ment made by Mr Cifarelli—we can see that modern science makes it possible to carry out desalination and purification at the same time. The world's need for drinking water will continue to increase, and I believe it is worth taking a long-term view and making a greater outlay and a more intensive commitment, in order to solve both these problems together.

This is rather similar to what was said in the discussion on the production of energy for heating purposes when Mr Noè observed that with modern science it was possible to derive advantages from what appeared to be the negative aspects of progress. I think this is the line the Commission should take. Of course this will involve very high expenditure but it will be worth it in the long-term, all the more so in that—let us be realistic—it would then be appropriate in my opinion to make industry contribute in accordance with the 'polluter pays' principle; all the more so in view of the fact that this course would be to the advantage of industry in any case. We could also ask for a comparable commitment from the Community. This is of course talking about the future—let us have no illusions—but it is not utopian, for certain stages have to be gone through. And the provision of drinking water supplies is one of those stages.

We constitute a political assembly, and it is therefore essential in this connection to state once again that the main issue for us is not scientific and technological improvement but the political will of the Community.

I agree with the rapporteur on the need in this sector for an exchange of ideas and information between the Member States and the countries bordering on the Mediterranean. We Italians live in a country where there are violent arguments every time a new power station is built and it cannot be otherwise, given the enormous complexity of the problems relating to tourism, the environment, historical sites, famous buildings, the countryside and agriculture.

In general, after the initial period of enthusiasm, when solutions seemed to be within easy reach—remember the discussion of 'zero growth', population control, etc.—it has been realized that the solution is in fact extremely difficult, much more difficult than it seemed at the time of the first outbursts of ecological excitement. In Italy we have learned from experience; people such as Mr Corona who have lived through such experience personally, know how necessary a collective commitment is and what active and passive resistance will be encountered on account of privilege, ingrained custom or just plain laziness.

Carettoni Romagnoli

Mr Jahn rightly stated at the Nairobi conference that it was essential to overcome national selfishness. But we must appreciate that this is much more difficult in a time of shortages and crises and we must not be content with mere speeches and motions: we must make an effort to work out appropriate measures to deal with the situation. We have pointed out two or three; there may well be others. We must make a choice as regards the priorities mentioned in the report. The Nairobi conference made it quite clear that the developed world has a responsibility and highlighted the fact that a system based on profit, privilege and selfishness in a sense owed a debt to humanity, especially to the humanity of tomorrow. I should like to conclude by stating that the Community, which has carried out valuable studies, and this Parliament which has adopted important resolutions should take the view expressed at the Nairobi conference: it is time to replace words with specific action. Otherwise we shall still be talking while the sea dies.

In conclusion, I ask the Commission to give serious consideration to certain long-term measures, whose technical preparation it could promote, and thus adopt a political position which is not vague and, above all, is not merely rhetorical.

President. — I call Lord Reay.

Lord Reay. — I hope it will be accepted that there should be a northern intervention in what has been predominantly a Latin debate. However, I think that the fate of the Mediterranean concerns a great many people apart from those who live on its shores.

The Mediterranean is known and loved by many millions of people throughout the world, especially in Europe, because of the strong historical ties and values that it has for us.

The damage which was done to Venice is widely known. However, I do not think that the people in the Community as a whole are as aware as they should be of the damage which is threatening the whole Mediterranean as a result of industrial pollution coming, as was pointed out by Mr Premoli, from many sources. It is true that corrective action must take proper account of the need to preserve local employment, but, as Mr Premoli says, a fair balance must be found between the needs of industrialization and the need to preserve the environment.

Mr Premoli mentioned in his report, although not in the resolution, the interests of the people

who visit the Mediterranean area on holiday. Millions of holiday-makers from within the Community visit the Mediterranean each year. Indeed, the Mediterranean must be the greatest holiday centre in Europe because of its climate, its beautiful environment, its ancient civilizations and the sea. I do not think that the interests of the holiday-makers necessarily clash with the interests of those who live locally.

Each holiday-maker has an interest in seeing that the Mediterranean and its shores are kept clean, that the environment is not ruined in other ways and that the process, which Mr Premoli has so vividly described, leading to the creation of a dead sea should be arrested. I think that that is very much a matter of interest to the Community, and that it is a problem which should be dealt with on a Community level. It is one on which I think I can safely say that, as a group, we shall greatly welcome initiatives from the Commission.

People who do not live locally may not be as concerned as they might be about the problem, because they do not yet believe in the possibilities of effective Community action. If that be the case, I hope that we can prove them wrong.

I strongly support the report. I believe that my group would support any action proposed by the Commission which would assist towards the solution or the alleviation of a problem which must surely be a matter of the greatest interest to all the citizens of our Community.

President. — I call Mr Della Briotta.

Mr Della Briotta. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish first of all to thank the rapporteur, Mr Premoli, for the report he has submitted on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment.

The report owes its origins to the petition submitted to the European Parliament by Mr Barel expressing anxiety at the extent of pollution causing damage to the marine environment of the Mediterranean, with serious consequences for marine flora and fauna.

But the problem is much more extensive, and if it is not dealt with, it will bring about profound changes in the human environment of the regions bordering on the Mediterranean.

The pollution of the Mediterranean referred to in the petition is pollution from land-based sources caused by mainly coastal industries depositing dangerous waste products in the sea. The petition is directed in particular at the Italian Montedison Company, which has been

Della Briotta

polluting and in part continues to pollute, the North-Western Mediterranean from its Scarlino factories, causing resentment among the fishermen in Corsica and the South of France, whose livelihood is threatened. There have been fierce arguments and these have received newspaper coverage all over Europe.

It has to be stated that it is not just the Montedison Company (whose chairman was sentenced by the Leghorn magistrates) which is to blame. Other industries, in particular French industries in the Marseilles region, are depositing alkaline residues in the sea and the Rhône pours large quantities of polluted water annually into the Mediterranean, as Mr Lemoine has observed.

I shall mention once again that Montedison, under pressure from public opinion expressed through the national parliaments, has now embarked on extensive and binding environmental programmes, which we should welcome. This is the first positive development, and it deserves to be emphasized; at the same time it is to be hoped that the Commission is also controlling the situation.

Discharging poisonous substances into the sea alters the marine biological balance; it destroys plankton, upsets the marine environment, may cause diseases in fish, and, above all, forces them to abandon their natural habitat, which having changed, no longer corresponds to their needs. The Mediterranean has been called an ailing sea; it is virtually landlocked, the flow of water from the Atlantic through the Straits of Gibraltar being extremely slow. The high rate of evaporation means that less concentrated water enters from the Atlantic, given the much lower rate of evaporation of the ocean, and this slows down the rate of plankton reproduction; this surface water is affected by all the floating pollutants, in particular hydrocarbons. This displaces more highly salted water richer in the mineral salts which provide nutrition for plant life. All these circumstances, plus the effect of the dense populations living on the coast, which grow considerably in the summer, mean that the Mediterranean is now a sick sea, and may well not survive its disease.

The Mediterranean is threatened in the West by industrial pollutants. In the East it is affected by agricultural insecticides (DDT and similar products), while pollution by hydrocarbon residues is particularly pronounced on the African and Middle East coastlines.

If the industrial development contemplated by the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, in particular by new undertakings, not to mention probable increases in population, is taken

into account, the future of the Mediterranean Basin certainly cannot be viewed optimistically.

That the seriousness of problems of the Mediterranean is particularly widely felt is shown by the various measures that have been taken at international level. These include the London Convention of 2 November 1973, concluded under the aegis of the Intergovernmental Consultative Maritime Organization on the prevention of pollution at sea from the discharge of waste from ships, which includes the Mediterranean as a protected zone, and the London International Convention of December 1972, which lays down standards for protection against pollution by dumping (where the main problem is the discharging of hydrocarbon residues into the sea).

After the Stockholm Conference in 1972, the United Nations set up a body on the environment called UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). In February, this organization arranged a meeting in Barcelona of countries bordering on the Mediterranean with the intention of drawing up a common 'plan of action on the protection of the Mediterranean'.

All bordering countries, including non-members of the European Community, and countries with political and ideological differences, such as Israel and Egypt, Turkey and Greece concurred in the now general concern, and expressed awareness of the consequences of failure to take concerted action on the Mediterranean problem.

Two protocols to the Barcelona Convention are of particular importance. The first provides for penalties for dumping and the other is concerned with mutual aid in cases of accidents at sea, especially as regards tankers carrying crude petroleum which are damaged or spill part of their cargo.

The final action plan on the protection of the Mediterranean will be submitted for approval to a conference of plenipotentiaries to be held in Barcelona in February 1976.

There are also (even if these do not relate to the Mediterranean specifically), the recommendations of the Caracas Conference on the law of the sea concerning protective and preventive measures as regards oil pollution. Where Community is concerned, the Community Action Programme on the environment, which was approved by the Council on 22 November 1973, makes provision, in terms of specific action on problems of common interest, for measures to protect the sea from pollution, whether from land-based sources or not. To this end, the Commission is required to set up a working party of experts on the problems of combating marine

Della Briotta

pollution to assist it with the implementation and preparation of proposals. There are of course enormous problems in laying down standards while reconciling the problems of competition and distortion of competition in industry in relation to the greater or lesser capacity of the sea to recover: and the capacity of the Mediterranean to recover is certainly less than that of the Atlantic. The problem is enormous and I should like the Vice-President, Mr Scarascia Mugnozza to make a statement if he is in a position to do so.

The European Parliament for its part has already delivered an urgent appeal to the Commission (Doc. 197/74 Premoli Report on the Paris Convention on the prevention of Marine Pollution from landbased sources) as the sponsor of a convention on the protection of the Mediterranean.

Clearly the problem is urgent, it affects everybody and will require every effort from everybody and is of such importance that even enemy powers are prepared to sit at the same table because they have a common interest in cleaning up and protecting the Mediterranean.

The Mediterranean is a common good of particular importance to the states which border on it, but it is also an asset to the whole of Europe.

On behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, I hope that both the Council and the Commission will give priority to the action provided for in the action programme on the control of marine pollution, with particular regard to the Mediterranean, and will be prepared to cooperate with international bodies to find legal frames of reference based on international directives, so as to make a contribution which is not just based on promises and recommendations but will seek precise implementation of normative international standards and action to the extent necessary to protect and preserve the Mediterranean. *(Applause)*

President. — I call Mr Noè.

Mr Noè. — *(I)* Mr President, allow me to say a few words on a point which, it seems to me, will further add to Mr Premoli's resolution, with which I am otherwise in full agreement.

This concerns the rapporteur's suggestion that all waters originating from rivers should be protected. There can be no doubt that of the three main sources of pollution in the Mediterranean, i.e. river water, coastal discharges and pollution caused by shipping, the largest on aggregate is river pollution since this emanates from a larger

area than just the coasts. This is therefore the most important factor and until we have managed to clean up the rivers—and this will also be useful to society, since river and lake pollution causes not inconsiderable detriment to our terrestrial environment—the Mediterranean will remain dirty. Today we are concerned with the harmonization of legislation on this matter, but it appears to me that we have neglected the fundamental need for riparian states to co-ordinate on problems concerning the waters of certain river basins.

On 25 February the Committee on Public Health and the Environment met in Paris in the presence of Minister Jarrot and a director-general responsible for such matters: the meeting was devoted to this very question, with particular reference to French experience. I would say that their approach makes for consistency. This is a subject on which one could speak at great length, but I shall not do so. I shall make do with one example: France has a certain number of 'Agences de Bassins' (river-basin authorities) instituted in 1962 and operational since 1968. The head of the Rhone Authority, the 'Agence du Rhône et de la Méditerranée' is Mr Lacroix. I first met him a few years ago and as I was on holiday in those parts last year I paid a visit to his laboratories on Lake Geneva, Lake Annecy and Lake Bourget, three lakes which have different pollution problems, but which are the responsibility of a single person who is in charge of the whole basin. This overall procedure has proved its worth insofar as conditions have improved in the three lakes and at the same time in the Rhone and consequently in the Mediterranean.

Mrs Caretoni said—and this is an interesting point of view—that she preferred purifiers to other more drastic methods. I would say that before dwelling on subjects of this nature it would be better to deal with the problem more generally. Every river of a certain size should have a Mr Lacroix working on an inter-disciplinary basis to solve the problems involved...

Mr Corona. — *(I)* Who opposed all this in Italy? Someone from your own party!...

Mr Noè. — *(I)* Certainly not from my party. I have always directed my efforts along these lines. My party, I repeat, did not oppose this idea, otherwise I would be guilty of inconsistency. This is something which has to be made clear. Without undue presumption I can say that there is no danger of making a mistake on such a straightforward matter whereas an affirmation of this kind in respect of more complex problems could be rather rash.

Noè

I would like to go on to request Mr Scarascia Mugnozza to do his utmost to ensure that all the Member States adopt this global approach to the problems connected with river basins.

When there is a Mr Lacroix for every major river in the Mediterranean area, we shall have made an initial step in the right direction; otherwise we shall have been wasting our time and shall be unable to guarantee effective protection and improvement of the quality of these rivers.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Concas.

Mr Concas. — *(I)* Mr President I shall confine myself to elaborating briefly on two points considered by the rapporteur in his report.

It is true that the Mediterranean already enjoys protection under two international conventions, the one on pollution caused by shipping and the other on the oil discharged by tankers during cleansing operations. It is however equally important to establish as soon as possible an international convention on marine pollution from land-based sources.

I would like to remind you of the great importance at the United Nations Conference on the law of the sea at Caracas of the principle (to be incorporated in an international convention) by which the riparian states are responsible for pollution control. The courts of the state whose flag the offending ship is flying have the sole duty to conform with whatever the controlling authorities of the coastal nation have decided and should therefore confine themselves to meting out punishment.

Or else (and this represents a substantial deviation from the principle of maritime law we have known until now) the coastal state may, through its own courts, proceed to punish the offender. I must say that this principle should be particularly emphasized since it represents a new departure in shipping law.

The other point to which I wished to draw attention concerns that part of the otherwise most valuable and comprehensive report presented by Mr Premoli in which the rapporteur emphasizes the desire not to disturb the balance of competition conditions between chemical industries, and states that uniform rules are needed for discharges, irrespective of the sea concerned.

I subscribe to this principle. The one comment I have to make is on the need for these uniform rules to be very severe to take account both of discharges on the high seas and discharges

in a closed sea basin. The uniform rules must, I repeat, be very stringent, above all to avert further damage to closed seas such as the Mediterranean and the Adriatic, or, simply, the Venice lagoon.

If a principle of this kind were not accepted (although I consider it most desirable) we would have to subdivide the seas. In this event the famous special fund which the rapporteur so rightly advocates would have to make a distinction as to eventual contributions and incentives to be accorded to firms—different percentages would apply for the installation of purifying plants as the larger the plant the more it costs. I have nothing further to add except that I wish to join in the general appeal launched here to restore the health of the seriously stricken Mediterranean as soon as possible.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission is particularly aware of the serious situation in the Mediterranean, and naturally I too am aware of this as I come from a region bordering the Mediterranean, which is feeling its effects.

Today's discussion has been extremely interesting: I have to thank not only Mr Premoli for his report which was so impassioned and full of concrete facts, but also all the other speakers and in particular Lord Reay, who put the problem in its real Community perspective—something which I found particularly welcome.

You will certainly recall that Parliament gave its opinion with regard to the participation of the Community as such in the Paris Conference, I emphasized that this was not only a step of fundamental importance but also the first expression of the common desire of Member States and states outside the European Community to solve the problems of the North Sea. Not only did the the French Minister of the time invite the Commission to take part in the work of the Conference in the place of the Council of Ministers, but I took a further step, asking that participation should cover not only the decision taken but also the signing of the Convention. I did this for two reasons: firstly to affirm the existence of the Community as such in conventions which affect not only the Member States but also third countries and, secondly, because the Community's signature engaged the responsibility of all the signatories on the basis of the norms which form part of our action programme. This ensures consistency with the norms of Community action.

Scarascia Mugnozza

Although fraught with the vicissitudes with which you are familiar, the matter was settled successfully, thanks mainly to the support given by the European Parliament. And, continuing from this, we are now proposing today to take further action, this time with reference to the Mediterranean. Why the Mediterranean in particular? Because, as has been noted in several quarters, an inter-governmental conference on this sea, in which Commission representatives took part, was held in Barcelona from 28 January to 4 February.

What guidelines emerged from the Conference? I would like to refer to them again because I think it would be useful to draw an analogy between the work of the Conference and the future of the Mediterranean. The Conference called for integrated planning of the development and management of the resources of the Mediterranean basin; it asked for a coordinated programme of research, continuous control and protection standards, as well as an exchange of information and data on the level of pollution. It also called for an outline convention for the protection of the marine environment annexes on each of the principal sources of marine pollution; finally, it asked for a study of the institutional and financial instruments required for the plan of action.

So a first important step has evidently been taken. And initiatives have already been taken for the elaboration of two draft protocols: the first concerning prevention of possible detriment caused by shipping and aircraft, and the second concerning the fight against pollution from oil and other harmful substances as a result of accidents. We already have initial activity on these matters. There are other initiatives which are to be taken by one or more coastal states, based on the elaboration of draft protocols concerning other sources of pollution, and in particular the prevention of pollution from land-based sources such as have formed the subject of our discussion today.

In the light of this, account should be taken of the fact that in the case of projects involving only Member States (I mention the example of the Rhine, referred to by Mr Cifarelli, on which we are working—without any results so far—since the Rhine passes almost exclusively through countries of the Community) it is not easy to find a solution. One only has to think, for instance, of the difficulties encountered at the Council when, called upon to approve the directive on water, we found ourselves confronted with conflicting interests between a number of Community countries (this was the case, for example for pure spring waters, which cross a part of France picking up pollution, arrive polluted in Belgium, leave Belgium even

more polluted and end up in the Netherlands with the highest possible degree of pollution: and this is water which is destined principally for domestic use); in this case it was ultimately possible to approve the directive and take a decision of principle, but not without serious difficulties.

If such problems arise on matters which concern only the states belonging to the EEC, it is not hard to imagine the difficulties likely to arise outside, not only in obtaining agreement between countries with conflicting interests (let us take the case of the Mediterranean, in respect of which a frequent subject of discussion between the oil-producing and oil-consuming countries has been the source of finance for the purifying plants, especially for certain projects, which have already been discussed and submitted, concerning systems of purification at source, i.e. where the crude oil is loaded) but also on questions of a legal nature, such as those which have been alluded to on several occasions. Here within the Community we can adopt directives and regulations in order to impose a single, standard system, but we must deal with third countries through international instruments which can be employed within the limits of the obligations of each of the Member States, their requirements and interests. The Commission is at all events aware of the seriousness of the problems. Its intention is not to indulge in rhetoric but to take action and this is my answer to Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli. We shall do everything necessary, on the basis of the ideas followed so far, with regard to our present and future plans, to ensure that the inner cohesion of the Community is also manifest in confrontations with third countries directly interested in the fate of the Mediterranean; of this sea which we look upon as our own and which we must endeavour to leave for future generations in the best possible condition if we do not wish it to become a source of danger for our future.

What measures should we adopt? Mr Cifarelli expressed a preference for regulations rather than directives, particularly as regards titanium dioxide. For this and other pollutant substances we have interested specially equipped institutes in the problems involved and invited them to draw up reports on the situation in various different seas. The study which has been prepared on titanium dioxide points out the concern of Italy and in particular of the president of the Tuscany region, who has made certain statements to the press on this subject.

What is the substance of the concern which has been expressed in the speeches today? That it is possible to judge by two different standards and that the problems of contamination of the Medi-

Scarascia Mugnozza

terranean are to be seen as being different and much more serious than those connected with the North Sea.

This is indeed true in as far as the North Sea is much more open and has strong currents, and polluting substances are therefore much more easily dispersed, presuming that once they have been dispersed they are neutralized by the water, which has, however, not been proved.

The problem is evidently different in the Mediterranean. There are no such currents since it is more of a land-locked sea. And so, in order to avoid greater contamination in the Mediterranean than in the Atlantic, industries which discharge harmful substances into the water must be obliged to install even more effective purifying facilities. Here we come to the problem of cost and the problem of competition, problems of which the Commission is fully aware. Such problems are not resolved in the studies made, which are of an exclusively technical nature; and in this sense the concern expressed by the President of the Tuscany region was justified.

We shall therefore submit a proposal for a directive in the near future. Why a directive and not a regulation? Because we cannot issue a regulation on all the points which we have to cover. It is not at all possible to regard the provisions for titanium dioxide in the same way as provisions for another substance, which will require norms, criteria and interventions of a completely different kind.

On the other hand, for the problem of the environment in particular, I think that it will be easier with a directive to overcome certain initial difficulties, and also later problems caused by the energy crisis, despite the many statements and assurances to the contrary. It is easier, in my opinion, for a directive to achieve the desired aim since a directive represents a framework of norms within which the necessary adjustments can be made. We shall also draw up regulations, but at a suitable point in time and for specific cases which can be examined in a narrower framework.

We shall therefore submit a directive, and in the framework of this directive, we shall not be able to ignore the polluter pays principle already accepted by the Council; we shall simply be providing norms to make it possible to proceed from the formulation of the principle to its practical realization. And the polluter pays principle states clearly that any industry which is henceforth set up in Europe must have its own purifying plant and consequently not cause any pollution. This is a principle which is no longer open to discussion and which has already been applied.

But the problem is the industries which already exist and it is for these that we shall be taking appropriate measures, with compensatory provisions aimed at avoiding distortion of competition conditions. In fact we have already acted in this sector, since two or three months ago the Commission, exercising its powers of decision, intervened with aid in support of certain Belgian and German industries within the framework of the ECSC. The aid was to allow firms to adapt their systems and plant to cut out pollution.

In the case of the industries in the Mediterranean Basin I am unable to anticipate the Commission's proposal. This is a problem for discussion in the European Parliament and for which, I believe, we shall find the right solution.

As regards the convention on pollution from land-based sources I would like to state, in the light of what I have already said, that the problems of the Mediterranean can also be studied and solutions considered on the basis of the Paris Convention; the Commission will soon be submitting proposals to this end to the Council. Naturally we shall ask Parliament to give its opinion on them. This will start an exchange of views between us which will enable us to deal with these problems.

One final remark: Mr Noè spoke of river basins. I believe that it can henceforth be understood that the Commission has come back to the idea of river basins and protecting the quality of water by this method. On the other hand, this argument will be the subject of further discussion between us since we intend to introduce it in the Commission's second programme on environmental protection which will come into effect on 1 January 1976. So in the course of this year, after consultation with a number of experts and with Parliament's Committee on Public Health and the Environment, this programme will be published and will represent a further opportunity to meet and exchange views with the European Parliament in order to establish priorities (the water problem is a priority problem), and to solve the water problem in legal and technical terms.

Mr President, I have nothing further to add except my thanks to all the speakers for their contributions and the assurance that the Commission will pursue its activities towards the protection of the Mediterranean, in the framework of the commitments which it has assumed vis-à-vis the European Parliament and the next action programme. Finally I give notice of the forthcoming submission of a number of proposals along the lines indicated by the Paris Conference.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Premoli.

Mr Premoli, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, I shall be brief. I thank the speakers for their substantial support and in particular Mr Scarascia Mugnozza for the information and assurances which he has given.

I would like to make a few observations. As regards the problem referred to by Mr Noè, I am in full agreement with what the Vice-President of the Commission said, and I also believe that the Commission will be well-disposed towards Mr Noè's proposal.

In reply to Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli I would just like to point out that when I stated that a part of the Montedison funds could be included in the appropriations of the special law on the safeguarding of Venice I was in fact referring to a particular article in this law which provides for contributions to purifying plants for industries on the lagoon. This is not a personal idea of my own, nor a kind of grant to Montedison, but a clause in the special law for Venice. I do not exclude the adoption of other methods suggested by the Community; but it is a fact that the industries situated along the lagoon pollute the lagoon itself. However I shall not persist in the request to take these particular funds from the Venice law.

I would like to tell Mr Concas that the problem he raised is referred to in my report, which established a connection with the French data.

Finally I would like to express my thanks to the chairman of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, Mr Della Briotta, for having supplied a wealth of up-to-date informa-

tion to support our report and in particular to Lord Reay, for having also given our report a European dimension.

President. — Does anyone else wish to speak?

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

Thank you Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

There are no other items on the agenda.

15. *Approval of the minutes*

President. — Rule 17 (2) of the Rules of Procedure requires me to lay before Parliament, for its approval, the minutes of proceedings of this sitting which were written during the debates.

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

16. *Closure of the session*

President. — I declare the 1974-1975 annual session of the European Parliament closed.

I would point out that pursuant to the provisions of the treaties, Parliament will meet tomorrow, Tuesday 11 March 1975 at 11 a.m.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 7.45 p.m.)

¹ OJ No C 76 of 7. 4. 1975.

